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Abstract

Several studies have centered around the effects of positive leader–member exchange and low employee turnover. Research has been expanded to include the effects of dual leadership on employee turnover. This qualitative phenomenological study examined how the leader–member exchange relationship and dual leadership affect employee turnover intentions in a Head Start program. A purposive sampling technique was used to gather information. The goal of this study was to examine the subjective experiences of employees’ relationships with supervisors. Standardized, open-ended interview questions were used to gather information from subordinates. Additionally, a survey was used to rate leader-member exchange experiences of subordinates. Participants were interviewed via WebEx and Zoom platforms due to COVID restrictions. Supervisors completed an open-ended questionnaire describing their support and determining employee satisfaction. Results indicated that turnover intentions were impacted by positive and negative leader–member exchange relationships. Positive followership characteristics affected turnover intentions. Subordinate relationships with both leaders mirrored each other. Specifically, when the leader–member exchange relationship with the immediate supervisor was low, attempts for a positive relationship with the site manager did not change a subordinate’s intent to quit. Finally, supervisor views of leader–member exchange engagement were misinterpreted as group engagement. Based on the study’s findings, it is recommended that both supervisors understand the need for ongoing, consistent face-to-face engagement that goes beyond job tasks. Terms such as “open-door policy” and “available when needed” should be clearly explained and separated from the rule of staff engagement. Supervisors should be trained in synchronization and social contagion’s impact on new employees. Staff mentors and increased engagement through communication are essential. If the new employee does not have strong
followership characteristics, it is the responsibility of both supervisors to connect regularly with the employee to develop a strong leader–member exchange relationship.

*Keywords:* leader-member exchange (LMX), turnover intention, dual leadership, followership
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Employee turnover has long been a problem for organizations. These problems often resonate in diminished tacit knowledge, work disruptions, discontinuity, and overall ineffectiveness for the company (Reina et al., 2018). Turnover intention is the mental process that takes form before individuals quit their jobs. This cognitive process is the strongest indicator of an employee’s decision to quit (Campbell et al., 2014). When an employee leaves a job, there is a profound impact on the company. One theory that has made a profound impact on improving employee turnover is the leader–member exchange (LMX) theory. There has been extensive research on LMX and its impact on employee turnover (Fan & Han, 2018; Li et al., 2012; Peterson & Aikens, 2017; Pucetaite & Novelskaite, 2014; Sherman et al., 2012). LMX is a relationship-based approach to leadership (Qi et al., 2019) that focuses on the individual relationships with leaders and their subordinates (followers). The research on LMX’s impact on employee turnover has shown some positive effects. Additionally, the idea of dual leadership has become increasingly popular, and the ability of leaders within organizations to manage these unique opportunities have caused some concern (Reynolds et al., 2017).

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2019), the number of voluntary separations for December was 3.3 million, with the total number of separations being 5.5 million or 3.8%. Employee separations included quits, layoffs, and discharges. Quits were voluntary separations initiated by the employee. Layoffs and discharges were involuntary separations originated by the employer. Employees also separated for other reasons such as retirements, transfers to other locations, employee disability, and employee death (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019). With voluntary turnover the primary reason for separation, considering reasons for employee turnover is important.
Voluntary turnover has some positive effects, such as fresh insight into current company issues, the loss of poor performers, or higher performance from remaining staff (Campbell et al., 2014). However, the cost associated with turnover and the loss of critical knowledge have a substantial impact on organizations. For organizations like Head Start, the effects of these losses impact more than just company processes. Head Start was developed in the 1960s in response to Lyndon B Johnson’s War on Poverty (Office of Head Start, 2019). In 2018, Head Start reported serving nearly one million children nationwide (Head Start | ECLKC, 2020). For example, one Head Start program serviced children in over 30 centers, including seven Early Head Start Centers. In 2017, this Head Start program serviced 4,337 children and families (Head Start of Greater Dallas, 2018). However, employee turnover has been a problem.

Research is extensive on the dyadic leader–follower relationship known as LMX (Steffens et al., 2018). The research on LMX and turnover has shown positive correlations between a high LMX relationship and low employee turnover intention. Employees in high LMX relationships feel supported by their leaders. Gomez and Rosen explained, “The quality of the LMX influences levels of delegation, responsibility, and autonomy, and in turn employees perceive greater latitude, decision influence, and feelings of contribution” (2001, p. 58).

**Problem Statement**

According to Vidyarthi et al. (2014), LMX theory posits that “leadership resides in the quality of the relationship between an employee and a manager” (p. 468). Several studies have centered on the positive effects of quality LMX and low employee turnover (Holliday et al., 2010; Li et al., 2012; Peterson & Aikens, 2017; Pucetaite & Novelskaite, 2014; Sherman et al., 2012; Zheng et al., 2016). These studies have shown an interrelation between positive LMX and low employee turnover intentions. Yu et al. (2018) expanded this research by focusing on LMX
differentiation, looking at the variability or the individual differences in the exchange among members and leaders in the same workgroup. Their analysis showed how the exchange variability impacted employee turnover intention and engagement. In addition to leader responsibility in this social exchange theory, Zheng et al. (2016) argued that followers were responsible for actual LMX processes. With all the research on LMX and its effect on employee satisfaction and turnover intention, few practitioners looked at dual leadership, LMX, and its impact on turnover intentions (Vidyarthi et al., 2014).

When subordinates have more than one leader to report to, each exchange has a unique impact on employee outcomes, including turnover and job satisfaction (Vidyarthi et al., 2014). This innovative approach to the LMX theory, dual leadership, and turnover opens the door for further exploration. Turnover research is needed in sectors where the exchange dyad in organizational matrixes has a more permanent setup (Vidyarthi et al., 2014). Nonprofit organizations such as Head Start are examples of more permanent setups. Hunter et al. (2017) revealed the benefits of dual leaders in reducing conflicts and improving turnover and suggested, “Future work should investigate the roles that each leader plays in supporting the dyadic relationship” (p. 1191). By narrowing the research related to employee turnover in nonprofit organizations like Head Start—to include dual leadership and LMX collectively—practitioners can obtain additional resources to improve turnover intentions in these organizations.

**Purpose of the Study**

This qualitative study examined employee turnover in Head Start through the lens of LMX and dual leadership. This research was intended to expand on the previous research of Vidyarthi et al. (2014), which looked at LMX in dual leadership environments. The significance of this study is the expansion of the dual leadership, LMX, and turnover intention triad to a
setting where employees were in constant contact with the same dual leaders. The study may help the wider community by uncovering how dual leadership and LMX impact turnover intention in an educational environment. A phenomenological approach was used to capture and analyze data. The key participants included Head Start teachers, managers, and education specialists.

**Research Questions**

RQ1: How does negative and positive LMX, as demonstrated on the LMX-7, impact employee turnover in Head Start?

RQ2: Describe the commonalities between dual LMX relationship, as demonstrated on the LMX-7, and employee turnover intention.

RQ3: How does dual leadership impact LMX relationships, as demonstrated on the LMX-7, within Head Start?

**Definition of Terms**

The following definitions provide clarity to common terms found throughout this study:

**Dual leadership.** Bai et al. (2012) defined dual leadership as an organizational structure that includes a top management team member and an immediate supervisor. This structure’s leader roles can also be defined as agency leaders (top management) responsible for overall projects, pay raises, and promotions and client leaders (immediate supervisors) responsible for specific aspects of job duties (Vidyarthi et al., 2014).

**Dyadic relationship.** The relationship between two people, specifically, a superior and a subordinate is considered a dyadic relationship.

**Leader-member exchange.** This leadership theory (LMX) is based on the assumption that leaders establish and foster individual exchange relationships with each person they
supervise (member), and both the leader and the member play a part in defining the member’s roles (Sherman et al., 2012).

**Turnover intention.** Li et al. (2019) described turnover intention as “pre-turnover work attitudes and decision processes contributing to each type of movement” (p. 10).

**Outline of the Remainder of the Study**

The four chapters that follow outline the remainder of the study. Chapter 2 presents the literature review, which provides an in-depth view of concepts and themes presented in the study. Chapter 3 presents the research methodology explaining the study’s design, population, instrumentation, and trustworthiness. Chapter 4 presents the analysis of data collected. Finally, Chapter 5 interprets the findings of the study.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Beach and Rutledge (2019) stated, “a strong, centralized leader with a clear vision and the power to execute that vision is more necessary today than ever” (p. 7). Leadership and its many styles have been studied throughout history. Leadership styles such as transformational, transactional, autocratic, servant, laissez-faire, democratic, bureaucratic, charismatic, and situational have been at the forefront of such research. Early studies on leadership emphasized a centralization of power and control. Leaders were considered a dominant force in organizations (Northouse, 2016). For example, transactional leaders use power and authority to arrive at certain goals within an organization, and their trait is characterized by self-confidence and power (Polic, 2019). Transformational leaders emphasize their employees’ abilities and arrive at goals by valuing contributions. Their trait is characterized by interpersonal influence. Leader traits play a significant role in defining leadership related to organizational outcomes. Each of the leadership traits mentioned is centered around a leader’s style as they move their organization (group) towards certain goals. LMX focuses on the leader’s ability to impact individual members in an organization to reach company goals. Regardless of the characteristics or skills of a leader, the process of leading has an impact on turnover.

Leader–Member Exchange

LMX theory is an approach to leadership centered on the interactions or the quality of one-to-one contact between leaders and their followers. In contrast to other leadership approaches, LMX focuses on how the leader relates to each employee and how that interaction affects outcomes. In their longitudinal study on leadership in organizations, Dansereau et al. (1975) presented the difference between supervision and leadership. Supervision relies on the employment contract agreed upon by the employee. In exchange for fulfilling the duties of the
contract, the organization compensates the employee. The employee can fulfill the duties of the contract with minimal exchange or engagement with the supervisor (Dansereau et al., 1975). In leadership, the exchange involves influence and an interpersonal relationship with the employee. Vidyarthi et al. (2014) proposed that leaders influence their followers through trust and affect relationships. A leader’s trust in his followers encourages commitment, thus enhancing the quality of the exchange (Gukdo et al., 2017). Vidyarthi et al. (2014) explained, “LMX theory is based on the assumption that leadership resides in the quality of the relationship between an employee and a manager” (p. 468). These relationships, expressed through transactions known as dyadic relationships, are reciprocated through episodic or a series of events between a leader and follower (Liao et al., 2019). These transactions continue to develop over time. Many evolve into high-quality exchanges while others remain as formal or traditional leader–follower relationships (Burton et al., 2008). The interpersonal dynamics of the dyadic relationship look at the synchronization of the relationship and the transmission process. Synchronization refers to the covariation of the member’s feelings, thoughts, and behaviors over time (Hofmans et al., 2019). Transmission, according to Hofmans et al., is the “process by which a person’s emotions or behaviors predict change” in a person’s behavior at a certain point (2019, p. 383). This happens through back-and-forth communication whether verbal or nonverbal. Synchronization is a process that happens over time.

Transmissions are events that happen at a certain point. LMX is rooted in social exchange theory, where individuals give benefits in exchange for an equal return on those benefits (Sherman et al., 2012). Originally called vertical dyad linkage (Dansereau et al., 1975) due to the vertical or top–down and back-up communication channel, LMX focuses on the different leadership styles, and approaches leaders exchange with each follower. This approach is different
from previous studies that centered on the interaction a leader had with all members. The quality of these individual exchanges is the main focus of LMX (Zheng et al., 2016). Northouse (2016) explained that LMX relationships are separated into two categories: expanded and negotiated responsibilities (extra roles) and formal employment contracts (defined roles). Followers (members) whose relationships with leaders are characterized by extra roles are considered a part of the in–group.

These members enjoy favorable relationships with leaders to include extra support. Leaders engage in high-quality exchanges with members of the in–group. These high-quality exchanges can manifest as positional resources such as support, information, rewards, high trust, and valued task assignments (Sherman et al., 2012) not generally shared with members of the out–group. Trust is an essential resource in the exchange (Gomez & Rosen, 2001). These high-quality LMX relationships as described by Liao et al., “highlight long-term exchanges that are trustful, open-ended, spontaneous, and mutually beneficial” (2019, p. 37). Followers who engage in defined role relationships are considered out–group members. These members generally have less access to leaders, receive fewer resources, and receive more restricted information (Sherman et al., 2012). These members will respond by volunteering less for extra assignments. They will also engage in avoidant communication behaviors (Sherman et al., 2012). Liao et al. suggested that low-quality relationships “focus on economic exchanges in which parties are attentive and suspicious of each exchange” (2019, p. 37). For transactional leaders, low-quality relationships are common. Polic (2019) explained, “Transactional leadership is characterized by the system of penalties and awards which can discourage followers” (p. 55). These types of interactions can fuel out–group membership associated with low LMX. In high-quality exchanges, strong interpersonal relationships are at the foundation and are characterized by trust and reciprocity.
This leads to long-term social relationships instead of short-term economic exchanges (Gutermann et al., 2017). Zheng et al. (2016) expanded LMX focus to include newcomer perceived and anticipated organizational support. Newcomers’ perceived value in the organization impacts LMX. The greater the anticipated organizational support, the higher the level of positive LMX. A follower’s proactive behavior will help facilitate this positive exchange.

**Synchronization**

Synchronization contributes to interpersonal stability. Hofmans et al. (2019) stated that high synchronization is critical for relationship stability because “emotional similarity aids in coordinating the thoughts and behaviors of the dyad members…synchronicity may be a key mechanism underlying high-quality LMX” (p. 383). During synchrony, participants continuously modify their actions to fit the actions of their partners. The continuous modification, or change in behaviors over time, is at the foundation of synchronization. Because these modifications are mutual, the “turn-taking” results are known as *synchrony* (Dumas et al., 2010). At the core of synchronization is the coordination of internal states such as mood, personality traits, values, goals, and temperament. Vallacher et al. (2005) reasoned, “Empathy, perspective-taking, and emotional compatibility capture necessary components of a relationship in which the partners are on the same wavelength” (2005, p. 37). Synchronization is an essential factor in human interaction, thus making it key to LMX relationships.

**Transmission**

The dyad members influence each other over time through synchronization but the behavioral state shifts during transmission (Hofmans et al., 2019). Transmission, also known as contagion, is the innate tendency to experience another’s emotions (Kimura et al., 2008) and is
facilitated through affiliation. In their theoretical review, Levy and Nail (1993) presented early
definitions of contagion, explaining that “in a crowd, emotions and behaviors are contagious to
such a degree that the individual readily sacrifices his interests to the collective interests” (p. 2).
The authors reconceptualized the contagion phenomenon to the term of social contagion and
defined it as the spread of attitude or behaviors from one person to another where the person
does not perceive an intentional influence attempt (Levy & Nail, 1993). This process in
interpersonal communication has important implications in the LMX process.

**Vertical Dyad Linkage**

Early research on leadership focused on two assumptions (Dansereau et al., 1975). The
first assumption was that individuals within an organization were alike in their perceptions and
interpretations of their leaders. Dansereau et al. described the second assumption as “a superior
[who] behaves in essentially the same prescribed manner toward each of his members” (1975, p.
47). By focusing their attention on the relationship between the superior and each member,
Dansereau et al. were able to look at the processes linking them together. This process became
known as the vertical dyad linkage. Unlike supervision, leadership involves influence. Dansereau
et al. specified, “…the nature of the vertical exchange is such that the superior cannot rely
exclusively upon the employment contract…[the] alternative basis of influence is anchored in the
interpersonal exchange relationship between a superior and a member” (1975, p. 49). Each of the
relationships in the vertical dyad was considered unique. The leader and the follower engaged in
an active exchange of input and outcomes (Dansereau et al., 1975).

**In–Group Members**

In the organization, certain followers (members) are given preferential treatment by the
leader. This positive exchange is rooted in the leader’s trust in the member’s work within the
organization. This exchange does not happen by chance. It is rooted in the process of role-creating during the initial stages of the leadership exchange. When new employees or new leaders are introduced to each other, each organizes their roles in the relationship. Because leadership is centered around influence, leaders will allow employees latitude in defining their roles. Latitude in role-defining allows employees or members to negotiate job-related issues with superiors (Dansereau et al., 1975). These members are given more responsibilities, have greater access to the leader to negotiate, and receive more resources from the leader including knowledge not shared with others in the organization. In return, these members will make extra contributions to the organization. These contributions go above and beyond their normal job functions (Liden & Graen, 1980). These contributions are reciprocated with greater support and attention by the leader. These members are known as in–group members of the organization.

**Out–Group Members**

Organizations have a responsibility to ensure employees are compensated through salary and other benefits. This compensation is contingent on the employee’s fulfillment of certain duties within the organization. Some leaders rely exclusively on this formal contract when relating to employees. These employees in return give only the required output. At its extreme, leaders treat these employees as part of a complex machine (Dansereau et al., 1975). There is little opportunity to engage in unrelated issues. The leader also is not dependent on the employee as an individual separate from the complex machine. These employees are considered part of the out–group within organizations.

**Evolution of LMX**

LMX has evolved over the years and has passed through several stages (Schriesheim et al., 1999). Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) suggested four stages with each stage building on the
other. In stage one, leaders developed different relationships with each subordinate. This approach was a move away from the traditional view that leaders had consistent interactions and behaviors with subordinates. This traditional view of leadership was known as the Average Leadership Style (Schriesheim et al., 1999). Stage one of LMX’s evolution can be dated between 1972 and 1973 (Dansereau et al., 1973; Graen et al., 1972, 1973). The second stage of LMX theory began to develop with research from Dansereau et al. (1975) and focused on the constructs and subdomains associated with these relationships. Some constructs introduced during this second stage included interpersonal skills, trust, support, reward, influence, and sensitivity (Schriesheim et al., 1999). This second stage of LMX theory brought about the widely accepted definition of LMX—as the quality of the exchange between leader and subordinate—and added subdimensions (Schriesheim et al., 1999). This stage of LMX theory lasted for a decade.

The third stage of LMX’s evolution came about as a response to the differing theoretical definitions that were presented in research papers and dissertations including the absence of adequate LMX sub-content (Schriesheim et al., 1999). Graen and Scandura (1987) presented a three-phase model of LMX development: role-taking, role-making, and role-routinization. During this third stage of LMX evolution, a more detailed definition of LMX was presented. Scandura et al. (1986) delineated, “Leader–member exchange is (a) a system of components and their relationships (b) involving both members of a dyad (c) involving interdependent patterns of behaviors and (d) sharing mutual outcome instrumentalities and (e) producing conceptions of environments, cause, maps, and value” (p. 580).
Social Exchange Theory

A fundamental practice is necessary to ensure healthy relationships. This practice is the exchange of rewards between individuals (Pillay & James, 2015). These exchanges, best known as social interactions, are reciprocated when the exchange is valued. Social exchange theory (SET) was developed by Thibaut and Kelley (1952) and looked at relationships in terms of costs versus rewards or benefits (as cited in Pillay & James, 2015). SET focuses on norms of reciprocity (Kim et al., 2017). SET is based on the metaphor of economic exchange; specifically, people view life as a marketplace (West & Turner, 2018). Thibaut and Kelley’s (1952) view of SET presented several assumptions: (a) people seek rewards or benefits and avoid punishment, (b) the standards for evaluating the exchange vary from person to person, and (c) the exchange relationship is a process.

In an organizational setting, the exchange continues. In the employment exchange process, Birtch et al. (2016) explained SET “suggests that when an employe satisfies his or her job demands but does not receive appropriate job resources in return, this will be perceived by the employee as an inequitable employee–employer relationship…which will adversely impact job outcomes” (p. 1218). On the other hand, when an employee perceives a valued exchange, both contractual and relational, he or she feels obligated to reciprocate through increased organizational commitment.

The reciprocal social interactions found in SET are the foundation of LMX relationships (Sherman et al., 2012). Burton et al. (2008) elaborated, “Specifically, leader-member exchange (LMX) represents the social exchange process between an employee and his/her supervisor” (p. 51). Leaders exchange resources such as support, information, positive task assignments, mentoring opportunities, visibility to higher management, and other intangible support. In return,
members reciprocate the exchange with extra time, greater concern for the organization, availability for more difficult tasks, and greater risks. During this process, a norm of reciprocity is created (Burton et al., 2008).

**Turnover**

Studies show that turnover has a major effect on organizations. These effects lead to higher costs associated with loss of experience, recruitment, training, company knowledge (Muldoon et al., 2018), fewer seasoned mentors, and a reduction in organizational effectiveness (Reina et al., 2018). The total number of individuals who quit their job during September 2019 was roughly 3.4 million (United States Department of Labor, 2019). This number does not include involuntary turnover and retirements. When adding the number of voluntary turnovers with involuntary turnovers, the total exceeds 5.8 million for September alone (United States Department of Labor, 2019). Turnover can be permanent or horizontal. When turnover is permanent, the employee leaves the organization. Horizontal turnover is characterized as transfers employees make to other departments (Bothma & Roodt, 2013). Additionally, employees make two decisions regarding turnover; they can leave the occupation or the organization (Li et al., 2019). When an employee leaves the occupation, they choose to leave the career they are in. An example of occupational turnover is a teacher leaving the classroom to sell real estate. With organizational turnover, the employee leaves one employer in a career field to work for another employer within that same career. For purposes of this study, we will focus on organizational turnover.

Several factors affect organizational turnover. Reina et al. (2018) studied how managerial influence tactics such as managerial pressure, inspiration, and emotional engagement affect turnover. Managerial pressure tactics like demands, control, and threats have a positive influence
on turnover within organizations. Inspirational appeals that motivate employees and appeal to their “values, goals, and aspirations” have a negative impact on turnover (Reina et al., 2018, p. 7).

**Turnover Intention**

In addition to influence tactics, job stress is positively correlated with turnover intention (Rehman & Mubashar, 2017). Rehman and Mubashar (2017) also found that individuals with positive psychological capital (e.g., hope, optimism, and resilience) were positively correlated with turnover intention showing that possibly “individuals with high psychological capital, being more skilled and confident, think of leaving their jobs if they perceive high stress” (p. 73).

It is important to distinguish between turnover and turnover intention. Muldoon et al. (2018) suggested, “an employee’s intention to quit is one of the most reliable and consistent predictors of actual turnover” (p. 230). Turnover intention is the phase individuals go through before leaving their jobs, and it predicts voluntary turnover (Campbell et al., 2014). It is also known as an individual’s behavioral intention to leave an organization (Bothma & Roodt, 2013).

Behavioral intention is a reliable assessment of actual behavior. Several antecedents are thought to impact turnover intention: leader support, colleague support, physical resources at work, occupational satisfaction, salary satisfaction, and intrinsic occupational choice motivation (Li et al., 2019).

**LMX and Turnover Intention**

Research has found a strong relationship between LMX and turnover intentions (Muldoon et al., 2018). External factors such as organizational change, politics, and interpersonal conflict were variables mediating turnover intention, and maintaining a healthy LMX relationship can buffer these stressors (Muldoon et al., 2018). As Muldoon et al. described, a
single leader can have an impact on an “employee’s perception of organizational variables.
Because many managers fail at encouraging and cultivating a positive relationship, there is the
need for greater management training” (p. 240). However, the researchers also noted that many
times these stressors far outweigh the leader’s attempt at maintaining a positive LMX
relationship.

Gutermann et al. (2017) argued that crossover theory is at the heart of the LMX and
turnover intention relationship. Crossover theory states that psychological states can transfer
from one individual to another (Gutermann et al., 2017). A leader’s psychological state also
transfers to his followers because the leader takes on the role of a role model. Researchers also
found that high LMX employees feel psychologically safe and can function better under
emotionally demanding jobs, thus minimizing their intent to quit under these circumstances
(Lam et al., 2018). In a strong LMX relationship, employees are less likely to consider leaving
their job.

**Dual Leadership**

It is common for employees to report to more than one leader within the same
organization. There may be a manager and an assistant manager or a senior manager and an
operations manager in many organizations. The employee may directly report to one supervisor
and fall as a subordinate for another. This setup is seen in large organizations with deep
organizational structures and flat organizations “where work is organized around projects”
(Vidyarthi et al., 2014, p. 468). Some organizations have dual executive leaders where the
leaders are hierarchically equivalent (Bhansing et al., 2016) like a co-CEO structure. Ebbers and
Wijnberg (2017) defined dual leadership or collective leadership, as a structure where two
leaders share high positions. In their study of dual leadership, Bai et al. (2012) defined dual leadership by referencing proximal supervisors and distal top management teams (TMT).

Similarly, Vidyarthi et al. (2014) looked at dual leadership in the context of hierarchical differences. They considered agency leaders and client leaders as the focus of their study. Agency leaders are leaders, similar to TMT, with the power of significant decisions, pay raises, assignments, and promotions (i.e., a manager or director of an organization). Client leaders give leadership to a specific department or project (i.e., assistant manager or assistant director in an organization). With researchers studying dual leadership from different perspectives, this study will focus on the definition of dual leadership in which the leaders are not hierarchically equivalent. Bai et al. (2012) and Vidyarthi et al. (2014) offer examples of this setup.

Additionally, employees may report to other managers in the same organizational structure.

**Top Management Leaders and Agency Leaders**

Vidyarthi et al. (2014) stated that followers reporting to more than one leader, “differentiate between leaders in terms of their perceptions of LMX quality” (p. 469). An employee may perceive a positive relationship with both supervisors. However, misalignment of the relationship may also be an issue. Top management leaders have the responsibility of casting vision and representing the organization to employees. They generally operate at the macro-level and rarely interact with employees (Bai et al., 2012). Because TMT (leaders) are known to design organizational structures, they are seen as representations of the organization. They are responsible for the organizational climate and the human capital system. Similarly, as defined by Vidyarthi et al. (2014), agency leaders are a representation of the organization and are responsible for major assignments in the organization. Unlike TMT (leaders), agency leaders will have more opportunities to interact with employees, though indirect in nature; however, they still
have greater power in decision-making and assignments than supervisors (Bai et al., 2012). They
typically give leadership to other supervisors within the organization. Within some Head Start
programs, the agency leader is the site manager. Site managers give leadership to education
specialists and other support staff within the center.

**Supervisor and Client Leaders**

According to Bai et al. (2012), supervisor and employee interaction are direct and
interpersonal. LMX theory states that supervisor, employee relationships are interrelated and
bring value within the exchange. Supervisors work closely with employees, making it easy to
create cooperative teams and give intellectual stimulation. Vidyarthi et al. (2014) call these
leaders client leaders who give leadership to projects and daily job duties. They interact directly
with employees and also set the tone for the working environment. Within some Head Start
programs, education specialists and other specialists are considered client or supervisory leaders.
Education specialists give leadership to the teaching staff.

**Followership Theory**

Uhl Bien et al. (2014) asserted that to be considered a leader, one must have followers.
To be a follower, one must "defer to another in some way" (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014, p. 83).
According to Oc and Bashshur (2013), followership places the follower as the primary focus and
followership behaviors as the underlying variable impacting organizational outcomes. As the
future of work moves towards a more technological and globalized setting, knowledge workers
are becoming increasingly valuable (Hickman, 2016). With a trend towards more reflexivity,
workers are demanding more from employers, which means a higher level of respect from
leaders. Hickman (2016) suggests worker insights are "broadening due to greater opportunities to
interact with diverse people at work, and these factors are expanding their views" (p. 3). This trend should encourage leaders to pay closer attention to the views and behaviors of followers.

Followership can be identified through two lenses: followership as rank or position and followership as a social process (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Followership as a rank is also known as the role theory approach. In the role-based approach, followers are influencers of the leader’s attitudes, and the follower characteristics act as the independent variable enhancing or diminishing leader characteristics and effectiveness (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Some examples of role-based approaches or follower characteristics include passive versus proactive schemas. In passive roles, followers’ behaviors can be characterized as obedient, deferent, and powerless. Proactive followers see their role as more of a partner with their leader. The implicit motivators of the follower will have a tremendous impact on the leader as well. As leaders learn more about follower traits, the interaction between leader and follower becomes more in tune.

Development of Followership Theory

Historically, leadership has been studied from a leader-centered perspective. Attention has been given to the leader and his/her impact on groups. Northouse (2016) defined leadership as "a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal" (p. 6). There is a process to leadership. There are individuals (followers) involved in leadership. Most importantly, there is influence. Leadership has generally been concerned with how leaders affect or influence followers. With this leader-centered perspective, followers are treated as passive recipients of the leader’s influence (Oc & Bashshur, 2013).

Follower-centered approaches view leadership from the follower’s perspective. This trend towards followership has its roots in contingency models of leadership such as situational leadership theory and path-goal theory (Oc & Bashshur, 2013). In these models, researchers no
longer looked exclusively at the traits of leaders but leaders’ perceived behaviors (Ayman & Lauritsen, 2018). Adding the behavior of leaders to the equation, researchers can look at the process of leadership as a two-way interaction between leader and follower. Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) reasoned, "without following behaviors, there is no leadership” (p. 83). From these contingency theories arose a more follower-centered approach known as implicit leadership theory and social constructionist approaches to leadership (Oc & Bashshur, 2013). Implicit leadership theory, as described by Oc & Bashshur (2013) is based on the premise that “leadership exists in the minds of the followers” (p. 920). Although follower behavior was considered an important part of the leadership process, it was still not actively shaping leader behaviors. It wasn’t until social constructionist theory that followers actively impacted leader behaviors and, in turn, impacted outcomes.

**Future Benefits of Followership Theory**

Followership theory has many advantages in the field of leadership. Considering the social influences of followers will prove valuable to any organizational leader. Social influence is defined as the amount of social pressure a target experienced (Oc & Bashshur, 2013). In this study, I am applying it to leadership. The pressures that leaders experience at the hands of their followers greatly impact leader behavior. Understanding that teachers have power and influence that affect principal or director roles will cause these leaders to make more informed decisions in the education field. Oc and Bashshur (2013) speak in-depth on the various influences that followers bring as individuals or groups. Social impact theory (SIT) is one of the approaches that encapsulates these influences. SIT argues that the power of a group of followers to shape the leader’s behavior is centered around the strength of the group, the immediacy, and the size of the group (Oc & Bashshur, 2013). The strength of the group includes the personal and positional
power of its members. Immediacy refers to how close the group members are to the leader and group size refers to how many followers are united.

Keeping these variables in mind, leaders can utilize their skills to direct the nature of the group. By itself, one cannot solely rely on Followership theory to lead an organization. The theory does not consider other external contexts such as lack of follower unity and organizational climate (Carsten et al., 2010). However, the theory provides information that can help leaders incorporate a shared leadership approach in this ever-changing workforce.

**Phenomenological Approach**

Phenomenology is a philosophical term outlining the study of consciousness. Edie (1964) defined phenomenology as a “description of the experience of the perceived world as the primary reality” (p. 59). Phenomenological researchers look at the structure of experiences or consciousness being careful to neutralize biases (Gaete Celis, 2019). This descriptive style of phenomenology is linked to Edmund Husserl’s Husserlian positivist position (Gaete Celis, 2019). Husserl argued that people are certain about how things appear in their consciousness and this certainty is validated by dismissing anything outside of immediate experience (Groenewald, 2004). Another approach to phenomenology includes an interpretive style that studies an individual’s subjective experience, looking beyond conscious practices (Gaete Celis, 2019). In its purest form, phenomenology is tasked to explain phenomena, defined by Edie (1964) as “things as they appear” (p. 57). It is the return to what is concrete (Groenewald, 2004).

Moustakas (1994) channels Husserl’s phenomenological approach to explain it as knowledge as it appears in consciousness. Moustakas goes further in explaining phenomenology: “what appears in consciousness is the phenomenon. The word phenomenon comes from the Greek *phaenesthai*, to flare up…to appear” (1994, p. 25). From a researcher’s perspective, the
aim is to describe, as accurately as possible, the phenomena or what appears. Groenewald (2004) expounded further indicating the researcher studies the “lived experiences of the people involved, or who were involved, with this issue” (2004, p. 44).

Transcendental Phenomenology

According to Edie (1964), *transcendental philosophy* means “to go beyond the ordinary, common-sense, taken-for-granted evidences of daily life and natural thought to the foundations of these evidences” (p. 53). The origins of transcendental philosophy are rooted in the objective view of experiences. These views were free from human consciousness (Edie, 1964). Moustakas (1994) stated that transcendental philosophy lends to the belief that all knowledge must conform to experience. This approach is rooted in intentionality. Aristotelian philosophy defines intention as the orientation of the mind towards an object (Moustakas, 1994). In orienting our mind towards an object, we are aware of our self-perceptions. In transcendental phenomenology, it is important to refrain from judgment and view phenomena from a pure standpoint (Moustakas, 1994). For the researcher, viewing each object or observation as a singular experience from a fresh perspective is the core of transcendental phenomenology.
Chapter 3: Research Method

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the qualitative study was to examine turnover in Head Start and explore the effect LMX and dual leadership had on an employee’s intent to quit. Further, the aim of this study was to examine commonalities between turnover intention and LMX. The research questions focused on LMX engagement and intent to turnover. My goal was to assist Head Start in identifying reasons for high turnover and to assist with improving employee engagement among managers and subordinate staff.

In this study, LMX was explored from a member (subordinate) perspective and the subordinate’s role in the dyadic relationship was examined. If the study participants revealed a subordinate who also supervised, additional LMX questions were asked regarding supervisor interaction. Also explored in this study was turnover intentions among current staff. I attempted to explore the LMX relationship with employees who had already resigned from the agency; however, due to human resources regulations, former employees were not included. The purpose of including past employees was to compare experiences of LMX with current employees and explore the impact of dual leadership among those groups. Future research was recommended to explore those dynamics.

The remainder of the chapter describes the research design and methodology. A phenomenological approach was used as it allowed me to describe the experiences of a number of participants. The goal was to examine the subjective experiences of employees’ relationships with supervisors and listen for cues on their intent to turnover. As the researcher, I immersed myself into the study as an interviewer of participants as well as a data analyzer. Data collection and analysis were centered on participants’ experiences in the LMX relationship, their subjective
responses of the intent to turnover or actual turnover, and their experiences navigating a dual or multi-leadership environment.

**Research Questions**

The primary research question sought to describe how LMX impacts turnover intentions within Head Start. Several subquestions were used to identify themes that may impact results:

RQ1: How does negative and positive LMX, as demonstrated on the LMX-7, impact employee turnover in Head Start?

RQ2: Describe the commonalities between dual LMX relationship, as demonstrated on the LMX-7, and employee turnover intention.

RQ3: How does dual leadership impact LMX relationships, as demonstrated on the LMX-7, within Head Start?

**Research Design**

The research design consisted of a qualitative, phenomenological approach. This approach was important for understanding the lived experiences of participants. The common phrase in phenomenological research was *describe* (Groenewald, 2004). As Groenewald, (2004) indicated, “The aim of the researcher was to describe as accurately as possible the phenomenon, refraining from any pre-given framework, but remaining true to the facts” (p. 44). The study described each participant’s LMX experiences using an interpretive paradigm as a guide. In the interpretive phenomenological study, focusing on the participant’s exact words and phrases was important (Ivey, 2013). Unlike descriptive phenomenology that asks the researcher to look at experiences in their pure form, interpretive phenomenology allows the researcher to conceptualize and investigate their meaning (Matua & Van Der Wal, 2015). In using a phenomenological, qualitative approach, I was able to identify common themes.
In August 2017, the former chief executive officer, current chief operating officer, and current director of center operations gave permission to conduct the study in one Head Start program (D. Brocks, personal communication, August 1, 2017). Follow-up conversations with the director of operations (D. Brocks, personal communication, August 3, 2019) confirmed their interest in the study in hopes of improving employee turnover. Additional follow-up took place in April 2020 to adjust procedures due to COVID-19 restrictions (D. Brocks, personal communication, April 16, 2020). Attempts to include more Head Start programs are explained in the next section.

**Participants**

After attaining IRB approval (see Appendix A), I contacted Head Start’s regional director responsible for Head Start programs in Texas. He recommended that I reach out to each program’s director for participation. I contacted directors and chief operating officers of North Texas area Head Start programs. Contact with a large southern Texas Head Start program was also made. I contacted Region 10 education center responsible for facilitating many Head Start programs in school districts throughout the region. I received feedback from two large Head Start programs responsible for services in their county. One of those programs believed the study would be valuable for studying turnover. However, due to COVID restrictions, they felt a future time would be more appropriate. The second program, serving over 2800 students, agreed to conduct the study. However, I was also concerned with participation due to most staff working virtually.

I met with the Head Start program’s director of human resources and director of operations to discuss the participation of employees in the study and obtain current organizational demographics. I requested to interview eight to 10 current employees of varying
demographics. Interviewing current and former Head Start employees would allow me to gain detailed information about turnover intention and LMX. I requested permission to email all employees ensuring that each employee had an opportunity to participate in the study if they desire. This convenient recruiting process (Leavy, 2014) was important to launch the study and ruled out bias related to opportunity.

**Sample**

A purposive or nonprobability sampling technique was used to ensure a solid inclusion of the demographic within the Head Start program. This approach allowed me to remain flexible in choosing interview participants. Leavy (2014) elucidated that choosing this intentional method allows the researcher to gather rich, meaningful data “useful in generating inductive theory” (p. 541). The use of mixed sampling strategies was considered to combine probability and purposeful samples (Leavy, 2017). To obtain these samples, an interest letter explained the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of the study, and the confidentiality clause (see Appendix B). The interest letter asked participants to provide demographic information such as gender, years of employment, ethnicity, and education level. Participant age was considered but removed due to relevance. Years of employment were divided into five groups: < 5 years, 5–10 years, 10–15 years, 15–20 years, and 20+ years. I desired to choose 10 participants, ensuring two participants for each category. I believed this plan would increase analytic generalizability (Farrugia, 2019) in the study. Maximum variation sampling was my intent. Critical case and stratified purposeful sampling appeared to be a better choice. A maximum variation allowed the researcher to receive information from participants with a wide array of thematic interests (Farrugia, 2019). However, a critical case would allow the researcher to focus on participants with an interest in turnover. This sampling strategy would have a stronger generalization with
others who fell within this category. Due to study participation, critical case and stratified purposeful strategies were not necessary. Due to the lack of response from supervisors, I reached out to the director of operations in a local Head Start program

**Setting**

I requested to conduct all interviews via WebEx, zoom, or over the phone. I created a WebEx account specifically for conducting interviews for the dissertation. I had a WebEx account, and the extension took place within that account. A zoom account was set up and used as a backup. Participants were allowed to keep cameras on or turn them off during the interview.

**Instrumentation**

The interview protocol allowed for in-depth information gathering related to participants’ experiences and viewpoints (Turner, 2010). Standardized open-ended interview questions allowed me to ask structured questions but leave room for more detailed information to be gathered through probing questions (Turner, 2010). Questions were adapted from the LMX-7 questionnaire (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Interview questions centered on turnover intentions were guided by Steffens et al.’s (2018) three-item survey measuring LMX and turnover intentions. Sample questions from that survey included, “I often think about quitting my job” and “I would like to work for another organization in the short term” (p. 378). These questions were adapted into the following interview question for my study: “Describe how often you think about leaving the organization.”

**Data Collection and Analysis**

An email was sent to employees asking for their consent and intent to participate in the study. The email included the purpose of the study, the confidential nature of the study, and the possible risks and benefits of participating (see Appendix C). I visited the Human Resources
department for previous employees to ask permission to send research information to former employees who completed an exit interview. The human resources director believed that confidentiality protocols might be violated and could not agree to reach out to former employees. However, the director agreed to have information sent to current employees in the program. Interested candidates responded to my research via email or phone. Interested candidates were emailed a demographic survey to include years of employment, gender, race/nationality, educational background, and reason for leaving, if applicable (see Appendix D). For current employees, I asked candidates to answer the following question: “On a scale of 1–5 with 1 representing never and 5 representing always, how often do you think about leaving the organization?” The intent was to include candidates who would score a 3 or higher in order to focus on a critical case sample. Due to participant responses, all score ranges were included. This allowed for a better comparison of turnover intention and LMX among participants.

I chose participants to include a cross-section of demographics based on feedback from the human resources director. If there was no response on demographics, I would choose participants based solely on turnover intent. However, demographic information from participants was included. Teachers were a priority because they were supervised by an immediate supervisor and overseen by an upper manager. After participants were selected, I reached out to participants and scheduled an interview time and style. A consent form was sent via email for participants desiring a phone or WebEx interview. Since I was unable to obtain the number of interview participants needed from the population within local Head Start programs, the research parameters were expanded to include other Head Start programs in the North Texas region. I contacted the Head Start Region 6 office to obtain permission to send additional research information. No other interview participants were gathered. However, one program
agreed to send an open-ended survey, created by myself, to supervisors discussing their support for staff. This adjustment proved helpful because it allowed supervisors to express their support for staff, the pros and cons of their job, and how satisfied they believe their staff was. Supervisors shared their responses with their director and myself. Supervisor name and center location were excluded from the survey responses. However, I compared the center location with subordinates who were interviewed in order to compare engagement responses if applicable. I reached out to each supervisor who completed the survey. One supervisor agreed to be interviewed for more in-depth information on LMX and dual leadership.

In preparation for the interview, the format and purpose were discussed with participants. I requested to record the session in order to gather accurate information. If the participant was unwilling, I would continue without recording the session. However, priority was given to participants who agreed to be recorded. I explained how recorded information would be kept confidential and permanently discarded from the electronic recording device. All nondigital notes would be shredded. Semistructured, open-ended interview questions were used during the interview. To analyze the data, I looked for consistent codes or phrases in the interviews. Data were manually coded and analyzed.

Validity and Reliability

To ensure validity in the study, it was important that the research design accurately described the themes being investigated (Carcary, 2009). The interview questions (see Appendix E) were derived using the LMX-7 questionnaire (see Appendix F) as a guide to enhance validity in exploring LMX and turnover.

Carcary (2009) stated, “From an interpretivist’s perspective, reliability is concerned with demonstrating that the researcher has not invented or misrepresented data or been careless in data
recording or analysis” (p. 14). For the supervisor survey, one question was adapted from the LMX-7 (see Appendix G). How the supervisor perceived each employee’s satisfaction or dissatisfaction and the support given to staff, proved valuable in obtaining information on positive exchanges (see Appendix H). To ensure the reliability of data, I requested to audio record participant responses.

**Consent and Confidentiality**

To ensure participants were informed and agreed to participate in the study, a consent form was provided. The purpose of the study and an outline of confidentiality measures were included. To protect data collected, I kept all recorded or transcribed data in a locked cabinet and secure hard drive in my care. Head Start did not have access to collected data during interviews. The supervisor surveys were distributed and collected by their supervisor, director of operations. Those surveys were used for discussion among their group and shared with me. The director of operations informed the supervisors that the written survey would be shared with me. I removed the name of the center and supervisor from the survey to ensure confidentiality beyond the research.

**Ethical Considerations**

I asked interview participants to describe their intent to quit their job as well as their feelings toward their supervisors. I understood the sensitivity of the data and addressed any concerns with participants. I reiterated the confidentiality of information shared but also addressed possible emotional stressors involved in sharing sensitive information. I advised participants of the voluntary nature of the study and the option they had to stop the interview or refuse to answer a question. My main goal was to *do no harm*. In addition, several supervisors did not complete the supervisor survey. I extended an opportunity to each supervisor to be
interviewed, reiterating the voluntary and confidential nature of the study. One supervisor agreed to be interviewed. There was no additional communication with the supervisor. I completed the required IRB training related to ethical considerations and followed all guidelines. I discussed with the Head Start director of operations, human resources director, and chief operating officer the confidential nature of the data collected.

Assumptions

My assumption was that the outcome of the LMX, dual leadership, and turnover intention relationship in a permanent setup would be the same as Vidyarthi et al. (2014). I expected that employees who had a strong intent to turnover or who had already resigned from the agency had a low-quality LMX relationship with the Agency (upper manager) and Client (immediate supervisor) leader as well as a low-quality LMX relationship with the Agency leader and a high-quality relationship with the client leader.

Limitations and Delimitations

One limitation to the study was a general concern in LMX theory related to synchronization and contagion. Some low LMX relationships are measured even when the relationship has not developed for an extended period of time. Some dyadic relationships, or relationships between individuals, may develop poorly due to other organizational issues. A delimitation in the study was the use of one-way LMX measurement. I only interviewed the LMX relationship from the member’s perspective (see Appendix I). This did not nullify the research because previous research on LMX, dual leadership, and turnover (Vidyarthi et al., 2014) presented member-only perspectives.
Summary

I conducted a qualitative study to explore LMX, turnover intention, and dual leadership using a phenomenological approach. The study’s goal was to examine the subjective experiences of employees’ relationships with supervisors. A purposive sampling technique was used to gather rich, meaningful data from participants. Teachers were the priority in the sampling. After selection, standardized, open-ended interview questions were used. This style allowed me to ask structured questions but left room for detailed elaboration. Information was collected via audio recording and transcription then stored in a locked cabinet or hardware accessible only to myself. Reliability was ensured through audio recording. Ethical considerations were made and documented throughout the study.
Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine turnover intentions in Head Start and to explore how LMX and dual leadership impact an employee’s intent to quit. The data collected in this study described the relationship between an employee’s intent to quit and the employee’s engagement with two leaders within the organization, an immediate supervisor and center manager. I used a semistructured interview process to interview teachers who engage with two supervisors during their workday. The 30–45-minute interviews were guided by open-ended questions adapted from the turnover intention surveys of LMX-7 and Steffens et al. (2018). This allowed for participants to be more independent and to minimize bias in their responses. I also presented supervisors with an open-ended survey to gather information on their perception of their employee’s work satisfaction. The study results are organized by research questions in conjunction with interviews from subordinates and survey results from supervisors.

To examine turnover intention, LMX, and dual leadership interaction, the following research questions were posed:

RQ1: How does negative and positive LMX, as demonstrated on the LMX-7, impact employee turnover in Head Start?

RQ2: Describe the commonalities between the dual LMX relationship, as demonstrated on the LMX-7, and employee turnover intention.

RQ3: How does dual leadership impact the LMX relationship, as demonstrated on the LMX-7, within Head Start?

The remainder of this chapter presents details about the trustworthiness of the design, participant information, data collection, and study results. Data collected identified sub-themes that emerged from the study.
I chose a phenomenological approach to capture the lived experiences of participants. It was important to understand LMX and turnover intention perspectives from the subordinate’s point of view. The intentionality in turnover or the orientation of the mind towards turnover is a catalyst to actual turnover in organizations (Moustakas, 1994). Keeping in step with transcendental phenomenology, I wanted to ensure that I steered clear from personal biases and captured what participants experienced. The lived experiences presented by participants paved the way for understanding the conscious knowledge rooted in turnover intentions. By focusing on their experiences, rather than my preconceived views on LMX and turnover intention, I gathered new perspectives in the study.

With this approach, I wanted to ensure that the data collected were trustworthy and would give outcomes that represented the participants’ lived experiences. I reached out to Head Start directors in the North Texas area. One agency agreed to look at turnover within their organization. I met with the chief executive officer, director of operations, and human resources director. Another North Texas Head Start grantee CEO explained that, due to COVID and staff adjusting to changes, they would consider a study at a later time. I reached out to several other Head Start grantees in the North Texas area and did not receive a response. Narrowing the study to one large Head Start program allowed me to gather more detailed information regarding LMX and employee engagement.

**Demographics**

The participants were recruited from Head Start programs in North Texas. Research information was sent to the chief executive officer (CEO) and Head Start executives. One Head Start program showed an interest in the study immediately. I met with the chief executive officer, director of operations, and human resources director to discuss the details of the research and its
possible impact on understanding turnover, employee engagement, and leadership. This Head
Start program’s center structure was ideal for the study. Each center is led by a site manager who
is responsible for overall center operations and an education specialist responsible for the
education component to include the supervision of teachers. Content area specialists also report
to center site managers when they are working in the centers; however, their immediate
supervisor is housed at the central office.

The CEO sent an email I prepared to the entire staff, informing them of the study and
potential for voluntary participation. The message sent to employees also noted the confidential
nature of the study. This process was necessary to ensure each employee had an opportunity to
participate in the study, and their participation would not impact employment in the agency. No
other communication about the study came from the CEO. Potential participants frequently
reached out inquiring about the study; however, only seven individuals were interviewed: five
teachers, one specialist, and a site manager.

A separate survey was sent to all site managers and education specialists in the agency.
The open-ended survey asked questions centered on supervisor engagement. There were 18
supervisors who responded to the survey, nine site managers, and nine education specialists. This
Head Start program had a total of 16 centers. Data were collected using purposeful sampling.
This approach was necessary to ensure the inclusion of subordinates, mainly teachers, for in-
depth semistructured interviews. Before detailing the research questions, the demographic
information of the respondents is presented. The results of the participants’ demographics are
illustrated in Table 1.
Table 1

Subordinate Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate participant’s code</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Years employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I intended to interview eight to 10 subordinates; however, I was able to conduct interviews with six subordinates listed in Table 1. During the interview, data saturation became apparent after the fifth subordinate interview. To assist with analytic generalizability (Farrugia, 2019), I intended to interview participants with varying degrees of years employed in the agency. The participants’ years of employment ranged from one year to 35 years of employment, with three subordinate participants employed in the agency five years or less. One subordinate was employed between 5 to 10 years, and two employees were employed over 20 years. There was one male subordinate participant in the study and five female subordinate participants in the study. The male participant was the only specialist, nonteaching support staff, participating in the study. Specialists report to a central office supervisor; however, when they enter the centers, they are under the supervision of the site managers for that time. There were four African American
subordinate participants, one Hispanic subordinate participant, and one White subordinate participant.

Supervisors were given an open-ended survey to complete for the study. The only demographic information gathered from supervisors were years in leadership. Table 2 shows how many years each site manager served in a leadership position in the Head Start program.

**Table 2**

*Site Manager Years in Leadership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site manager</th>
<th>Years of leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education specialists directly supervise teachers in Head Start. Site Managers supervise education specialists and other support staff working at the center. Table 3 depicts the leadership tenure of the Education Specialists participating in the study.
Table 3

*Education Specialist Years in Leadership and Corresponding Site Manager*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education specialist</th>
<th>Years in leadership</th>
<th>Site manager supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>9 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>8 months</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 also shows the supervisor of the education specialists. Supervisors’ demographic information shows nine supervisors have been leading less than 5 years, six have been leading 5–10 years, two have been leading 10–15 years, and one has been leading over 15 years. No supervisor has been in their role for over 20 yrs. For education specialists, 7 out of 9 have been in their leadership position less than 5 years.

**Intent to Quit and LMX**

Maximum variation was the intent of the research. This approach allowed me to gather information from subordinate participants with a wide array of intent to quit and LMX scores. On the demographic survey, participants were asked to rate their intent to quit with the question:
“How often do you think about leaving the organization?” A scaled score range of 1 (never), 2 (sometimes), 3 (occasionally), 4 (often), and 5 (always) was presented. LMX was measured by both interview questions and LMX-7 questionnaire responses (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). LMX-7 scores were interpreted using the following guidelines: very high = 30–35, high = 25–29, moderate = 20–24, low = 15–19, very low = 7–14 (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Table 4 provides information on subordinate responses.

Table 4

*Subordinate Intent to Quit and LMX-7 Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Years employed</th>
<th>Intent to quit score</th>
<th>LMX-7 score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32 (very high)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34 (very high)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21 (moderate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24 (moderate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19 (low)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21 (moderate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows two participants—with the same supervisors—having polar opposite LMX experiences and intent to quit scores. In comparing the demographics, both participants are Black women; however, participant 20 has been with the agency for over 35 years, has a bachelor’s degree, an intent to quit score of 1 (low), and a very high LMX score. On the other hand, Participant 29 has been with the agency for 2 years, has a master’s degree, an intent to quit score of 4 (high), and an LMX score of 18 (low).
Table 5

Subordinate and Supervisor Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Immediate supervisor</th>
<th>Upper management supervisor</th>
<th>Subordinate year employed</th>
<th>Supervisor year in leadership</th>
<th>LMX/Intent to quit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12 / 5</td>
<td>High/Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very High/Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12 / 5</td>
<td>Low/High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate/Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 / 1</td>
<td>Low/High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate/Mid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Table 5 outlines subordinate/supervisor years employed as well as LMX and intent to quit range.

<sup>a</sup>Participant 24 is a specialist reporting to multiple centers and is supervised by a central office employee.

<sup>b</sup>Participant 30’s supervisor did not complete survey. <sup>c</sup>Participant 32’s supervisor did not complete survey.

LMX and Turnover Intention

Research Question 1 examined the impact of negative and positive LMX on employee turnover in Head Start. The interview questions were designed to align with the LMX-7 questionnaire (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). For example, the LMX-7 states, “How well does your leader recognize your potential?” The interview questions for this study were: “Describe how well your immediate supervisor recognizes your potential, and describe how well your upper-level manager recognizes your potential.” These questions were presented to encourage participants to discuss any variation with immediate supervisors and upper management leadership as it related to LMX. These variations will be discussed in research question 2 results.
Other questions adapted from the LMX-7 included: “Discuss the pros and cons of your job and your immediate supervisor’s knowledge of it.” Some questions appeared repetitive to see if participants would give consistent responses. For example, “Describe your working relationship with your immediate supervisor” was similar to the question “Describe the support you receive from your immediate supervisor.”

To analyze LMX and turnover intention, I also looked at the participants’ self-rating on the demographic question, “How often do you think about leaving the organization?” This question was designed by Steffens et al. (2018) and measures LMX and turnover. Those scores ranged from 1–never to 5–always. I also asked other open-ended questions adapted from Steffens et al.’s (2018) 3-item survey measuring LMX and turnover intention. Those questions included: “Describe how often you look forward to coming to work each morning” and “Describe how likely you would accept another job at the same compensation and similar time off.”

**Participant Responses**

After meeting with the chief executive officer, human resources director, and director of operations in the Head Start program, each acknowledged the value of the study and agreed to send study information to all employees in Head Start. The chief executive officer sent the initial Request for Research Volunteers to all employees through internal email. I received three responses from specialists. However, there were no responses from teachers. Teachers were more likely to engage with two leaders daily. The site manager provided overall center management, including licensing and maintenance, social services, health, nutrition, and education. The education specialist gave leadership to the education component, which included teachers. This dual leadership dynamic was of interest.
Due to the lack of teachers’ responses, I reached out to the director of operations, who provides leadership to the education component. He forwarded the chief executive officer’s email again. This time, he only included teachers. I received responses from eight teachers. Six teachers agreed to be interviewed and signed informed consent forms. One teacher did not follow through to the interview. Additionally, one specialist and one site manager agreed to be interviewed. In total, seven participants were interviewed via WebEx or Zoom platforms. Each participant agreed to be audio recorded.

Each subordinate participant was emailed the LMX-7 questionnaire (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) to complete. Table 4 presented their response score. Participant 24 had the highest LMX-7 score of 34. This score indicates a high-quality LMX and generally represents in-group members (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). When asked to discuss the pros and cons of his job and his immediate supervisor’s knowledge of it, participant 24 responded:

She’s been with us for two years, and I wish she had been with us since I started Head Start. She’s extremely professional, knowledgeable, and extremely available. She cares about personal growth as well as professional growth. She’s very much a servant leader.

Participant 24’s self-recorded intent to quit score was 2, indicating that he sometimes thinks about leaving the organization. Participant 20’s LMX-7 score was 32, indicating a high LMX relationship with her supervisor. When asked to describe how well your supervisor recognizes your potential, she responded: “She appreciates that I do come to work, be [sic] on time, and have all my material…She likes how I communicate with the parents.” When asked to describe her supervisor’s knowledge of how satisfied or dissatisfied she is with her job, she stated:

She is satisfied with what we are doing, and she does understand when we are not satisfied…I went through a situation last year…I expressed it with them many times and
let them know I was getting stressed out. She [supervisor] talked to me and said she was going to address it. I’m not sure if she ever did that.

Participant 20’s self-identified intent to quit score was 1, indicating that she does not think about leaving the organization. Participant 30’s LMX-7 score was 24. Moderate LMX-7 ranges are between 20 to 24. Participant 30’s score indicated that she was on the higher end of a moderate LMX-7 score. When asked to describe how well her supervisor recognizes her potential, Participant 30 responded, “I would say she does. They’ve been very supportive of me.” Participant 30’s intent to quit score was 2 representing that she sometimes thinks about leaving the organization. Participant 32’s LMX-7 score was 21, indicating a moderate LMX relationship. Her intent to quit score was 3. When asked to discuss the pros and cons of her job and her immediate supervisor’s knowledge of it, Participant 32 stated:

She (education specialist) will help out. It’s just sometimes I think she really tries to get along with everybody. When I first got to Head Start…[I] heard a lot of negative things about her…to me I didn’t see that, but I’ve seen it with other teachers.

Participant 29’s LMX-7 score was 21 and her intent to quit score was 3. These scores were identical to Participant 32. However, during the interview, Participant 29’s verbal responses indicated a much lower LMX relationship and higher intent to quit. She mentioned several detailed conflicts with her co-teacher and immediate supervisor. During the interview, the participant paused to keep from getting too emotional. At one point, I saw her eyes water while discussing a death in the family and the lack of support she received. This was an indication that the issue was difficult to talk about. After describing the incident, Participant 29 stated, “They keep telling me I’m a part of the family. I don’t feel a part of the family.” Participant 31 had the lowest score on the LMX-7 questionnaire—19, indicating a low LMX relationship with her
supervisor. She also self-reported a 4 on intent to quit indicating that she often thinks about leaving the organization. When asked to discuss the pros and cons of her job and her immediate supervisor’s knowledge of it, Participant 31 discussed her discontent with how the agency was structured and the last minute changes being presented.

The agency as a whole is not on the same page. Over here in Head Start, there are several centers. Each center is kind of doing their own thing, which I kind of feel like that is amazing. But we’re an agency and we’re working under the same umbrella we should all be on the same playing field…But, they just pretty much say do what works best for your center, but I just kind of feel like as an agency as a whole why are we not using the same thing?

My immediate supervisor, her knowledge of the issue is not as great as I would like for it to be. I would prefer for her to know more. A lot of times I go to her. It sounds like an “I don’t know.” Or, she will say one thing, and I may begin to work in that area.

She comes, and I have to come back, and I have to redo it…frustrating.

**Emerging Themes**

The foundation of LMX is centered on the relationships that leaders establish and foster with individual subordinates. The primary part of that relationship is the exchange both parties engage in (Sherman et al., 2012). Several themes emerged, during data collection, as it related to LMX and turnover intention: followership, work environment, and generalized engagement from supervisors.

**Followership**

Leadership theorists have proposed that leaders are not isolated actors, and leadership exists in the follower’s minds (Oc & Bashshur, 2013). At the same time, followers influence
leaders. This can be collectively and individually. Carsten et al. (2010) suggested that proactive followers influence their leaders’ behaviors and decisions more than passive or active followers. Follower behaviors and reactions drive leadership behaviors and reactions (Oc & Bashshur, 2013). In the context of LMX, the member or subordinate is considered the follower.

Followership traits, both positive and negative, were evident in the LMX relationships. Participants with high and moderate LMX scores verbalized positive followership attitudes. Additionally, these participants had low intent to quit scores. Participants with low LMX scores verbalized negative followership attitudes. The sub-themes that emerged were part of a consistent attitude among these participants. Those sub-themes were subordinate initiative, positive attitude, job knowledge, and independence. While addressing the pros and cons of her job and how she approached the issues, Participant 20 stated, “When I have a conflict, I will wait until my break and go talk to her (supervisor).” Participant 30 stated:

The Ed Specialist we have now, we didn’t hit it off well at all. That just happens. So, you have to work that out. I’m all about that. I consider myself a problem-solver. So, if I have a problem with somebody, I’m gonna do whatever I can to fix it. I have a “can do” positive attitude.

Participant 32 stated, “I’ve heard a lot of negative about my supervisor. But you can tell me anything, I have to learn you on my own.” Participant 24 added:

With Head Start and other nonprofits, it’s not like you have your annual evaluation and you get a bonus and a raise. So, it was a different motivator for us. What motivates us? Is it the children? Is it the staff? Is it professional development…I had to remain flexible.
Each of these participants acknowledged their responsibility in the exchange relationship and showed some form of initiative. Some participants mentioned personal attitude as a driving force in their followership. Participant 24 stated, “Sometimes you have people who don’t have that positive outlook during difficult work relationships, and it affects their work.” Participant 30 stated, “Attitude is everything…I have a can do, positive attitude…I consider myself a problem solver.” Participant 32 stated, “I have a relationship with people. I don’t treat them the same as others because everyone is different.” These participants also had an intent to quit range of low to moderate. The exception to the intent to quit/LMX paradigm was Participant 32. This will be discussed later as we look at years employed and intent to quit parallels.

Even participants with low LMX and high intent to quit acknowledged some form of followership characteristics. These characteristics appeared negative as it relates to the exchange relationship. Participant 29 stated, “I try to do everything I can. I speak, even if they don’t speak. I try to create a positive environment.” When I asked the participant to give me examples of how you create a positive environment, the participant was unable to give examples other than speak. Participant 31 stated, “Tell me what you want me to do, give me a deadline…we are not the set of teachers you have to constantly remind.” This participant did not acknowledge positive attitudes. However, Participant 31 showed initiative. When addressing the question regarding how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with your job, the participant stated, “It’s gotten to the point where I have to take the next step and go to the site manager.”

Work Environment

The work environment also emerged as a prominent theme related to LMX and turnover intentions. The work environment was described as lateral support for subordinates, with several
subordinates referencing a family environment. Subordinates with positive LMX described a positive work environment and felt supported by their co-workers. Participant 30 stated:

I love my co-teacher, we’re really good friends. She enjoys her work, and it shows. We do things outside the job…I’ve met her family. We’re really close. The co-teacher I had before, didn’t like their job. They just showed up for a check. That was not a happy time for me.

Participant 32 stated, “The one thing I like about my job is my co-worker, we communicate with each other.” Participant 20 stated, “I love coming to work now. It’s like a big family.” Participant 20 has been with the agency for 35 years. She talked about a time when she did not like coming to work and did not have a good relationship with her supervisors. Participant 20 stated:

There were previous supervisors who didn’t treat us with a lot of respect. When I got up in the mornings, I was like lagging because I knew once I got there, it’s gonna be unfair. I had to motivate myself to do better because I was there for the children. So, I just did what I was supposed to do, my responsibilities.

Participant 20 talked about the support she received from other employees during that time.

Another employee, she’s deceased now, really motivated me to stay in Head Start. I also met other ladies in the organization who were a great motivation. They inspired me to go on and get my degree. They always praised me on the job, so, that was a lot of the reason I stayed as long as I did.

Participant 24 mentioned the supervisor as facilitating the positive environment and compared her to his previous supervisor.

The supervisor before, she would have been a perfect case study for you on low LMX. There’s a doghouse or some employees are in the doghouse and some are given choice
assignments and then some of you are kicked outside. So that rotated among our components. Sometimes you were in the doghouse, sometimes you were getting the choice assignment. That’s not the case with my supervisor now.

Participant 29 had problems with her co-worker and talked about the environment from a different perspective.

I do not like being around my co-worker…She sits there and doesn’t do anything. I didn’t have this problem when I was over at the other Head Starts…They always tell us to work it out…Then the other coworkers will go behind my back, and I end up being the one at fault because they’ve been there longer…The staff is more like a family, so it’s like I don’t have a chance…I’ve been there 2 years, this is the only center in HSGD that I have worked at.

During the interviews, I found that Participant 20 and Participant 29 were from the same center. Each participant described the environment as a family. However, Participant 29 stated she felt like an outsider. One significant difference between the two subordinates is that Participant 20 has been with Head Start for 35 years and Participant 29 has been with the agency for 2 years. Participant 29 also has a higher educational degree.

**Synchronization and Transmission**

Participant 20 has been an employee with Head Start for over 30 years. She has also been employed at the same center as Participant 29 for a longer period. Participant 29 has been employed with the agency for 2 years. Participant 20 has had a greater opportunity to experience synchronization and transmission within the center. *Synchronization* is the intermix of member’s feelings and behaviors over time (Hofmans et al., 2019). During this process, members modify their behaviors to fit the actions of other members in close proximity. This is a continuous
process that happens over time. *Transmission* is centered on a participant’s ability to experience another’s emotion (Kimura et al., 2008). This process is generally associated with affiliation with other members of a group. The positive environment expressed by participant 30 could be attributed to synchronization and transmission, which are contributors to LMX engagement. Similarly, Participant 29’s low LMX relationship and feeling of exclusion can be tied to the lack of synchronization.

Supervisors’ generalized engagement was a theme that emerged from the open-ended surveys by supervisors and not during subordinate, participant interviews. This theme will be discussed later.

**Dual Leadership and Turnover Intention**

Research Question 2 explored the commonalities between dual LMX relationships, as demonstrated on the LMX-7 questionnaire (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) and employee turnover intention. Several interview questions, adapted from the LMX-7, were presented to explore leadership engagement with subordinates. Dual leadership can be presented in several forms. For purposes of this study, I considered hierarchical differences in supervisors and their proximity to subordinates. Bai et al. (2012) referenced proximal supervisors and distal TMT when addressing dual leadership. Vidyarthi et al. (2014) considered client leaders and agency leaders in the dual leadership paradigm. Education specialists in Head Start operate as client leaders or proximal leaders because they give leadership to a certain department and generally come in contact with subordinates regularly. Site managers are considered agency leaders or distal TMTs to teachers, as they have more power in casting vision and are a direct representation of the organization.

Several interview questions addressed dual leadership relationships from the subordinate’s perspective. For example, “Describe how well your immediate supervisor
recognizes your potential” is followed by “Describe how well your upper-level manager recognizes your potential.” The same approach was used for the question “How would you describe your working relationship with your immediate supervisor?” The participant was asked, “How would you describe your working relationship with your upper manager?” These questions were adapted from the LMX-7 questionnaire. This ensured the LMX relationship would continue to be the foundation while addressing dual leadership relationships. Additional questions were added to the interview questions to address dual leadership. For example, participants were asked, “If a center is experiencing a lot of turnovers, in your opinion, who is responsible and do you feel valued by both leaders, why or why not?” I also asked participants, “Is it important to you that you feel valued by both leaders?” These questions were asked to determine if participants would show differentiation among the leaders’ leadership approach.

**Participant Responses**

Each subordinate, except for Participant 24, reported to an education specialist as their primary supervisor. The education specialist reported to the site manager, who was housed at the same location. Site managers and education specialists were not hierarchically equivalent. Participant 24 was a specialist responsible for providing services to several centers. Although his immediate supervisor is housed in the central office and not located in the centers, the specialist was responsible for adhering to the guidelines of the center enforced by the site manager.

Each participant’s intent to quit or turnover intention was explored by responding to the survey question on the demographics form and interview questions adapted from Steffens et al. (2018). I did not address whether or not the participant considered an organizational or occupational turnover. I intended to stay focused on organizational turnover. In organizational
turnover, employees leave one employer in a career field to work for another employer in the same career field.

**Dual Leadership Participant Responses**

When asked to describe her immediate supervisor’s knowledge of how satisfied or dissatisfied she was with her job, Participant 20 stated:

She is satisfied with what we are doing, and she does understand when we’re not satisfied. I went through a situation last year and I was so unsatisfied with their arrangement…when they switch the Local Independent School District (ISD) teachers to other rooms, it kind of messes up the routine that you had in your classroom. No matter how much we try…it seems the other part, the ISD part is not willing to cooperate…I expressed that to them (supervisors) many times and I would let them know that I was getting stressed out…but my supervisor, she does know my frustration.

When asked to discuss the site manager’s knowledge of how satisfied or dissatisfied she was with her job, Participant 20 answered:

the manager, she understands my satisfaction because she always comes in and told me how well I’m doing in the classroom…she knows I was dissatisfied with how my class was run last year. And she’s, you know, willing to try to help get it better.

When asked if her immediate supervisor is aware of the pros and cons of her job, Participant 30 stated:

I think she’s pretty aware, I would describe her as knowledgeable and that she’s aware of those things. I don’t know if she thinks about them all the time. You know, ‘cause it’s different when you’re not in the classroom.
When asked if her immediate supervisor was aware of how satisfied or dissatisfied she was with her job, Participant 30 stated:

  I would think she’s well aware of it. We’ve been working together with her for about four years now. We’ve developed a relationship over time, and I guess she’s probably just seeing through how I do my job - that I’m dedicated to it, and I know we’ve had many conversations about it too. She knows that I feel like I have communicated to her. She knows I like working here.

When asked if her site manager is aware of how satisfied or dissatisfied she was with her job, Participant 30 responded “Oh yes, the two of them together they both [are], I communicate with them really well.” When asked if her supervisor recognized her potential, Participant 30 stated, “I would say she (education specialist) does. You know they’ve been very supportive of me, encouraging me.”

  When asked if her immediate supervisor understood the frustrations with her job, 
Participant 32 stated, “I think they understand it…I always say they are probably frustrated with their job too because they have to do a lot of stuff in the database too.” I interjected and asked, “When you say ‘they,’ are you talking about the education specialist and the site manager?” 
Participant 32 responded:

  You gotta work with the Ed Specialist and the Site Manager too. Because to be honest, if you got a situation or whatever, the Ed Specialist will let the Site Manager know. There’s nothing she won’t do without the education specialist.

Participant 31 voiced frustrations with the lack of coordination between all the centers in Head Start. When asked if her immediate supervisor was aware of her frustrations, she explained “My immediate supervisor, her knowledge of the issue is not as great as I would like for it to be. I
would prefer for her to know more.” When asked about the site manager’s knowledge of how frustrated she was, Participant 31 stated “Normally, we don’t talk to him. I mean we speak, and we converse that way, but as far as what goes on in the classroom, we don’t stop him because he’s really not our immediate supervisor.” When asked if her immediate supervisor recognizes her potential, Participant 31 explained:

She says, “Oh, you’re doing a great job.” She gives us praise and I really feel like she’s fully aware and knows that we’re more than capable to do our job. But, at the same time you will say those things but then turn around a do the other stuff. So, I feel like you think I’m capable of doing all these things but the actions - don’t match what you’re saying.

As it relates to the site manager, Participant 31 added:

I think he does [recognize my potential]. He does the same thing. He’ll come in and say you guys are doing a great job. I appreciate everything you do for the kids, for the parents. I feel like he is more genuine. He’s not gonna come back and say anything different because he’s not our supervisor. So, he’s not gonna come back and be like- Oh well you didn’t do that.

When asked if her supervisors recognized her potential, Participant 32 stated:

Oh yes. We had a zoom meeting last week and the Site Manager told each of us one by one about what she likes, our personality, what she sees in us, and everything. So, we were all quiet and she asked why everybody was so quiet? I specifically said “because you just set up here and told all of us our personalities, what you liked about us. All along, maybe some of us didn’t realize that you noticed that in us.” She will come into
our room and talk to us, play with the kids and she’s gone. So, you never know that
someone recognizes you. So, she really does be paying attention to me.

To ensure consistency, participants were asked to describe the support they receive from their
immediate supervisor and upper manager. How is it the same or different? Participant 20 stated,
“The support from both of them is the same to me because they honestly come and talk to me
and they do try to understand my frustrations.” Participant 32 answered:

I get a lot of support from my Ed. Specialist… She knows me, and I’ve learned her and
when I go to her and I talked to her…she listens to me and she explains stuff to me like
she breaks it down.

Regarding the site manager, Participant 32 stated, “I try not to go to the site manager for
anything if I can help it.” When asked, what is your supervisor’s role in understanding the
conflicts she was experiencing? Participant 29 stated, “They always tell us to work it out and
then the other teacher will go behind my back. Then I end up being the one at fault because
they’ve been there longer.” To understand the upper-manager relationship, I asked Participant 29
“What is the site manager’s understanding of these issues?” She responded, “She goes the same
way. She told us we got to get along or she could get us out of there.”

**Turnover Intention Responses**

The turnover intention was described by how often a participant thought about leaving
the organization. Participants were asked to describe how often they look forward to coming to
work each morning? Participants were also asked how often they thought about leaving the
organization? This question was adapted from Steffens et al.’s (2018) three-item survey
measuring LMX and turnover intention. The final interview question, related to turnover, asked
participants to describe how likely they would accept another job at the same compensation and
similar time off? In addition to addressing turnover intention during the interviews, participants were asked, “How often do/did you think about leaving the organization” on the demographics survey. As a candidate for the study, participants were asked to rate their response to the question by using a scale from 1 to 5 (1 = never and 5 = always looking for another job). I intended to focus on participants who scored a 3 or higher. I also wanted to include, as needed, candidates with lower scores. However, due to the low number of participant interest. I considered candidates from all ranges. As shown in Table 4, three participants had intent to quit scores of 3 or above indicating moderate or high intent to quit and three participants had scores of 1 or 2, indicating low intent to quit. On her survey, Participant 20 gave herself a score of 1 but wrote in “sometimes #3.” During the interview, I addressed the discrepancy. She stated:

Over the past two years, I thought about it (leaving) maybe three or four times… thought about leaving many times when I had a different supervisor. They weren’t supportive of us. They just didn’t treat us with a lot of respect or trust. They would play favoritism.

For her intent to quit score, Participant 30 wrote 2 on the demographic survey indicating that she sometimes considers leaving the organization. When asked to discuss how often she thought about leaving the organization, she stated that she was working on an advanced degree and that “there were a lot of possibilities…I like working with the zero to five (age), it’s what I’m comfortable with. I can’t see myself doing that the rest of my life.” For intent to quit, Participant 32 self-reported a score of 3 (occasionally) on the demographic survey. When asked to discuss how often she thought about leaving the organization, she responded:

Probably [I think about it] twice a month. It’s not because I don’t want to be there with the kids. I want a job to pay me more money… Sometimes, to be honest, I feel like it’s not fair that you get paid less than the people that make $20 an hour for both of y’all
doing the same job. You do want to go find another job. But you like the job. You like what you’re doing and you like the person you work with. You’ll be like if it happens, it happens and if it doesn’t, it doesn’t.

Participant 31 recorded an intent to quit score of 4 on the demographic survey. This score indicates that she often or “actively looks weekly” for other employment. When asked, during the interview how often she thought about leaving the organization, she stated “Before virtual, I probably thought about it maybe once or twice. I sought other employment maybe twice.”

Participant 31 discussed a change in duties that impacted her intent to quit.

Before I took the floater position, which I just took this position in December of last year, I had a classroom. The classroom, at that point, was with the other teachers…ISD, myself, and another teacher. We had built a great working relationship, so I look forward to going in everyday… But now I’m at a point where like I’m not excited to be there.

When asked to describe how likely she would accept another position at the same compensation level and same time off, she responded “I probably absolutely would.” Participant 29 recorded a 3 as her intent to quit score indicating that she occasionally thinks about leaving the organization. When asked to describe how likely she would accept another job with the same compensation and similar time off, Participant 29 replied:

Quickly, I would not hesitate. You don’t have a clue what’s going on in a person’s personal life when you go to work. So, if I’m leaving home from whatever craziness I may have at home to go to work for some calmness, but I’m still going at the craziness, it’s not adding (up).

When asked how often she looked forward to coming to work each morning, Participant 29 responded “I don’t.” Participant 24 recorded a 2 for his intent to quit score indicating that he
sometimes considers leaving the organization. When asked to discuss how often he thought about leaving the organization, Participant 24 responded “I’m looking for more advancement. It’s more about growth, not discontent. It would be wonderful if Head Start had the position and salary where I would stay.”

**Emerging Theme**

LMX relationships are grounded in the belief that supervisor, employee relationships are interconnected or interrelated. This interrelation brings value into the exchange. The uniqueness of the dual leadership environment allows interrelations to be expanded. One common theme that emerged from subordinates was that the LMX relationships with both supervisors paralleled each other.

**Parallelism**

If there was a positive LMX with the education specialist, there was a positive relationship with the site manager. Similarly, if there was a negative LMX relationship with the education specialist, there was a negative LMX relationship with the site manager. Parallelism was evident when subordinates referenced both supervisors concerning satisfaction or dissatisfaction within the center. When asked to describe how the education specialist is aware of how satisfied or dissatisfied they were with their job, Participant 30 stated:

> I would think she’s well aware of it…we’ve developed a relationship over time, and I guess she’s probably seeing through how I do my job and that I’m dedicated to it. We’ve had many conversations about it too. She knows I like working here.

When asked to describe the site manager’s knowledge of how satisfied or dissatisfied she was with her job, participant 30 stated, “The two of them together, I communicate with them really well.” Participant 32 stated:
I think they both understand how satisfied or dissatisfied I am with my job. But I think they are probably frustrated with their job. And, I always say “they” because they are close…if you talk to one, there is no need to talk to the other.

When asked if she felt valued by both the education specialist and the site manager, Participant 20 stated, “Yes, I think I feel valued by both of them. I work there in the center with both on any given day…I feel valued because they give me feedback.” When asked if the education specialist and site manager understand the pros and cons of her job, Participant 20 stated, “I don’t think they truly understand. They say they do but, they don’t.” Participant 29 had a moderate LMX-7 score and a high intent to quit score. When addressing whether her immediate supervisor recognized her potential, she stated, “She never really said that.” When asked if the site manager understands her concerns, Participant 29 added:

She goes the same way. She told us we got to get along or she could get us out of there.

There have been times I’ve been able to go to the site manager and talk to her…but I didn’t feel 100% comfortable.

Participant 31 acknowledged that her supervisors do not fully understand her frustrations.

When it gets to the point where I can’t get an answer (from an education specialist), I go to the site manager. With him, it’s like let him find out…there’s only so much he knows.

He and she apparently don’t communicate a lot.

**Corresponding Themes and Subthemes**

As presented with research question 1, followership impacted turn-over intention among subordinates. The dual leadership relationship did not impact the subordinate’s intent to quit response, and followership characteristics were still evident. Followership characteristics from subordinates were paralleled concerning supervisors. Additionally, work environment attitudes
were not impacted by the dual leadership set-up. Participants’ positive and negative environments were also reflected when discussing interactions with both education specialists and site managers.

The sub-themes that emerged included generalized engagement, open-door policy, goal achievement, initiative, and positive attitude. Generalized engagement, open-door policy, and goal achievement were themes that emerged from the supervisor interview and supervisor surveys. These themes will be discussed in the next section. Initiative and positive attitudes are characteristics of Followership.

**Dual Leadership and LMX**

Research Question 3 explored how dual leadership impacted LMX relationships, as demonstrated on the LMX-7, within Head Start. Research Question 3 presented opportunities to discuss the organizational structure of dual leadership in Head Start. Due to the lack of participation from other Head Start programs in the area, one Head Start program’s organizational structure was considered in choosing the dual leadership style. Bai et al. (2012) referenced proximal supervisors and distal TMT. For this study, proximal supervisors are education specialists who engage regularly with teachers and provide day-to-day supervision of the center’s education content area. In their study, Bai et al. (2012) considered distal top TMT as upper managers or executive employees with the power to make major decisions. Site managers in Head Start do not have power at the executive level related to policy changes. However, they come in contact with higher executives more than other center staff and can influence decisions. For this study, I considered them a part of the distal TMT or agency leader because of their position in each Head Start center. Similarly, the dual leadership and LMX relationship could be
evaluated more systematically if I focused on each center’s LMX and dual leadership connection as opposed to top executive relationships with teachers.

The original intent of the study was to consider LMX from the member or subordinate’s perspective. The LMX-7 questionnaire captured those responses. To address dual leadership’s impact on the LMX relationship, I needed to gather information from site managers. There were no responses from site managers when the Chief Executive Officer emailed the research interest form. After the Director of Operations forwarded the email to the education component, several teachers responded. I decided on a less invasive approach to gathering information from site managers and education specialists. I sent the following questions to the Director of Operations:

1. What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?
2. Describe the support you give to your staff?
3. What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center? Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not?
4. If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?
5. How long have you been in a leadership role?

I asked if he and his staff of site managers and education specialists would engage in open discussion and send me information. I wanted site managers and education specialists to have an assurance that their supervisor, director of operations, supported their responses. The director of operations forwarded the questions to site managers and education specialists throughout the agency. The director of operations did inform site managers and education specialists that information would be forwarded to me. After receiving responses from site managers and education specialists, the director of operations forwarded those responses to me. I received responses from nine site managers and nine education specialists from different centers.
This Head Start program operates 16 centers, five are partnership centers. I sent an email to each respondent to see if any would agree to a one-on-one interview. Two leaders responded and one site manager, Participant 220, was interviewed.

**Supervisor Responses**

Three research participants’ supervisors completed the supervisor survey: Participants 20, 29, and 31. Supervisors for participants 30 and 32 did not turn in supervisor surveys and did not respond to requests to be interviewed. Participant 24 was a specialist whose supervisor was not in a dual leadership position. Participants 20 and 29 were from the same center and had the same supervisors, participant 220 and participant 110. Participant 220 was the site manager and participant 110 was the education specialist.

When asked about the pros and cons of supervising her staff, Participant 220 stated, “I enjoy being able to help staff achieve individual and center goals. I’ve established a lot of relationships. The cons are sometimes [it is] difficult to separate personal relationship roles and keep balance.” Participant 110 completed the survey and wrote, “Pros - helping others grow, assisting with problem-solving, helping others see a positive perspective. [The] cons are that change is hard for most people’s point of views and habits are hard to change.” When asked to describe the support she gives to her staff, Participant 220 stated:

As a manager, I am the direct supervisor of support staff which is Ed Specialist, kitchen, custodial, family advocate…my support is to make sure they have the tools needed, that also includes teachers and receptionists. I make sure they have the tools they need to do their jobs. There is open communication as well as asking them how I can help them do their jobs and be efficient in doing their jobs.

When asked to describe the support given to teachers, Participant 220 stated:
As far as teachers, that’s a step that I do as well. But it also means going into the classroom to relieve them and give them breaks -to make sure they also have what they need to do their job effectively with the kids. I offer support when they need additional resources so they can work well with the kids. The kids can benefit as well as the teachers and staff.

When asked to describe the support given to staff (on the supervisor survey), Participant 110 wrote:

I provide a listening ear and possible solutions to issues or concerns. I am respectful in approaching staff. I try to model appropriate behavior with staff. If staff needs assistance, I try to help or provide them with someone who can.

During the interview, Participant 220 was asked to describe her knowledge of how satisfied or dissatisfied her staff may be in her center. Additionally, she was asked if she could answer that questions for each employee and to explain why or why not. She responded:

I join the education specialist since she is their supervisor and we ask questions about their goals, what they want to see for the school year. We also follow up again at the end of the year…my staff knows I have an open-door policy and will let them know…I typically go in each morning to greet them -just to ask them how they are doing…I try to make sure to send them messages to tell them I appreciate what they are doing…Sometimes, I’ve learned that people do feel a different way and they don’t always feel comfortable…some staff told me, “we thought it was going to be hard working with you”. My response was, why? I tell them I’ve been a teacher, so a lot of that stuff that I do, I do because I’ve been in your shoes. I’ve been a teacher. I’ve been a
family advocate…so, I try to bring that back to the table…what I would have appreciated or what I did appreciate from a manager.

When asked about their “knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center,” Participant 110 wrote: “I think the majority of our staff are satisfied to be in our center. Although someone may not feel as though their needs are met, I feel as though we address all concerns that we are aware of.” Participant 220 has been a manager in Head Start for five years and Participant 110 has been a supervisor for 12 years. Participant 31 was supervised by Participant 227 and 130. Participant 227 was the site manager and participant 130 was the education specialist.

The supervisors did not respond to requests for an interview; however, they did complete the supervisor survey. Participant 227’s response to the pros and cons of supervising staff were: “Pros – I enjoy what I do…More money…Way to show commitment to what I do. Cons – Constant seeking of approval…Always involved during times of dissatisfaction…Not a big fan of being the focal point.” Participant 227’s response to describing the support provided to staff was:

By giving motivation with hopes to inspire them. I also like to encourage them to take the first step on their own before coming to me for every hurdle. Also, I keep my door open at all times so they can come to me if needed.

Participant 130 responded to the same question:

I meet them where they are individually. I will meet with the teachers one on one to discuss what it is that they need. I will then guide and support them by mentoring and coaching if needed. I will also observe and follow up with the teacher to determine if a second cycle is needed.
Participant 130 addressed the pros and cons of her job as follows:

**Pros** – The staff is always willing to adhere to the Head Start policies and procedures. When changes occur within the agency and or at the center level, the staff adapts to change. **Cons** – the COVID-19 situation has caused some roadblocks. My staff and I are team players; therefore, we find ways to overcome those roadblocks and obstacles as a team and adapt.

In answer to the question, “What is your knowledge of how satisfied or dissatisfied your staff may be?” Participant 130 wrote: “To my knowledge, my staff is satisfied in my center. However, I do believe in meeting with my staff one on one to discuss issues and give clarity.” Participant 227’s response to the same question was:

Staff have been a little dissatisfied with a few policy changes that came with COVID-19. However, I believe that we have slowly started to make it over the hill and staff have begun to find their groove for this year. I can answer this for each employee because I talk with them daily and we hold meetings whenever convenient.

Participant 227 has been a supervisor for 1 year and participant 130 has been a supervisor for 5 years. Additional responses from site managers and education specialists can be found in Appendix F.

**Emerging Themes**

The hierarchical makeup of the dual leadership environment lends itself to some variations with leadership styles and approaches. However, there were common themes that were presented from the supervisor surveys and the site manager interview: generalized engagement and open-door policy. Availability, goal achievement, parallelism, and work environment were sub-themes that emerged.
Generalized Engagement

A common theme that became evident from supervisor surveys and the supervisor interview was a generalized view of an engagement or a generalized view of the leader–member exchange relationship. Supervisors viewed employee satisfaction from a group perspective as opposed to an individual perspective. In response to knowledge of “how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center,” Participant 220 (Site Manager) discussed how she and the education specialist met as a group and ask questions about their goals. Participant 220 also stated, “We follow-up again at the end of the year with like a closing.” She mentioned that she goes around each morning to greet them [teachers], “Sometimes I do just a verbal one day and next week…an email just to say I appreciate them.” No other engagement examples were given. Additionally, no other examples, as it related to staff satisfaction were given. When asked if there was engagement with each employee, Participant 220 responded:

I’ll say there are certain employees that you are more comfortable with…there are some people whose personalities seek you out. So, even in just passing I find myself speaking to that person more than I spoke to someone else. It’s a natural thing and sometimes people can take that and think “you don’t like me.” I have to consciously make an effort to make sure that I’ve made it around to every room.

When asked to discuss their knowledge of how satisfied or dissatisfied the staff may be, participant 110 (Education Specialist) responded, “I think the majority of our staff are satisfied to be in our center. Although some may not feel as though…I feel we address all concerns that we are aware of.” No other examples of how satisfied/dissatisfied the staff may have been were given. Also, there was no response to the question, “Can you answer this statement for each employee, why or why not?” Participants 20 and 29 are both supervised by participant 110
Participant 220 [site manager]. Participant 29 has a moderately, low leader–member exchange score and describes the relationship with supervisors as poor and “she does not want to be there.” Participant 110 address support to staff as follows:

I provide a listening ear and possible solutions to issues or concerns. I am respectful in approaching staff. I try to model appropriate behavior with staff. If staff needs assistance, I try to help or provide them with someone who can.

Participant 110 [education specialist] addressed support for staff in general and feels that they “address[es] all concerns [they] are aware of.” Participant 110 has been in a leadership role for 12 years and Participant 29 has been on staff for two years. Additionally, participant 29 has a higher educational level than participant 20. These factors may contribute to the differences in engagement responses. Participant 20 has been with the agency for 35 years and has a high leader–member exchange relationship score. Her response to participants 110 and 220’s generalized view of engagement was summarized with her response to the question, “Describe your working relationship with your supervisor.”

It’s excellent, I love the ladies I’m working with now. They are straightforward and I like how they respect every employee and if they have a concern, they call you to the office and talk to you personally.

Participant 227 (site manager) also addressed staff satisfaction in a general context. “Staff have been dissatisfied with a few policy changes…I can answer this for each employee because I talk to them daily and we hold meetings whenever convenient.” Although the site manager stated, “I can answer this for each employee,” the answer of dissatisfaction was generalized to all staff and there were no examples of individualized engagement to support satisfaction. Participant 130 (education specialist) addressed staff satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the survey indicating: “To
my knowledge, my staff is satisfied in my center. However, I do believe in meeting with my staff one-on-one to discuss issues and give clarity.” No other examples or mention of engagement was presented except job clarity. Participant 130 addressed staff support as follows:

The support that I provide to staff is that I meet them where they are, individually. I meet with the teachers, one-on-one, to discuss what it is they need. I will then guide and support them by mentoring and coaching if needed. I will also observe and follow up with the teacher to determine if a second cycle is needed.

Participant 130 noted that she met with teachers one-on-one to address needs. When asked, “If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?” Participant 30 acknowledged that four teachers had resigned. This is in line with the description of turnover from participant 31 who is a teacher in the center. She explained, “Turnover is high in my center…My kids have been through three teachers.” Participant 130 (education specialist) wrote that the turnover was due to a long commute.

Ms. [Adams] resigned because of the commute to work…Ms. [Bay] transferred because of the commute. The center she transferred to was closer to home. Ms. [Caren] transferred because of the commute to work. Ms. [Dean] transferred to another position…closer to her home.

Participant 31 addressed the transfer of one of her co-teachers in a different light:

All the teachers are at that same level of frustration. As a matter of fact, we just had a teacher who transferred to another center. I’ve spoken with her since she left, and they’re doing things totally different…why are things being done so differently? She’s less stressed now because the center she’s at, they are not doing things the way that we do it
at our center. She’s less stressed. I mean, she was frustrated too. So, she was just like she couldn’t take it anymore.

This response is more in line with participant 227 [site manager], who described the staff as dissatisfied with policy. However, the education specialist attributes the turnover to commuting issues. As noted earlier, participant 31 has a low LMX score and high intent to quit score with the relationship with her Education Specialist [participant 130] characterized as strained. Additionally, participant 130 did not give additional engagement examples for the employees.

Supervisor responses on the leader–member exchange survey presented more information on supervisors’ generalized view of employee engagement. Participant 228 wrote, “For the most part, I think my staff is satisfied.” Participant 140 wrote, “I answer 95% of my staff. I have new staff and subs but, I try to communicate with the staff to know how they feel and their position on working at this agency.” One site manager, participant 223, acknowledged that they have not engaged with staff to know if they are satisfied or dissatisfied.

I really can’t and do not talk for others. I have not worked with this staff for very long to have in my heart what they think or really feel about me. I can see the staff that has a passion for the work we do and those that are just doing it or going through the motions. Participant 223 wrote that they have been in leadership for 8 years. However, based on their response “[We] haven’t worked together long enough yet to build a true team.” Participant 223 is a relatively new supervisor in their center. Participant 222 wrote that some staff are content rather than satisfied.

When you are in management, you have to have a very strong and intentional purpose with your staff. Some days staff are satisfied when things are going good, and everyone is smiling. But then you have those days when you have to be the leader and inform people
of their wrongdoing and that is when your staff is not satisfied…sometimes explaining things helps a dissatisfied staff person understand. They tend to be satisfied again. All staff have their days when they feel satisfied and not satisfied it’s just normal in a professional world.

Participant 222 appears to attribute satisfaction with the center environment when “things are going good, and everyone is smiling” and dissatisfaction when staff is informed that they are doing something wrong. No other knowledge of how “satisfied or dissatisfied the staff may be” was noted. Participant 222 also did not address whether or not this question could be answered for each employee. Participant 222 has been in leadership for 1 year. Participant 180 also addressed staff satisfaction in a general manner, that is, they generalized employee satisfaction to the entire center.

Honestly, each person will have their own opinion about their satisfaction within the center. With being in this position, I learned as individuals we can never fully satisfy a person. However, I believe, for the most part, everyone is satisfied within the center. Participant 180 did not give information on whether or not they can answer this statement for each employee. Participant 190 generalized satisfaction and dissatisfaction to overall attitude, “I can guess how satisfied or dissatisfied all the teachers here [are]…based on their overall attitude and their work performance.”

Few supervisors showed an understanding of the Leader–member exchange engagement, particularly, the individualized approach to engagement. However, a couple of supervisors showed an understanding and/or ability to engage systematically with employees. Participant 226 listed each employee and rated their satisfaction on a scale of 1–10. They were able to say which
employees do not like change. When asked to describe the support given to staff, participant 226 wrote:

I work with them…I’m talking to the staff…sometimes listening to them and being present for them. I answer text messages fast and I cater to their needs as much as possible. I also joke with them a lot so I could create an easy-going environment.

Participant 222 also acknowledged that they make themselves available during an employee’s time of need.

**Open-Door Policy**

Several supervisors referenced having an “open-door policy” as it related to employee support and employee engagement. The phrase was commonly used as a response to engagement, job satisfaction, and employee concerns. When answering the question, “Describe the support you give to your staff,” Participant 228 wrote, “I have an open-door policy. Staff know that I am here for them if they need anything. I also try to lead by example.” Participant 220 acknowledged, “My door is always open.” Participant 223 wrote, “I listen to staff, open-door policy, and talk with them and try to come to an understanding.” When presented with the question, “Describe the support you give to your staff,” Participant 224 wrote: “Trainings, open-door policy, listening to concerns, discussing what works and doesn’t work for the center and staff, open communication.” Participant 120 wrote, “The staff is also welcome to call, email, or text me at any time to help them with their work.” Participant 227 wrote, “I keep my door open at all times. They know they can come to me when needed.” The phrase “open door policy” was used by site managers more than education specialists. Participant 220 used the phrase several times during our interview.
**Subthemes**

Similar to open door policy themes was the idea that supervisors believed being available when needed was a priority for support. Participant 221 described support to include “assist[ing] whenever it’s needed.” Participant 150 acknowledged, “I am trying to meet their needs daily.” Availability in addressing issues was also common. Participant 223 wrote, “I can say many staff have come to me with issues and we work to get them solved.” Participant 170 wrote that the support given to staff included “meetings to discuss challenges.” In answer to the question, “Describe the support you give to your staff,” Participant 222 wrote: “[It is] making myself available for the staff in their time of need.” Participant 170 wrote, “the support given to staff is weekly meetings to discuss challenges.”

Engaging to achieve organizational goals was another sub-theme that emerged from supervisor surveys. Participant 190 described the support given to staff as transactional job duties expected of education specialists.

I review and submit timesheets…approve leave requests…screener/assessment-accuracy, lesson planning, and implementation, review of all virtual learning documentation, inputting and reviewing data on the database or website, communicating important educational timelines and assuring they are met, review all forms, such as home visits and parent–teacher conferences. Set up an age-appropriate classroom environment.

Participant 224 acknowledged that the support given to staff includes “discussing what works and doesn’t work for the center.” Participant 120 wrote, “To provide support to staff, I have helped complete lesson plans, conduct training on the database, email zoom links for staff, and assist with documentation.” Participant 180 wrote:
When it comes to supporting the staff, I sit down with them one-on-one and show them what I need done or allow them to ask questions. Some teachers need more support, and I will create videos or have a zoom conference call and allow them to ask questions. Participant 110 wrote, “I provide a listening ear and possible solutions to issues or concerns.” Participant 220 described support to include going into the classroom to relieve teachers…” and offer support when they need additional resources so they can work well with the kids.” Work environment and parallelism were common themes associated with Leader–member exchange and dual leadership. Appendix F outlines responses from supervisor surveys.

Conclusion

Within this research, three questions were investigated. The first question considered how LMX impacted turnover intention in Head Start? The analysis of the data indicates that turnover intention is impacted by positive and negative leader–member exchange. This analysis is in line with previous research on leader–member exchange and turnover intention. Additional analysis indicates that an employees’ followership characteristics impact turnover intentions. Positive followership traits were characteristic of low intent to quit employees and negative followership traits were found in members with high intent to quit scores. The perception of a positive work environment was evident in low intent to quit and moderate to high LMX subordinates (members). Acknowledging the support from co-workers and supervisors was prevalent throughout the interviews. Additionally, the lack of support from co-workers and lack of knowledge and support from supervisors was indicative of low leader–member exchange relationships and high intent to quit responses.

The second research question asked describes the relationship between dual leadership leader–member exchange and turnover intention. The interconnected properties of high and low
LMX relationships are expanded in the dual leadership environment. Subordinates’ relationships with their supervisors paralleled each other. A teacher’s positive relationships with her immediate supervisor or education specialists were mirrored with her site manager. Even when there was little interaction with the site manager, the positive LMX relationship remained, and the intent to quit desire was low. When the LMX relationship with the immediate supervisor was low, even attempts for a positive relationship with the site manager did not change a subordinate’s intent to quit.

The third research question explored the impact of dual leadership on LMX relationships. In general, supervisor views of leader–member exchange engagement were misinterpreted as group engagement. Leader–member exchange understanding was not individualized. LMX looks at the relationship a supervisor has with each employee. Both immediate supervisors and upper management viewed subordinates as one group as it related to job satisfaction and support. In addition to broadening leader–member exchange, upper managers viewed having an open-door policy statement as a common approach to employee support. However, there were few discussions on direct support for individual subordinates.

As presented in Chapter 1, Vidyarthi et al. (2014) described LMX theory as “leadership [that] resides in the quality of the relationship between an employee and a manager” (p. 468). The quality of the relationship is rooted in the leader’s ability to engage with subordinates on an individual basis. When an employee has more than one leader, each exchange has a unique impact on the employee’s intent to quit. Hunter et al. (2017) acknowledged, “future work should investigate the roles that each leader plays in supporting the dyadic relationship” (p. 1191). In examining turnover intention and leader–member exchange, the purpose of this research was to investigate the dual leadership roles in leader–member exchange and turnover intention. In the
next chapter, I interpret the findings related to the research question and problem statement. I also describe the limitations, implications, and future recommendations for the study. Lastly, I discuss how this research extends past research from Vidyarthi et al. (2014).
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Extensive research exists on the effects of positive leader–member exchange relationships and low employee turnover (Holliday et al., 2010; Li et al., 2012; Peterson & Aikens, 2017; Pucetaite & Novelskaite, 2014; Sherman et al., 2012; Zheng et al., 2016). In the previous chapter, I presented findings on the relationship between LMX, turnover intention, and dual leadership. In this chapter, I will discuss those findings and how the study addressed the research questions and problem statement presented in Chapter 1. I will present limitations to the study and recommendations for future research and practical applications. Last, I will end the study with a conclusion and summary.

When employees have more than one leader to report to, each exchange can have a unique impact on employee outcomes like turnover. The purpose of this research was to examine employee turnover intentions through the lens of LMX and dual leadership relationships. This research expanded on previous research by Vidyarthi et al. (2014) and included dual leadership structures in a more permanent environment. In their study, Vidyarthi et al. (2014) extended the LMX theory of mono-leader exchanges to include dual leader relationships where “employees simultaneously report to two leaders” (p. 469). Their research was conducted in an information technology setting where employees worked on assigned contracts, and leaders changed periodically. I expanded the research to study leader–member exchange, dual leadership, and turnover intention in an organization with a more stable or non-contract setting for employees. I also chose a qualitative research style, including one-on-one interviews with subordinates and open-ended survey responses from supervisors. I chose early childhood programs like Head Start because the teaching and leadership structures were stable. The research questions I proposed included ties to the theoretical framework, LMX. Those questions were:
How does negative and positive leader–member exchange impact employee turnover intention in Head Start? Describe the commonalities between dual leader–member exchange relationships and employee turnover intentions. How does dual leadership impact the leader–member exchange relationship within Head Start?

**Discussion**

Addressing LMX and employee turnover intention was an important first step and Research Question 1 was presented to address the relationship. Previous research had already established the relationship between LMX and turnover intention. My research extended the previous research to show how LMX impacts employee turnover in established work environments like Head Start. Employee surveys showed a relationship between leader–member exchange relationships and turnover intention. Employees with high or positive LMX relationships with their supervisors had low or moderately low turnover intentions. This outcome was expected. The factors impacting leader–member exchange and turnover intention were revealed through the themes of followership, work environment, and supervisor’s understanding of the individual exchange needed in the leader–member exchange relationship. Followership characteristics such as subordinate initiative and a positive attitude were characteristic of subordinates with positive LMX and low intent to quit. Independence and subordinate’s perception of their supervisor’s job knowledge were also characteristic of individuals demonstrating strong followership qualities. Subordinates with high or medium-high LMX scores acknowledged their responsibility in the inter-relationship between leaders and followers. Employees with low LMX scores and high intent to quit rating showed little initiative in the exchange relationship and felt their supervisors lack the knowledge necessary to perform job duties.
How a subordinate perceived her work environment, in the form of lateral support, mirrored the LMX relationship and turnover intention outcomes. The support from other employees within the agency was echoed by several participants. An employee with a low LMX score and a high intent to quit score frequently acknowledged the lack of support she felt from coworkers. Employees with high LMX scores acknowledged support from coworkers in the agency. Another factor of lateral support was also found in the number of years an employee worked in the agency. Employees with low LMX and high intent to quit scores were employed less than 2 years. An assumption arises that employees with low LMX and high intent to quit scores have not had the opportunity to establish positive relationships with other coworkers who can support them when the relationship with a supervisor is poor. Employees with more years of service in the agency have established more supportive relationships and/or take more initiative in navigating their relationships.

Research Question 2 addressed the dual leadership and turnover intention relationship from the subordinate’s perspective. One-on-one interviews with subordinates yielded a mutual or parallel view of the leader–member exchange relationship. Subordinates completed the LMX-7 questionnaire (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), which provided information on the leader–member exchange relationship with their immediate supervisor. Additional questions from one-on-one interviews expanded the questions to include upper managers. Steffens et al.’s (2018) 3-item survey measuring LMX and turnover intention was used to determine turnover intention. Subordinates with a low LMX relationship with one leader had a low LMX relationship with the upper manager. This fueled the subordinate’s feeling of nonsupport thus impacting the intent to quit or turnover intention of the employee. The research did not show dual leadership directly
impacting turnover intention. The research did show that subordinates’ relationships with both leaders were mutual.

As mentioned in Research Question 2, dual leadership and leader–member exchange (LMX) relationships are mutual from the subordinate’s perspective and impact turnover intention. Research Question 3 expands dual leadership and LMX relationships by studying how the two leaders impact the LMX relationship. Many immediate supervisors and upper managers completed an open-ended survey referencing their support for subordinates and their knowledge of how satisfied or dissatisfied their staff may be. In the research, dual leadership showed no direct support to turnover intention. However, supervisors’ understanding of leader–member exchange in the context of employee satisfaction and employee support was limited. Most supervisors viewed support and engagement, which are important in the vertical dyad of LMX, as a tool used with staff collectively and not as an individual variable. The key to high-quality LMX relationships is the individual social exchange between supervisor and subordinate. Poor LMX relationships are characterized by poor exchanges between leader and member (follower). Many supervisors, both immediate and upper managers, acknowledged their support in general ways like group meetings and assisting where needed. Staff support was also demonstrated in task support. Only one supervisor documented staff support not associated with daily employee tasks. The research shows that this misunderstanding of the dynamics of LMX has an impact on subordinates employed less than 2 years. Employees with low LMX scores acknowledge that they do not feel support and are not satisfied with their supervisors. In this study, those subordinates were employed for 2 years or less.

Another common theme echoed by supervisors, particularly upper managers, was the term *open-door policy*. This term was used by several upper managers when asked to describe
their staff support. By maintaining that subordinates can seek out support when needed was evident by comments such as: “They know they can come to me when needed” and “My door is always open.” The notion of initiating the exchange of support was not presented.

Relation to Past Literature

Vidyarthi et al. (2014) found that low turnover intention and high job satisfaction were present when both supervisor LMX relationships aligned. When there was a misalignment in the LMX relationships, a stronger relationship with the agency leader (upper manager) led to lower turnover intention. In the case of a stronger LMX relationship with the client leader (immediate supervisor) during a misalignment of dual LMX relationships, the theory was not supported. Also, employees with low-quality LMX relationships with their client leader had more positive outcomes when their LMX-agency was high and there was a high degree of communication with the agency leader, indicating that high levels of communication with the leader who plays a long-term role over the career of the individuals can compensate for a low-quality exchange with the leader who shapes the daily tasks of the individual. (Vidyarthi et al., 2014, p. 479)

In essence, a stronger LMX relationship with the upper manager can lower turnover intentions among followers having a low LMX relationship with immediate supervisors.

The research presented in this dissertation attributes the low turnover and satisfaction to staff support and positive followership characteristics. Additionally, subordinate members employed in an agency for a longer period have higher LMX relationships and low intent to quit even when placed with newer supervisors. Subordinates viewed their leaders as one unit, whether the LMX relationship with one was high or low did not change the employee’s intent to quit. For one employee, with a high intent to quit and a low LMX relationship, her relationship
with the upper manager was stronger than her relationship with her immediate supervisor. However, the upper manager’s (agency leader) support was not enough to sway her intent to quit. The poor-quality exchange with the immediate supervisor led to discontent. The employee’s length of employment, one and a half years, possibly influences the dissatisfaction and intent to quit.

I expected positive leader–member exchange relationships, from supervisors, to be the dominant factor impacting low turnover intention. I expected a differentiation in the leader–member exchange relationship with teachers, their site managers, and education specialists. I unexpectedly found synchronization within the organization and proactive followership characteristics fueled low intent to quit feelings. I found that teachers’ aligned or misaligned engagement, or LMX relationships, with education specialists and site managers had no obvious impact on their intent to quit. I expected supervisors to generalize employee engagement as leader–member exchange theory is not commonly taught in organizations. I unexpectedly found the term open-door policy used excessively by site managers as a reference to engaging behaviors with staff.

Advances in the Literature

Previous research has shown LMX’s impact on turnover intention (Holliday et al., 2010; Li et al., 2012; Peterson & Aikens, 2017; Pucetaite & Novelskaite, 2014; Sherman et al., 2012; Zheng et al., 2016). Vidyarthi et al. (2014) and Hunter et al. (2017) expanded LMX and turnover to include dual leadership. The current research advances previous research by focusing on LMX, turnover intention, and dual leadership in environments where the leaders are in closer proximity and have opportunities for continuous, day-to-day interactions with subordinates. In these environments, subordinates see the leaders as one unit and the LMX relationships with
each supervisor and a single relationship. In addition, the dual leadership environment does not directly impact turnover intention. Synchronization, transmission, and proactive followership characteristics impact turnover more than the overall LMX relationship with the supervisors.

**Limitations**

In Chapter 3, I stated two limitations that were of concern: synchronization and contagion. Synchronization is an important factor in LMX as it contributes to interpersonal stability through the coordination of internal states such as mood, personality traits, values, goals, and temperament. This covariation of employees’ feelings happens over time and is a key indicator in high-quality LMX relationships (Hofmans et al., 2019). Contagion or transmission is a behavioral shift that takes place when employees experience each other’s emotions. Contagion is a behavioral state that happens through affiliation and can lead to synchronization. In organizations, individuals will sacrifice their personal interests for the interests of the collective body (Levy & Nail, 1993). This social contagion is a valuable part of the leader–member exchange process.

As predicted, low LMX relationships and high intent to quit scores corresponded with participants who had been employed 2 years or less and where synchronization may be limited. In addition, participants employed less than two years did not feel accepted in comparison to employees who had been employed 10 years or more. The low LMX rating and the high intent to quit scores may have a stronger connection to poor synchronization than low LMX. Since poor synchronization and contagion impacts LMX, its relevance to this study is important. Further research on employees hired within 2 years is recommended and will be discussed later in this chapter.
Another limitation to the study came about during data collection. Fewer subordinate participants were included in the study than expected and no former employees responded to requests to be interviewed. Specifically, teachers did not feel comfortable being interviewed. Several responded to initial requests to participate in the study. However, the interview style of questioning appeared to be intimidating and many did not respond to requests to be interviewed. The next section will discuss recommendations for future research and practical application.

Implications

In response to the research questions, the current study shows that negative and positive leader–member exchange impacts employee turnover through followership characteristics, the employee’s work environment, and synchronization within the work environment. A common analysis toward dual leadership, from the employee’s perspective, was that employees viewed the dual LMX relationships with leaders similarly. A positive relationship with one supervisor was mirrored with a positive relationship with the other and vice versa. An employee’s intent to quit was not minimized if one supervisor made efforts to improve the relationship. The final research question considered how dual leadership impacts leader–member exchange relationships. Supervisors viewed positive engagement with staff as a group effort and not the individual exchange necessary for positive leader–member exchange relationships.

These findings are important when considering the why in employee turnover when LMX and dual leadership are part of the equation. Past literature on LMX, dual leadership, and turnover showed positive correlations between LMX and turnover. Additionally, previous research showed positive LMX relationships with the top managers lowered an employee’s desire to quit. This study differs in that upper manager and immediate supervisor LMX relationships were viewed as the same to subordinates. This study extends the knowledge base
on LMX, dual leadership, and turnover intention to include synchronization and transmission in the work environment, positive followership, parallel or mirrored LMX relationships with both leaders, and a generalized view of engagement by leaders.

**Recommendations for Practical Application**

Based on the results of this study, several recommendations can be inferred. As noted in the research, a subordinate’s initiative through followership facilitated positive engagement among members with high leader–member exchange experiences and low intent to quit scores. Immediate supervisors and upper managers should work at or obtain training in the understanding of their role in the engagement process. This can include setting policies for staff engagement and support by both supervisors. The key is to ensure both supervisors understand the need for ongoing, consistent face-to-face engagement not associated with job tasks. Terms such as *open-door policy* and available when *needed* should be clearly explained and separated from the rule of staff engagement. Supervisors should understand their role in seeking out engagement opportunities, thus minimizing their staff’s low LMX probabilities. These engagement opportunities can be as simple as regular affirmations. However, they must be consistent and ongoing.

With low leader–member exchange relationships and turnover intentions evident in employees employed less than 2 years, ensuring a positive work environment for those employees is critical. Supervisors should be trained in synchronization and social contagion’s impact on new employees. Working to ensure new employees have positive work experiences is important. Staff mentors and increased engagement through communication are essential. If the new employee does not have strong followership characteristics, both supervisors must connect regularly with the employee to develop a strong leader–member exchange relationship.
Recommendation for Future Research

The results of this study and previous research show that LMX impacts turnover intention. The dual leadership dynamic did not change those results. This study was limited to local Head Start programs thus minimizing the sampling and participant size. The benefit to this sampling size was the ability to pair supervisors with some subordinates. In doing so, I was able to gain in-depth information of the leader–member exchange relationship from the subordinate as well as obtain corresponding information from some supervisors. If the sampling size includes one program, I recommend a quantitative survey for both supervisors and subordinates. Specifically, I recommend using the LMX-7 for all participants, including supervisors. I recommend supervisors complete the LMX-7 on each employee they supervise. Turnover intentions can be measured in the same manner by presenting Steffens et al.’s (2018) three-item survey measuring leader–member exchange and turnover intentions. This survey can be presented to each subordinate. To measure turnover, I recommend making the LMX-7 questionnaire (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) available during exit interviews. This process will extend the study’s timeline. However, valuable information related to leader–member exchange and turnover can be added to the research.

Attempts to include other programs in the region were not successful. Expanding the research to include more education programs with a dual leadership set-up is recommended. Both hierarchically and non-hierarchically equivalent leadership should be considered. A mixed-method approach is recommended following the same quantitative layout as provided for the smaller sample. Open-ended interviews should be used for a more in-depth analysis of the quantitative data. New instruments may be necessary to measure turnover intentions.
Summary

Employee turnover intention is the mental process that takes place before individuals leave their job. Campbell et al. (2014) reminded us that the cognitive process of leaving one’s job, turnover intention, is the strongest indicator of why people quit. Whatever the reason or direction a person takes in turnover, the intent to quit is always present. Many leadership styles have been studied throughout literature, and each supervisor brings a unique characteristic to the leadership role. However, the relationship-based approach of LMX and its impact on employee turnover brings a valuable focus on the individual relationship between supervisors and their subordinates. In essence, a leader develops a positive relationship with each subordinate, maintaining support for that employee throughout the employment journey. An added twist to the relationship between leaders and followers is dual leadership in the architectural or organizational structure of the organization. When two leaders are a part of the equation, an added layer of the exchange relationship is present. This can be directly or indirectly. Some dual leadership environments have hierarchically equivalent leaders where leaders are on the same hierarchical level. An example would include a chief operating officer responsible for maintaining quality and improving current processes and a chief innovation officer responsible for exploring new ideas. In other dual leadership environments, leaders are not hierarchically equivalent, such as managers and assistant managers. Many organizations such as Head Start are structured to allow for non-hierarchical equivalent leadership environments. In these early childhood education programs, teachers are supervised by education specialists. However, the site manager gives leadership to the education specialists and other staff and oversees center operations. I chose to address how this dual leadership structure impacted leader–member exchange and turnover intention within these programs.
The qualitative approach of the study allowed me to gain information regarding how and/or why dual leadership, through the theoretical framework of LMX, impacted turnover intention. After interviewing teachers and receiving surveys from supervisors at both the site manager (upper manager) and education specialist (immediate supervisor) level, I found that dual leadership did not profoundly impact low or high turnover intention in the early childhood education environment. However, subordinates’ perceptions of both supervisors (dual leaders) were generally the same in the context of the LMX relationship and turnover intention. For example, previous research on the impact of low LMX and high turnover intention is consistent. Sherman et al. (2012), Pucetaite and Novelskaite (2014), and Peterson and Aikens (2017) each showed how low-quality relationship exchanges with employees lead to high turnover. Vidyarthi et al. (2014) extended the LMX relationship and turnover to include dual leadership in an IT contract environment. The educational occupation, specifically the Head Start early childhood program, showed that low and high-quality exchanges were the same among dual leaders and their subordinates. Subordinates did not separate the view of leadership and engaging relationships between leaders. If there was a high-quality exchange relationship with the immediate supervisor, the same relationship was mirrored with the upper manager even when there were no concrete examples of actual engagement with the upper manager. These high-quality relationships corresponded with low intent to quit (turnover intention) scores among subordinates. Similarly, if there was a poor quality LMX relationship with the immediate supervisor, even attempts at a quality relationship with the upper manager did not change the subordinate’s high intent to quit score. Followership or the employee’s initiative in the exchange relationship was a strong indicator of a low intent to quit score and a positive LMX relationship. Employees with a positive outlook and ability to seek out resolve during conflict maintained a
high-quality LMX relationship. However, followership characteristics did not change intent to quit levels for newer employees.

In addition to the parallel view of the LMX relationship between subordinates and dual leaders, years employed showed a positive response in the LMX relationship and turnover intention. Subordinates employed less than 2 years had a high intent to quit score and a lower LMX range than employees employed longer than two years. This theme remained even when the subordinate engaged in positive followership traits like taking the initiative and seeking resolve during the conflict. Synchronization and contagion are possible variables in this outcome. Further research looking at synchronization within an organization will assist in addressing this dynamic.

One area that stood out in the dual leadership structure is leaders’ view of support and employee satisfaction. Both immediate supervisors and upper managers viewed employee support and satisfaction as a general, one-size-fits-all approach. Very few supervisors were able to list or discuss how they support each employee individually and/or whether their employees were satisfied with their job. This lack of understanding in the leader–member exchange relationship possibly plays a role in why subordinates see both supervisors in the same light related to the supervisor–employee engagement. One subordinate gave an example of an upper manager giving examples of how she supported each member. She acknowledged that the manager had never done that before, and it made her feel valued. No other participant, leader, or subordinate acknowledged this type of relationship throughout the study. In addition to the lack of understanding of individualized engagement, upper managers consistently and frequently used the term open-door policy when referring to staff support. These upper managers perceived support as being available when needed as opposed to seeking out opportunities for engagement.
Immediate supervisors did not use the term. However, immediate supervisors did use the phrase available when needed to define staff support.

This study validates previous research related to LMX and turnover intention in many respects. When dual leadership is added to the equation, the research validates Vidyarthi et al. (2014). The significance of this study is the expansion of the dual leadership, leader–member exchange, and turnover intention triad to an education setting where employees were in constant contact with the same dual leaders. Another significant contribution is in understanding the possible engagement breakdown among supervisors and employees. Supervisors who see employee engagement as a generalized task of being available when needed run the risk of missing opportunities for high-quality leader–member exchange relationships; thus, increasing employee turnover intention among their staff.
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Appendix B: Email Seeking Participants

Request for Research Volunteers

Brief Description: Hello, my name is Dana Brocks. I am pursuing an EdD in Organizational Leadership at Abilene Christian University. I am conducting original research to explore employee perceptions in dual leadership environments and their relationship to turnover intention. I would like to conduct a 30–45-minute interview with interested employees or ex-employees.

Study Purpose: The purpose of the study will be to examine employee turnover and to explore the effect Leader–member exchange (LMX) and dual leadership have on turnover and an employee’s intent to quit. The interview is voluntary and confidential.

If you are interested or wish to inquire more about the study, you can contact me via email at xxxxxx@acu.edu, xxxxxxxxxx@gmail.com, or by phone at XXX-XXX-XXXX.
Appendix C: Consent and Confidentiality

Letter of Intent and Informed Consent

Date ____________ Name ________________________________________________

City ______________________ Zip Code __________ Phone # ________________________

Email ______________________________________________________________________

Researcher: Dana C Brocks

Study Title: A qualitative look at Leader–member exchange and dual leadership and its relationship to turnover intentions

I am a student at Abilene Christian University. This study is being conducted as a part of my EdD Program requirement for Organizational Leadership with a concentration in Conflict Resolution.

Please read the information below and feel free to ask any questions before signing.

Purpose: The purpose of the qualitative study is to examine turnover in Head Start and to explore the effect LMX and dual leadership have on an employee’s intent to quit. The researcher’s goal is to assist Head Start in identifying reasons for high turnover and assist with improving employee engagement among managers and subordinate staff. Your experience can assist in gaining valuable insight into the relationships between leaders and subordinates in dual leadership environments. Dual leadership environments are environments where subordinates report to one primary supervisor but follow directives from leaders in more executive roles (i.e., Site Managers, Education Specialists, Content experts, etc.).

Procedure: The primary interview will take 30 to 45 minutes. Further contact may be necessary if during data analysis further clarification is needed. The initial interview may occur via telephone or WebEx. There will be approximately 10 individuals interviewed for this study. The conversation content is strictly confidential, and your personal information will remain coded.

Risks to Participants:

Due to the possibility of emotionally aroused conversation, there may be a risk to participant’s emotional or psychological affect. It is natural for an individual to feel uncomfortable talking about possible issues with supervisors. If you feel uncomfortable at any point during the interview, would like to pause, or wish to withdraw, you have a right to do so. No other anticipated risks are detected. Procedures to ensure confidentiality are discussed below.
**Benefits to Participants:** Participation in this research will allow for a better understanding of the relationship between supervisor engagement and turnover intention. In an effort to improve turnover within its agency, the information obtained can assist Head Start in developing training modules for supervisors and subordinates.

**Confidentiality:** During the study, information will be gathered for the purpose of this research only. This includes interview data, demographic information, and contact information for follow-up (if necessary). Data collected from interviews will be coded to conceal the identity of each participant. Tape recordings will be processed by a professional transcriptionist software with no relation to Head Start or its affiliates. Demographic information will be coded to preserve confidentiality. Interviews will be recorded with a recording device and conducted in a mutually agreed upon location and format. Interviews will only take place after permission has been given in the form of a signed consent form. The consent form and research material will be placed in a secure, locked file cabinet outside of any Head Start offices. Transcripts and media files will be kept on file until the completion of the study. The materials will be disposed of in a manner consistent with the highest standards for destroying confidential information. Your research records may be reviewed by the University’s committee whose responsibility is to protect human subjects participating in research.

**Questions/Concerns:** If you have any questions, please contact me, Dana Brocks, at (XXX) XXX-XXXX. You can email me at xxxxxx@acu.edu. My Dissertation Chair is Dr. Bradley Thompson. He can be emailed at xxxxxx@acu.edu.

**Consent to Participate in Research**

Participant:

I have read the above information and have received satisfactory answers to my questions. I understand the research project and the procedures involved have been explained to me. I agree to participate in this study. My participation is voluntary. I will receive a copy of this consent form for my records.

____________________________________________________
Name of Participant (print)

_______________________________________
Signature of Participant

Researcher: ___________________________________________
(Print)

Researcher: __________________________________________
(signature)
Appendix D: Demographics

Demographic Data Form

This information is for research purposes only and will be kept strictly confidential.

Participant #  Participant Reference Code

Participant Name  Gender

Ethnicity: _________  Education level: ___HS/GED  ___AA
___ BA/BS  ___MA/MS
___PhD/EdD

Currently employed Y/N _____  Years of employment: ____

Reason for leaving (if applicable): ___better job opportunity  ___dissatisfied with employer
___retired  ___other
If other, please explain: ____________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

On a scale of 1–5

1  –  Never  2–sometimes  3–Occasionally  4 – Often
5–Always

(I love my job)  (once a month)  (I actively look
(always looking  monthly)  (actively look
for another job)

How often do/did you think about leaving the organization? _____
Appendix E: Interview Questions

Interview Questions

Leader–Member Exchange/Dual Leadership

Discuss the pros and cons of your job and your immediate supervisor’s knowledge of it.

Discuss your immediate supervisor’s knowledge of how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with your job.

Discuss your manager or upper-level manager’s knowledge of how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with your job.

Describe the support you receive from your immediate supervisor and upper-level manager.

Describe how well your immediate supervisor recognizes your potential.

Describe how well your upper-level manager recognizes your potential.

How would you describe your working relationship with your immediate supervisor?

How would you describe your working relationship with your upper manager?

Turnover Intention

Describe how often you think about leaving the organization.

Describe how often you look forward to coming to work each morning.

Describe how likely you would accept another job at the same compensation level and similar time off.

Dual Leadership Only

In many organizations, there is an immediate supervisor and an agency leader. The immediate supervisor would be your direct report. The agency leader is responsible for overall program management. This could be described as upper management. Who would you say you have a better relationship with? Why?
If a center is experiencing a lot of turnover, in your opinion, who is responsible?

Is it important to you that you feel valued by both leaders? Why or Why Not?

Do you feel valued by both leaders? Why or Why not?
Appendix F: Supervisor Survey

Leader Member Exchange Supervisor Survey

Center:
Position:

I understand that COVID-19 has placed a strain on teachers and supervisors. With that in mind, consider approaching these questions with a pre-COVID (or post COVID) mindset.

What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?

Describe the support you give to your staff.

What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center? Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not.

If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?

How long have you been in a leadership role at your current location?
### Appendix G: Supervisor Response Tables for Question 1

#### Table G1

*Site Manager Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?</th>
<th>Supervisory Years</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong> - “Being TEAM oriented. During trying times, we have learned to work closely together to ensure the safety of the children and staff.”</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons</strong> - “Breaking up individual clicks. Education specialist not being clear on delivery”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong> - “Staff have bought into the vision I have for the center…willing to work with me on making the environment more welcoming and pleasant for everyone.”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons</strong> – “When an individual will not take ownership of their actions and try and blame the supervisor or others. Dealing with a few staff members who refuse to be a part of the team and constantly separating themselves from the group inadvertently creating a negative atmosphere.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong> - “Team that works pretty well together, never boring, working again with others I know.”</td>
<td>8 (but new to center)</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons</strong> – “I don’t personally feel accepted by a handful of staff.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong> - “Building relationships, leading and building teams, establishing trust, helping staff reach goals, being able to execute your vision for you and your staff, making mistakes and learning from them.”</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons</strong> – “Stressful(sometimes), overwhelming (sometimes), staff wanting to be in control, not having the necessary tools in the moment, carry a lot of responsibility.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong> - “The advantage of being a leader is being able to inspire and motivate staff.”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con</strong> – “Thinking about the job on nights and weekends.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong> – “They are really devoted to their work and they are great people to work with. They are diverse, different, and unique, but work hard for their center, not just their area.”</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons</strong> – “Sometimes they get stressed due to work and they pass the stress to me”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong> – “Providing a supportive environment for staff to grow and building a team.”</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons</strong> – “[It] can be challenging at times.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Years</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Pros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>“Come to work/Sometimes flexible.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>“They are willing to adapt to change when shown examples and have a set plan in place.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>“Being able to communicate one on one with staff and getting to know them. Seeing growth and being able to work with them to meet their goals. Being able to find ways to help them become successful in their job responsibilities.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>“The pros of supervising my staff include watching the growth of my teachers. Seeing teachers evolve through knowledge training is very exciting and rewarding.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>“…the opportunity I have to help them learn new exciting ways to do their job…being there to offer support and guidance is fulfilling.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>&quot;Working together as a team to assure that we are implementing HS [Head Start] performance standards, Texas State licensing standards, and local Head Start program standards. Observing teachers set specific individualized goals…and seeing their expression of joy when a child shows progress, achievement, or mastery. Working together to ensure we create a pleasant environment that is peaceful, friendly, and open for others to share ideas or experiences. Communication, I have an open-door policy for all teaching staff. I promote and express that I welcome all comments whether positive or negative.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 months</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>“Their eagerness to learn along with learning as a team and wanting to be better teachers. Their open minds to understanding changes we have all faced with COVID-19.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Supervisor Survey Responses

Supervisor Name (Staff)  
Center: 

Reference # 220

-What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?

Enjoy being able to help staff achieve individual and center goals. Established a lot of relationships

Cons: sometimes difficult to separate personal relationship roles and keep balance.

- Describe the support you give to your staff.

As a manager, I am direct supervisor of support staff which is Ed Specialist, Kitchen, custodial, Family Advocate, so I direct supervise them. For them, my support is to make sure they have the tools needed. That also includes, teachers, receptionist – they have the tools to do their job. So, I try to make sure they have what they need.

There’s open communication as well as asking them how can I help them do their jobs and be efficient in doing their jobs.

As far as the teachers, that’s a step that I do as well. But, it also means going into the classroom to relieve them and give them breaks. -to make sure they also have what they need to do their job effectively with the kids and offering support when they need additional resources so they can work well with the kids. The kids can benefit as well as the teachers and staff.

Support staff is supervised by central staff but they (support staff) have to follow the guidelines of the center when they come into the center. I supervise the cooks but the nutrition specialist gives them direction and I don’t supervise the nutrition specialist. Sometimes that can be a headache. We have to have a good working relationship. If I am having an issue, I can go to their direct supervisor.

Support staff are supervised externally but they fall under our governing when they are in the center.

-What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center? -Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not.

At the beginning of the year, we typically sit down in groups, for teachers I join in with the Ed Specialist since she is their direct supervisor. We sit down and we ask questions about what their goals are; what they want to see for the school year. And. We also follow-up again at the end of the year with like a closing.

But, we always, my staff know that I have an open door policy and will let them know. Even in going around in the classroom and asking. Typically, I go each morning to greet them just to ask them how they are doing – are there any concerns. Sometimes I do just a verbal one day and next week start the week out with an email just to say I appreciate them for what they did last week, especially dealing with this COVID. I try to make sure to send them messages to tell them I appreciate what they are doing, what we need to do to stay moving forward. So, that’s usually how I give my feedback.
But, in honestly all I can do is say- that’s what I get. Sometimes, I’ve learned that people do feel a different way and they don’t always feel comfortable. But, I do take pride even those - I eventually get it. Because I had some staff when I first came over here and I didn’t change a lot of stuff. But I stayed with the standard that I had. So some of the staff told me, we thought it was going to be hard working with you- but why (my response)? I tell them, I’ve been a teacher, so a lot of stuff that I do, I do because I’ve been in your shoes. I’ve been a teacher, I’ve been a family advocate, I’ve been in the school district. So, I try to bring that back to the table. — to what I would have appreciated or what I did appreciate from a manager.

In doing that, I’ve learned that some of them will say ‘well we didn’t know how to talk to you because all managers don’t like people coming in their office’. My door is open (unless somebody’s in there) or they can always call. I did a video and enlisted things about me -listing my cell phone number to just let them know.

But, you don’t always get that. So, you hear it in the grapevine that something is a problem. But, I the type of person, when I hear it; I’ll tell the person ‘bring it’ everybody here is an adult. So, if they have a concern they need to come talk to me about it. I don’t do he say, she say. I don’t get caught up in that. That’s just me. I’m not going to go off what somebody else says. They can come tell me that they have a problem.

Are you this way with each employee?

I am but I’ll say in keeping the balance - there are certain employees, to me, that you are more comfortable with. So I’ve worked on making sure I try every morning to go to each room. There are some people who their personalities seek you out. So even in just passing – So, I found myself speaking to that person more than I spoke to someone else. It’s a natural thing and sometimes people can take that and think ‘you don’t like me’. I have to consciously make an effort to make sure that I’ve made it around to every room. Other than just going in and checking on the classroom (procedure), I’m doing that maybe two times a day. But, I have to make an effort to give them a little more attention because they needed that. They really need that kind of attention. And, that’s the part of being a leader is understanding what they need.

I got that from the social work part. Some you have to hold their hands and some you don’t. Well it’s the same with teachers, some you can give directives and they can handle it and go do it. Some need to get a clearance every step of the way. It can be draining sometimes. But, when you know what you are dealing with, it makes it a lot easier. With those teachers or staff members, I start with those first. Because I know I will have to spend more time.

- If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?

I’m fortunate that I do have turnover. I had turnover in the beginning but I don’t consider it turnover because it was center promotion. I only lost one person because they left the agency. Everybody else was because they moved up. I see that as a positive.

Most of my staff are degreed teachers. So I ask, you have this degree, are you comfortable being a teacher or do you want to be an Ed Specialist or advocate. I lost three teachers to either Ed. Specialist or Family advocate. That’s a celebration
If turnover is happening at a center, what could be the problem.

It can be management style. Because there are some people who say I just can’t work for that person. Sometimes it’s not the center, it’s more the agency. As a manager there’s a flexibility that you would want to give but the agency doesn’t want to give.

Both Site manager and Education specialist management style could be an issue. I’ve seen where an Ed. Specialist is supervising the teacher but the teacher will go to the manager versus the de. Specialist. And, the manager would not send them back. So, it’s kind of dividing the center. You had people who would go tell the manager something and she would make a decision and would not communicate with the Ed Specialist.

I think a lot of turnover is about the demand from the agency. We ask a lot of our teachers and we may not have the support. So, it’s easy for them to get burned out. And when you look at it, what we’re asking and what we are paying doesn’t always line up. It’s always at the top of my head that I have all these teacher that are degreed, and that’s what we want them to be, but it’s also scary too. They can leave here and go make more money. So, we kind of have to have that balance of supporting and encouraging them to go out there and get this – this is your dream. But, at the same time, you have to create an environment that even though I have this degree, I would like to stay where I am.

We ask our teachers to do a lot. That’s why I step in when I can because I know they can leave us and go to the school district. We do offer some flexibility because we are family oriented. I want to be able to support them to do what they need to do. That doesn’t always happen in the school district. I think that’s how we kinda maintain out people.

Anyone that comes here know that from 7:00 – 5:30 we’re like family. We are a team.

-How long have you been in a leadership role

Site manager – almost 5 years

Before the management position - I did program management (ISD) for about 10 years
Leader Member Exchange Survey

Center: 

Position: 

What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?

Pros: Helping others grow, assisting with problem solving, helping others to see a positive perspective.

Cons: Change is hard for most people’s point of views and habits are hard to change.

Describe the support you give to your staff.

I provide a listening ear and possible solutions to issues or concerns. I am respectful in approaching staff. I try to model appropriate behavior with staff. If staff is in need of assistance I try to help or provide them with someone who can.

What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center? Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not.

I think the majority of our staff are satified to be in our center. Although someone may not feel as though their needs are met I feel as though we address all concerns that we are aware of.

If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?

No turnover.

How long have you been in a leadership role: 12 years
Leader Member Exchange Survey

Center: 

Position: 

What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?
The pros are that they are really devoted to their work and they are great people to work with. They are diverse, different and unique, but work hard for the center, not just their area.

The cons are that sometimes they get really stressed due to work and they pass the stress to me.

Describe the support you give to your staff.
I work for them, if paperwork is late or I haven’t done the database tasks is because I’m talking to the staff, repairing their classrooms, sometimes just listening to them or being present for them. I answer text messages fast and I cater to their needs as much as possible. I also joke with them a lot so I could create an easy-going environment.

What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center? Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not.
From a scale from 1 to 10, 10 being the happiest, I think they may be on an 8. The other 2 levels to reach 10 may be that as an agency sometimes we don’t plan as we should and we ask people to do things for tomorrow when we could have done with more time. I can answer for each.

10

10

8 (Maybe she thinks HS should pay more)

7 (She doesn’t like change)

10

9

9

9

10

8 (maybe gets nervous because I have asked her to do check in with us).

6 (she doesn’t like how HS gives deadline for the next day and that we are disorganized as an agency).

8 (she may think there are things we could do better as an agency).

8 (she didn’t like that we wrote her up when the kid left the classroom).

8 (she doesn’t like that the Specialist keeps sending us email but doesn’t explain well how to do things).

8 (she is looking for something different but knows the job well).

If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?
Things happen, we lost 3 teachers this summer. One went to work for [name] because that was her goal. Another one moved to [name] because she wanted to be with family. Covid 19 changed people’s perspective on what it is important. The last teacher that left did it because she had to take care of her [name] because he is really sick. The hard part is finding people because our recruitment methods may focus on the south, east and west of [name] but not on [name].

How long have you been in a leadership role: In Head Start almost 4 years. In [name] (2 ½ years, I wasn’t a Site Manager but as we lead the center).
Leader Member Exchange Survey

Center: 

Position: 

What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?

The Pros are:
- The staff is always willing to adhere to the Head Start policies and procedures.
- When changes occur within the agency and or at center level the staff adapts to change.

The Cons are:
- The Covid-19 situation has caused some roadblocks. My staff and I are team players therefore we find ways to overcome those roadblocks and obstacles as a team and adapt.

Describe the support you give to your staff.

The support that I provide to my staff is that I meet them where they are at individually. I will meet with the teachers one on one to discuss what it is that they need. I will then guide and support them by mentoring and coaching if needed. I will also observe and follow up with the teacher to determine if a second cycle is needed.

What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center? Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not.

To my knowledge my staff is satisfied in my center. However I do believe in meeting with my staff one on one to discuss issues and give clarity.

If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?

My center has experienced turn over. I will list staff and the reason they resigned or transferred.

- [ ] resigned because of the commute to work and she had applied and was hired at a private school that was closer to her home. She lived in [ ].
- [ ] transferred because of the commute. The center that she transferred was closer to home.
- [ ] transferred because of the commute to work.
- [ ] transferred to another position. The position that she applied for was closer to her home.

How long have you been in a leadership role: 5 years
Leader Member Exchange Survey

Center: ______________________
Position: _____________________

What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?

PROS
- I enjoy what I do.
- More $. 
- Way to show commitment to what I do.

CONS
- Constant seeking of approval .
- Always involved during times of dissatisfaction.
- Not a big fan of being the focal point

Describe the support you give to your staff.
By giving motivation with hopes to inspire them. I also like to encourage them to take the first step on their own before coming to me for every hurdle. Also, I keep my door open at all times so they know that they can come to me if needed.

What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center? Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not.
Staff have been a little dissatisfied with a few changes in policy that came with COVID-19 however I believe that we have slowly started to make it over the hill and staff have begun to find their groove for this year. I can answer this for each employee because I talk with them daily and we hold meetings whenever convenient.

If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?
My center is fairly small. However it is currently experiencing some turnover. I believe the main reason is due to wanting to be closer to home.

How long have you been in a leadership role: 1 Year
Leader Member Exchange Survey

Center: 
Position: 

What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?

• Pros:
  1. Working together as a team to assure that we are implementing HS performance standards, Texas State licensing standards, and local program standards.
  2. Observing teachers set specific individualized goals and objectives for children, and seeing their expression of joy when a child shows progress, achievement, or mastery. Their expression is priceless and rewarding.
  3. Working together to assure that we create a pleasant working environment that is peaceful, friendly and open for others to share ideas, or experiences.
  4. Communication, I have an open door policy for all the teaching staff. I promote and express that I welcome any and all comments whether positive or negative. I work toward being a mentor first.

• Cons:
  1. Time, honestly I need more time to be in the classroom observing, role-modeling, coaching, and mentoring.
  2. HR job duties, last minute deadline expectations, and last minute service area communication.

Describe the support you give to your staff.

1. I review and submit time sheets (Review accuracy of time, approve leave request, submit time sheets)
   a. Screeners/Assessments-accuracy and meeting deadlines
   b. Lesson planning and implementation
      1. Assure curriculum is implemented for lesson planning
      2. Individual plans for each child, and whole group
   c. Review of all virtual learning documentation
      1. Teacher virtual schedules
      2. Virtual individual plans
      3. Virtual Activity Logs
      4. Assuring all virtual data is up to date in virtual binders
   a. Inputting and reviewing of all data onto the database or websites (DECA, eLAP, CLI Engage)
      1. General Docs/observations
      2. Developmental Ongoing Assessment
   b. Communicating important educational timelines and assuring they are met
   c. Review all forms, such as home visits, and parent teacher conferences.
      1. Digitally signing all forms (home visits and parent conferences)
   d. Setting up age appropriate classroom environments
      1. Purchasing the needed age appropriate furniture and materials to support all classroom physical environments.

2. I also review and submit time sheets (Review accuracy of time, approve leave request, submit time sheets)
What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center? Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not.

Honestly, I think I can pretty much guess how satisfied or dissatisfied all the teachers here at [Redacted] are, this is based on their overall attitude and their work performance.

If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?

Currently, I think that turnover is due to the new virtual learning expectations plus in-class expectations.

How long have you been in a leadership role:

1 year with [Redacted] and 12 years with another [Redacted] agency.
Leader Member Exchange Survey

Center: [Redacted]

Position: [Redacted]

What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?

Pros- They are willing to adapt to change when shown examples and have a set plan in place.
Cons- I would say a con of supervising my staff at the current moment is stress of the unknown with COVID and having to tell the already stressed staff to add more work. However, they are a great team, and go with the flow.

Describe the support you give to your staff.

When it comes to supporting the staff, I sit down with them one on one and show them what I need done, or allow them to ask questions. Some teachers need more support and I will create videos or have a zoom conference call and allow them to ask questions. Each teacher has a different learning style and I try to understand and teach them accordingly.

What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center? Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not.

Honestly, each person will have their own opinion about their satisfaction within the center. With being in this position, I learned as individuals we can never fully satisfy a person. However, I believe for the most part everyone is satisfied within the center.

If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?

We have experienced a turnover due to several different situations, to name a few:

- Moved out of state and it would take her 100 miles (50 miles one way) to commute to work. She tried for [Redacted] before she left.
- Moved back to [Redacted], her mother was deathly ill.
- Could not pass her CDA test and left.
- Did not want to return from Virtual Learning due to COVID concerns.
- Left to work for [Redacted]
- Made her transfer due to not having Infant and Toddler CDA.

How long have you been in a leadership role?: 2 years
Leader Member Exchange Survey

Center: [Redacted]

Position: [Redacted]

What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?

I believe that some of the pros of working with the staff is that many of the staff has bought into the vision that I have for the entire center and is willing to working with me on making the environment and professional relationships more welcoming and pleasant for everyone. I see more and more that several of the staff is becoming more comfortable with me and beginning to trust my leadership and intentions more which is allowing many of the walls and barriers to come down. Last but not least I can hear more laughter throughout the center on a daily basis.

The cons of supervising the staff is that when an individual will not take ownership of their actions and try and blame the supervisor and others. Dealing with the few staff members that refuses to be a part of the team and is constantly seperating themselves from the group inadvertently creating a negative atmoshpere is a con as well.

Describe the support you give to your staff.

I like to believe that I am a very supportive Site Manager to the team in which I will work alongside the team to ensure that center operations run smoothly. I will go to bat for individuals as well as the team when I know that they have put forth the effort in doing the right thing. I listen to what the team members have to say and try to incorporate as many of their ideas that is in the best interest of the center as a whole. I also like to give praise and appreciation as much as possible when warranted.

What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center? Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not.

I would like to think that I can answer for each staff member at the center because I am constantly talking with everyone; however, more with some than others because I will only go as far as the individual allows me to engage with them. For the most part I feel that more of the staff is satisfied than dissatisfied. Unfortunately, you can never please everyone especially when the individual is a selfish individual and only thinks of themselves and/or does not do well with change. I am seeing that many of the staff is overwhelmed and many are having a difficult time adapting to the rapid chances as we work through this pandemic.

If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?

N/A

How long have you been in a leadership role: 5 years
Leader Member Exchange Survey

Center: Head Start

Position:

What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?

The advantage of being a leader is being able to inspire and motivate staff. The disadvantage of being a manager is thinking about the job on nights and weekends.

Describe the support you give to your staff.

Communicate any agency updated information, flexibility, recognition and praise, show empathy, offer encouragement, create a positive work environment and assist wherever it’s needed.

What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center? Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not.

The vast majority of the staff is satisfied with our current work environment. Others may be dissatisfied because of the current management style, and/or the lack of communication from their team members.

If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?

Has not experienced a high turnover rate, however Teachers are receiving their 4 year degree and are weighing their options for other positions.

How long have you been in a leadership role: 5 years
Leader Member Exchange Survey

Center: 
Position: 

What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?

Pros: Being able to communicate one on one with staff and getting to know them.
Pros: Seeing growth and being able to work with them to meet their goals.
Pros: Being able to find ways to help them become successful in their job responsibilities.
Cons: Interference from Upper Management (SM) when I am able to handle situation.
Cons: Negative feedback from Support Staff that upper management concerning me. I'm fine with Constructive criticism but complaining to others won't fix the problem.

Describe the support you give to your staff.

Checking on staff daily and checking to see if they need anything. Even asking about their family members.
By giving staff genuine compliments and feedback.
By showing love and compassion.
Also, by helping staff out by picking up a piece of paper or trash, sweeping, assisting with Name to Face form, cleaning and sanitizing, and helping out when others are overwhelmed.

What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center? Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not.

For the most part people are satisfied with their jobs, the ones who are not have tried. But they might feel a sense of retaliation if they speak up enough or feel defeated because of past situations.

If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?

N/A

How long have you been in a leadership role: 4 ½ years
Leader Member Exchange Survey

Center: 
Position: 

What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?

The Pros of supervising my staff include watching the growth of my teachers. Seeing teachers evolve through knowledge training is very exciting and rewarding.

The Cons are seeing those not truly doing their best and those who do not encourage or try to be a team player.

Describe the support you give to your staff.

I give support to my team in several ways. I enjoy giving verbal encouragement and praise. Giving trainings and tips to teachers make things smooth. Knowing I am trying to meet their needs daily. I try to listen and give feedback that is useful.

What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center? Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not.

My knowledge for their satisfaction and disapproval is evident. I receive staff feedbacks yearly. I give choices to my teachers to promote a team relationship.

If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?

Not at this time

How long have you been in a leadership role:  Almost 2 years
Leader Member Exchange Survey

Center: 

Position: 

What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?

Pros: Team work environment (est. team that works pretty well together), more space than I am use too (LOL), working again with others I know (not enough), being able to hire a wonderful team member, never boring.

Cons: haven't worked together long enough yet to build a true TEAM (can take up to 7 years), I don't personally feel accepted by a handful of staff, not being able to interview for cook and custodians positions. Currently the lack of support staff available to work or that I can rely on fully.

Describe the support you give to your staff.

I am a positive person and try to approach all I do in life with a positive outlook or spin. I listen to the staff, open door policy, and talk with them and try to come to an understanding. I view my job no different than others and we are all in this together. All of our work is for our children and families and we work together to get it done. When making changes or doing things, I ask the staff (for the most part) for their ideas on the subject. This helps them feel like they have a say and they are a part the TEAM. I look for strengths and weakness and try to help team members build on their strengths and figure out a hack to their weakness with encouragement and opportunities. I do what I can to walk around and be seen, not just shut up in my office. I also do things and learn new things so I can help other and so the staff can see I don't just ask them to do it but I can do it too. I also explain, in different ways, that we are all adults and I trust you to do your job. When I see someone having a hard time or not doing something, I try talking and working out what can be done to fix the problem. I work with people and really try to not work against others and hold others accountable for their actions or non-actions.

When I became a supervisor, I was told by a mentor to stop and reflect on my past supervisors, the good and bad. Then to take the good and do that and remember the bad and don't do that....so that is what I did. I don't supervise out of fear but understanding and with goals and missions. I also try to make myself human and real to staff; it's easier to work with another person than for another person.

What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center? Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not.

I really can't and don't like talking for other. I have not worked with this staff for very long to have in my heart what they think or really feel about me. I can say I can see the staff that has a passion for the work we do and those that are just doing it or going through the motions. I can say many staff have come to me with issues and we work to get them solved and have said they haven't had a supervisor that listens like I do. Well, I can speak to her, she loves me.
If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?

Currently my turnover is due to the virus. I have 2 teachers that came to me on Monday 11/2 to talk about they are thinking they may have to give their two week’s notice. Their home work balance is not working, kids doing home school and they are not home to help. I have one teacher that already left after returning from due to us having to close due to COVID the week she was to return. That helped make her mind up that she can’t work and not feel safe going home to a new baby.

I have shared with , but feel we need teachers that can work from home. I have a handful that did an amazing job while out last year. I personal feel that we should open up a certain number of teacher positions to online teachers. Maybe working at the school 2 days a week to gather materials and put together the go home buckets the teachers have been doing. But then able to work from home doing the videos, reaching out to parents at the off hours’ time. One teacher came to me today explaining she has a child they can only do zoom at 5:30 so she does it but after a long day, then home to kids and family, then doing that zoom, she is worn out and tired. She does it because that is what the family needs but it is stressing her. I wish we could open up a few more spots for working from home and have employees apply and managers hire those that really did work from home well. I know this would be difficult to do and the cost is an issue but thoughts I have and wanted to share.

**How long have you been in a leadership role:** 8 years I believe
Leader Member Exchange Survey

Center: 

Position: 

What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?

The pros to supervising my staff is the opportunity I have to help them learn new and exciting ways to do their job. As the new normal settles in, being there to offer support and guidance is fulfilling. The cons to supervising will be supervising staff that is not passionate about what they do. This brings moral down and affects other staff who are passionate about their job. Also having to work with staff that is not able to complete the job regardless of the trainings and guidance provided to them on a daily basis.

Describe the support you give to your staff.

This school year our center is short of a teacher and the use of technology is new to many. To provide support to the staff I have helped complete lesson plans, conduct trainings on database, email Zoom links for staff, and assist with documentation. The staff is also welcome to call, email, or text me at any time to help help them with their work.

What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center? Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not?

As for my knowledge the staff is satisfied with the support and guidance they recieve from the support staff. The staff let's us know on a consistent basis they are satisfied with the management at our center. The dissatisfaction is with the amount of work they are having to complete, they feel overwhelmed at times. The teachers are stretched really thin and they are being very flexible as they complete a daunting task before them each week. So as a supervisor I make myself available to them whether it’s to help with a lesson plan or ask about their day.

If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?

We are not experiencing turnover at the moment due to the commorady we have as a center. There is no job too big or too small for any staff member we all work together regardless of the situation or area. Our center staff have a family atmosphere and we show our appreciation for each other.

How long have you been in a leadership role: 9 months
Leader Member Exchange Survey

Center: ____________________________

Position: __________________________

What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?

✓ Pros - During this trying time we have learned to work closely together to ensure the safety of the children and staff.
✓ Being TEAM oriented.
✓ Cons - Breaking up individual clicks.
   Education Specialist not being clear on delivery (working on).

Describe the support you give to your staff.

✓ I have an open door policy. Staff knows that I am here for them if they need anything. I also try to lead by example.

What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center? Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not.

For the most part I think my staff is satisfied. For the teachers one reason is the [blank] not pulling their load. (working on)

Education Specialist delivery/tone

As a center we are trying to get use to the new norm.

If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?

We had a lot of turn over this year because teachers becoming floaters and seeking employment elsewhere.

How long have you been in a leadership role:
Leader Member Exchange Survey

Center: 
Position: 

What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?
- Pros - Come to work/Sometimes Flexible
- Cons - Don’t follow chain of command/accountability/combative/questions everything/Change

Describe the support you give to your staff:
- Provide them with the training they need to be self-sufficient
- Answer any questions that I’m able to answer about Education content area
- Model for them
- Give strategies

What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center?
Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not.
- I answer 95% of my staff. I have new staff and subs but I try to communicate with the staff to know how they feel and their position on working at this agency.

If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?
- This is the first time I have experienced turnovers since I have been here. However most moved on to a more stable job. With the uncertainties of this agency majority felt the need to move on. The word FLOATER is a word lots of teachers take offense to and feel they have too much experience and education background for that position.
- What I have observed over the past few years when teachers are held accountable for the job performance and their job duties they feel like you’re mean for asking questions. Also setting quality and high expectations so we will always be prepared.

How long have you been in a leadership role: 3 years 8 months
Leader Member Exchange Survey

Center: ____________________________
Position: __________________________

What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?

Pros- providing a supportive environment for staff to grow and building a team.
Cons- can be challenging at times.

Describe the support you give to your staff.
Trainings, open door policy, listening to concerns, discussing what works and doesn’t work for the center and staff, open communication.

What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center? Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not.

I feel that most staff here are satisfied and enjoy working here. I can answer for most staff. We have a few that are more quiet and don’t express their views as openly.

If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?

Some teachers wanted to go back to HS age children and were made to transfer to EHS.

How long have you been in a leadership role: 6 years
Leader Member Exchange Survey

Center:  
Position:  

What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?

The pro’s of supervising staff is their eagerness to learn, along with learning as a team and wanting to be better teachers. Their open minds to understanding changes we have all been faced with COVID-19. Most teaching staff generally attempts to meeting deadlines and etc...

The Con’s is trying to support teacher’s with trainings and learning their job performances, while learning my own position, as . Other con’s include challenges with building necessary equipment, changing the mindset of individuals from daycare background settings .

Describe the support you give to your staff.

The support given to staff is weekly meetings to discuss challenges, updates and moral boost. Supporting teachers in job performance one-on-one interactions, trainings and assisting with documentations.

What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center? Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not.

I believe the staff is pretty much satisfied, from different conversations with staff and others around the building.

If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?

Our center experiences due to the challenges of the building and some other’s include changing of management or forced to work in Early Head Start.

How long have you been in a leadership role:  8 months
Leader Member Exchange Survey

Center:  

Position:  

What are the pros and cons of supervising your staff?

Pros
- Building relationships
- Leading and building your team
- Establishing trust
- Learning from your team
- Helping staff to reach goals
- Helps you to learn more about yourself
- Good training when offered
- Being able to execute your vision for you and your staff
- You learn how to balance your day (sometimes)
- Making mistakes and learning from them (sometimes making that same mistake a few times until you get it)
- You carry a lot of responsibility

Cons
- Stressful (sometimes)
- Overwhelming (sometimes)
- Staff wanting to be in control
- Not having the tools you need sometimes in the moment
- You carry a lot of responsibility

Describe the support you give to your staff.
Making myself available for the staff in their time of need. Being a listening ear as well as being honest when they need it the most. Keeping a smile on my face daily while setting the tone for the entire center.

What is your knowledge of how satisfied and/or dissatisfied your staff may be in your center?
Can you answer this statement for each employee? Why or Why not.
In all honesty some staff may be content rather than satisfied and some are not as content or satisfied. When you are in management you have to have a very strong and intentional purpose with your staff. Some days staff are satisfied when things are going good and everyone is smiling. But then you have those days when you have to be the leader and inform people of their wrong doing and that is when your staff is not satisfied. Which I understand but I do not feed into. Sometimes explaining things helps a dissatisfied staff person understand. And they tend to be satisfied again. All staff have their days when they feel satisfied and not satisfied it's just normal in a professional world.

If your center is experiencing turnover, what could be the reason?
The reason could be lack of communication between staff and management. It could be how management is running the center. It could be that this is not the best profession for the staff or it could be as simple as people not wanting to really be in the center. It could be the change of one manager to the next.

How long have you been in a leadership role:  

made a year
Appendix I: Participant Interview Transcripts

Participant 020 Interview

Participant 0020:
So, it's ran very well. We communicate well with our co-teachers and she knows the children are being well taken care of. Can you tell me the other questions?

Interviewer:
Is your supervisor aware of how satisfied or dissatisfied you are in your job? And it sounds like you're saying that she [supervisor] is.

Participant 0020:
She is satisfied with what we're doing, and she do understand when we're not satisfied with things. Understanding that too and she talks too. I went through a situation last year with this girl, and I was so unsatisfied with the arrangement we had and because we have to work with the ISD side of things, which I'm all for that. I love it. It's just that sometimes I think when they switch the ISD teachers to other rooms, it kind of messes up. I'm trying to find a word for it. It kind of messes up your routine that you had in your classroom.

Interviewer:
Gotcha. Okay.

Participant 0020:
And no matter how much you're going to try and try and try to make it work, it just seemed like the other part, the ISD part, is not willing to cooperate more.

Interviewer:
Right, Right. And—

Participant 0020:
I realized, I was wrestling with them many, many times. And I was letting them know that I'm really getting stressed out. You know? My first responsibility is the children's safety and if the other person is not going to help with that, then I prefer not to have that person there with me. But since we have the partnership with the ISD, they have no point but to let them still be there. But my supervisor, she do know my frustration. She do understand that. So we've been talking about it and working through it.

Interviewer:
Now, how did... I'm sorry, how did your supervisor back... This was last year. How did your previous supervisor support you at that time?
Participant 0020:
Yes, she talked to them and she said she's going to address it with the ISD supervisors. I'm not sure if she'd ever done that, but I have talked to the educational specialists, one of the ISD when she come in and observed the room. And I just let her know what my concerns were, and she also knew that I was frustrated because she said she read it on my face.

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0020:
And she didn't want to say anything. She wanted me to come to her first, but I don't know if my lead supervisor—I don't know if they really talk to them or not.

Interviewer:
I see.

Participant 0020:
He hasn't written back to me.

Interviewer:
Okay. So let me ask you. So the education specialist that comes in—not the Head Start one but the ISD—there's another ed specialist that comes in and gives directions sometimes? Is that what you're saying?

Participant 0020:
Yes. They have a ISD teacher. They have an ed specialist mentor with whatever they call them. They come in and observe them in our classroom also.

Interviewer:
So do you have to take direction from this person as well sometimes?

Participant 0020:
Sometimes I will because she gives some suggestions—

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0020:
—that we can use in the classroom and it works pretty good. She, mainly come in to observe her teacher.

Interviewer:
I see.
Participant 0020:
Trying to see how the classroom is run.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0020:
And there’s a lot of things observed that could have been a lot better.

Interviewer:
Okay. Gotcha. Describe your manager or your upper managers. So for you, it'd be the site manager. Discuss your manager’s knowledge of how satisfied and dissatisfied you are. So you have your education specialist you talked to me about, so describe how your manager understands how satisfied or dissatisfied you are.

Participant 0020:
Okay. The manager, she understands my satisfaction because she has always come in and told me how well I’m doing in the classroom. And she expressed this, her concern about some things that's going on in the classroom. And it was a dissatisfaction. She knows that I am dissatisfied with how my classroom was ran last year. And she's willing to try to help get it better. And like I explained to her, I can see that some of the things that was progressing started decreasing because of the person I'm having, and it seems that this person is not willing to work with me. But my supervisor, the immediate supervisor, she really understands what's going on. She expressed it to me a lot.

Interviewer:
Okay. All right. So this may sound like a repetitive question, but I'm going to ask it. So describe the support you receive from your immediate supervisor and the site manager. How is it the same or how is it different (the support you feel)?

Participant 0020:
The support from both of them are the same to me because they honestly come and talk to me and they do try to understand my frustration. And they really try to work with me on that. And like I said, I'm not sure if they are talking to the ISD representatives or not. They haven't really reported anything back to me—what they discussed with them.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0020:
But, them coming into the classroom and talking to me—they really—they understand that I'm frustrated and they are trying to work with me on that.
Interviewer:
Okay. So describe how well your immediate supervisor, your ed specialist, recognize your potential.

Participant 0020:
It was expressed to me that she appreciates that I do come to work, be on time, and I have all the materials in the classroom ready for the children. And she liked how I communicate with the parents because she always get feedback from them. And they always expressed to them how well they liked me. And I treat them with a lot of respect. She just comes through and she'll say, "Your room is doing fine" and leave out.

Interviewer:
So do you ever feel that you need more support? Do you feel that your potential is recognized? Your true potential is recognized by your immediate supervisor?

Participant 0020:
Yeah, I believe it is. I just want them to really work on getting the partnership to really understand head start policy and ways and to trying to give us more respect for what we're trying to do in the classroom.

Interviewer:
Okay. I got you. Okay. So similar to that question. Describe how well your site manager, your upper manager, recognizes your potential.

Participant 0020:
She recognizes it too. She knows that I'm there all the time. She trusts me to come in and open up the center in the morning. I get there first thing, and she knows that I'm going to follow the policy. And she knows that I want the best for my classroom.

Interviewer:
Okay. Now I'm going to delve deeper with this question. I'm going to talk about upper management now. So not just site manager, let's go [to] upper management. So how well do you think that upper management, outside of the center, recognizes your potential (like central, whoever comes in, whether it's specialists, etc.)?

Participant 0020:
Well, the people from central office, I never see them come to the center. I remember one time we had our children to [work on a project] and we was planning a big open house for the [project] release for the parents and for a lot of administrative and central office. So [we] sent out invitations to some of them, and the site manager approved of getting some little snacks for the parents and for them to come. We had everything decorated for them to come out and see how these children [worked on their project] and no one showed up to come.
Interviewer:
So what does that—describe how, as an employee, how important is that to have your upper management support what you're doing?

Participant 0020:
It was very important to me because they, a lot of time they say they understand what we're doing but I don't believe they really do because they never come to the centers. And when they do come, they don't come into the classroom to sit for like 10 or 15 minutes just to see what we're doing. And they give us a lot of demands. They put a lot of things on us, but they don't really understand what it takes to run the classroom with 16 different personalities. Then, when we have two or three children that's having some challenges, behaviors going on. It makes me really sad when they don't come to the center enough just to see what we're doing. But they'll give us a lot of things to do, but they're not understanding that in a day’s time, it takes time to do a lot of things they want us to do.

Interviewer:
Gotcha. Okay. So how would you describe your— I think you've answered this, if you want to add more to it, you can—how would you describe your working relationship with your immediate supervisors—your working relationship?

Participant 0020:
I mean, it's excellent. I love the ladies I'm working with now. They are straightforward, and I like how they respect every employee. And if they have a concern, they call you to the office and talk to you personally. They don't address the situation in front of other teachers. So I really appreciate and respect them for that—for being upfront with everything.

Interviewer:
Okay. Now this next question is twofold. So describe your working relationship with your upper manager, which is your site manager, and then second, we're going to describe the working relationship with top management. So let's start with your site manager. How would you describe your working relationship?

Participant 0020:
My relationship with the site manager is great. She respects me. I give her respect. If she needs to say anything to me, she addresses me personally. We just have a good relationship. For the relationship with the upper management, there are some that try to be respectful, and there are some that—there was one in particular that we're not really comfortable with that person. And I've been here 35 years, and I sometimes feel like there's unfairness going on with a lot of upper management. Sometimes I feel like it may be a little racism going on—discrimination going on with the upper management.

Interviewer:
Okay. So do you feel that way with upper management in general? Or are you just talking about one particular person? Is that a general feeling that you have?
Participant 0020:
It's a general feeling with maybe just one.

Interviewer:
Okay. Do you feel that upper management—I think I'll get to this next part later on, I think. Because I'm hearing some things, but I think you'll answer it later on in the interview. This next section... That first section just dealt with leader–member exchange. All of the questions I was asking was centered around the exchange that you have with your immediate supervisor and then upper management. And then dual leadership, because dual leadership is about having an immediate supervisor, but also getting directions from other people—whether it's upper management or a site manager. So those relationships. This next part is about turnover intention. If I'm not mistaken, I think you wrote one and sometimes a two or three, I believe. I'm going by memory. Instead of one it's sometimes a three. So we'll get into that in these different questions here. So describe how often you think about leaving the organization.

Participant 0020:
I think within the last maybe two years, I thought about it maybe like three or four times—

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0020:
—of leaving.

Interviewer:
Over the last two years. Okay. And you've been there for such a long time. So when you were discussing, you said right now, the relationship that you have with your immediate supervisor is very good. And then there were times over your tenure that you did not have a good relationship. Talk about when you thought about leaving during those times. How often do you think, if you can remember, you thought about leaving when the relationship wasn't good with your immediate supervisor?

Participant 0020:
I've thought about it many times. You know, even when I had different supervisors that I thought about leaving with. They wasn't supportive of us. They just didn't treat us with a lot of respect or trust. And they will play favoritism, we found. And it just didn't sit well with me because I was a dedicated person and employee. I came to work every day. I didn't abuse time or anything, and I always felt like when I had an opinion about something, I always got called in the office and was considered being hostile about it.

Interviewer:
Describe how often you look forward to coming to work now?
Participant 0020:
I love coming to work. My husband sometimes tells me if I can live at that job, I probably would. You know the staff there is great. I mean, we just get along like a big family.

Interviewer:
Okay. So those times when you had poor supervision, those years that you went through that, how motivated were you each morning? Describe your mornings when you had the—I'm talking about the immediate, maybe your ed specialist—describe your mornings, or as far as wanting to go to work.

Participant 0020:
Well, when I got up that morning, I was kind of poking around because I knew once I got there it's going to be some unfairness going on. And I just had to motivate myself to do better because I was there for the children. And I'm there for the families, and I want to be in there. I just do what I'm supposed to do; my responsibilities. Go on and do it. And if I had any conflict with the supervisor, I would wait until a right time and talk to her or send an email.

Interviewer:
Okay. Describe how likely you would accept another job at the same compensation level and similar time off. So same job, same amount of money, same hours off. Describe how likely you would accept another job outside of the agency.

Participant 0020:
I would've probably accepted a whole lot. Many times I sit down and same benefits, same paid time off. I would probably go to them.

Interviewer:
So when you were having problems, as far as not wanting to go to work, what kept you going in? In spite of... as far as leadership. You have your ed specialist and then you have upper management and then higher management. Was there an impact from those other leaders when the leadership from the ed specialist was poor that helped you to stay? Talk about that.

Participant 0020:
Yes. Matter of fact, one of the ladies, she's deceased now, and she was really the person that motivated me to stay as long as I had. She told me that she see a lot of potential in me, and she knows that I will make it and not quit. And then I also met other ladies in the organization, also was a great motivation to inspire me to go on and get my degrees, and they always praise me on a job well done. So those are a lot of the reasons why I stayed as long as I did, along with loving what I did with the children and families.

Interviewer:
Okay. Now were these supportive people upper management or just other coworkers?
Participant 0020:
They were upper management, directors. They were education coordinators.

Interviewer:
Yeah. That says a lot. Okay. All right. This last section is on—you're doing very well—this last section is on dual leadership.

So when I talk about dual leadership, I'm talking about your immediate supervisor, and then I'm talking about managers. So these questions are centered around that. So, if a center—in your opinion—if a center is experiencing a lot of turnover, who is ultimately responsible? So is it the immediate supervisor or is it upper management?

Participant 0020:
I think it would be the site management, because they're the ones working directly with the staff, and they're the one who have to lead us. And when that leadership is not up to par, then that makes other people want to turn the other way.

Interviewer:
Okay. All right. So let's think about it in terms of site managing ed specialists. So there's a large turnover in the teaching staff. Is it still the site manager or are you thinking ed specialist? And there's no wrong answer. I Just want to know your perspective.

Participant 0020:
Yeah. Well, it depends on the situation. It may be, it could be ed specialist, and sometimes it can be the site manager. I've had—I don't know if I can say this or not—but I know I've had other coworkers I've worked with for many years that at other centers and work with other site managers and ed specialists and they always talk about how they're unhappy with situations going on and how things is happening to them. I believe it can be both. When you want to leave, it comes from site manager especially.

Interviewer:
So, in your opinion, you believe—I don't want to put words in your mouth—that the site manager is ultimately, as far as turnover, responsible?

Participant 0020:
Yes.

Interviewer:
Yeah. And you can't say anything wrong. So whatever you say is fine. So is it important to you that you feel valued by both leaders? Why or why not? Both your immediate supervisor and your site manager.
Participant 0020:
Yes. I think both. Because, I work there in the center with both and on any given day, if the ed specialist is not at the center, or for any reason, I have to dress and work with the site manager. And I would want her to value me as much as I would value her. And the same with the ed specialist too.

Interviewer:
Okay. What about top management? Is it important to you that they value you as much as your ed specialist and site manager?

Participant 0020:
I think, I want to say yeah. I think they should value us working in the classroom at the centers and everything because they are upper management and they should really appreciate us coming. And they always say, "If it wasn't for the children, we wouldn't have jobs," which goes hand-in-hand. But the upper management really should appreciate the teaching staff a lot because we have a hard job.

Interviewer:
Yes.

Participant 0020:
I don't think they truly, truly understand. They say they do, but I don't believe they really do.

Interviewer:
And that's important. Yeah. And my final question, do you feel—and then you may have answered this—but do you feel valued by both leaders?

Participant 0020:
I think I feel valued by them. I know my site manager and ed specialist. I really feel valued by them. And there are some in upper management, like the educational coordinator, I feel valuable with her because she always gives me good feedback on the classroom. There are couple other ones that I know in the main office that I think I feel valued with them too.

Interviewer:
Okay. I'll let you ask me any questions that you would like. If you had to recommend any... If you had to give advice to leaders on what employees need—immediate supervisors and upper management, what employees need from each one of them—what would you recommend? From your immediate supervisor what do you need, and from your upper management what do you need?

Participant 0020:
From the immediate supervisor, I think we would need consistence from them to be honest and be fair with everybody—and to have that respect for what we do in the classroom.
Interviewer:
Okay. Right. And from upper management, what do you need? What do you think that employees need or what you need from upper management?

Participant 0020:
Upper management, I need, and I believe some of the other employees would need them to be consistent in what they're doing for the agency, the policies and whatever we're doing. And to be also be fair with everyone. To have trust and that what we're doing is the good for the child.

Interviewer:
So trust that you all know what's good for the child. Is that what you're saying? That teachers know...

Participant 0020:
Yeah. Good to have trust in us that we're following the policy and everything. Believe that we're competent in what we're doing because a lot of times, they like to dictate everything for us and we're trying to give our advice or opinion on things. They say okay, but then we don't get to do it. So they could maybe value our opinion a lot of times.

Interviewer:
Okay. Right. So I am finished with the questions that I have to ask you. Do you have any questions for me?

Participant 0020:
No.

Interviewer:
Okay. All right. So hold on one minute. I'm going to stop the recording.

Participant 0020:
Okay.
Participant 024 Interview

Interviewer:
I'm just going to give you just a series of questions. Some of them will sound repetitive. I just finished another one. I was hearing some repetitive answers, but because I have them segmented, have them separated, so please forgive me if they sound repetitive, a lot of them.

Participant 0024:
No, no, it's fine.

Interviewer:
Discuss the pros and cons of your job and your immediate supervisor's knowledge of your job.

Participant 0024:
Okay. Of course, you know how Head Start is set up. In our component, I have a direct supervisor, and then when I go to centers, they're not my supervisors. My immediate supervisor we have now, she's been with us for two years, and I wish she had been with us since I started at Head Start. She's extremely professional, knowledgeable, extremely available. She cares about the personal growth, as well as professional growth, whereas supervisor before her was not. She would have been the perfect case study for you on because they had supervisor.

She was very typical LMX to where you read. There's the doghouse where some employees are in the doghouse. And some are given choice assignments. And some of you are kicked outside. So that rotated a Monarch component. Sometime you were in the dog house. Sometimes you were getting the choice assignments. That's not the case with my supervisor now. She's very more of, I guess a servant leader, the one that I have now.

Interviewer:
So you feel that she has a good understanding of your job and your functions and what you have?

Participant 0024:
Oh yes. She knows our job inside and out. She knows the complex arise from working at center level. She understands how we're pulled in two different ways, like from the center, the site managers are asking us to do one thing, and central office is asking us to do one thing, and she knows we're in the middle, and she handles that very well. Because currently, I think I have maybe six or seven centers that I'm assigned to. So at every center it's different and she knows everybody has a different personality, and different management style, but she works very well.

Interviewer:
Good, okay. Discuss your manager, and these questions are written thinking about teachers in mind, but also I have to convert it to specialists. As far as the differentiations of manager level, discuss your manager or your upper manager’s knowledge of how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with your job. So your immediate supervisor's knowledge of how satisfied or dissatisfied you are and upper management's knowledge of how satisfied and dissatisfied you are with your job.
Participant 0024:
Okay. Now, the way our agency is set up is of course, it's more like three different levels because I had my immediate component supervisor, and then I have a center supervisor, and then of course we have to answer to people at central. So your question right now, is it directed to center managers or central?

Interviewer:
And this is what makes it very interesting. You're right about those three levels. I will write that in. That's something I have to add in because some people just have the ed specialist and the site manager, and then others have those... So I'm okay with you talking about all three because all of them could impact turnover differently.

Participant 0024:
Okay. Now, I'll speak of site managers. What I've come to understand is there's totally different needs based on if the site manager rose from the ranks through education: teacher and specialist, and then site manager, and then those who rose up through leadership, maybe through family advocate, add maybe a Masters on leadership.

What I find is those that came up through education, they struggle a little more because maybe they didn't get the management courses or the leadership courses on how to deal with people. And in those instances, I can see where I have to approach them differently. You know? And then, as far as if there's a site manager who was the leader, or comes up through business school or whatever, they're different as well. And you can see that every center takes the personality of the site manager, the culture. And there's some that are education people who struggle on how to manage and direct people. Of course, some go to the extreme of everybody's my best friend. It's a time to discipline somebody because you're always tardy or calling in sick. It's difficult. But where those that come from the leadership roles, there's definitely a dividing line. I respect you. You're a professional in your job, but I'm not your best friend. You were late. We're going to document this and get the ball rolling.

I have to be flexible in how I work at every center, especially with six or seven centers, you know? That's one aspect that I have and working. Now, when I go to central, things are lining up wonderfully. We have a CEO and she's starting to put her thumbprint on the agency. She hasn't even been in there 100 days yet. We give the President of the United States 100 days to do what he can or she can, whenever we get a female. And so we're still in that aspect of it, but she rose up through education, but she's very hardcore as far as, this is your responsibility. This is what you pay for it, you're accountable for it.

Interviewer:
Okay. So, how do you see each of these being knowledgeable about your satisfaction or dissatisfaction with your job, each of those. Do you think that each of them have knowledge of how you are, how you're feeling, or what you're going through on your job—each of those?

Participant 0024:
It depends on how long they've been with the agency. There's the newer ones. They don't know what really is my job responsibility, and that comes with time. So they don't really understand,
and they rely on you as a resource, which is what we're here for. And then there are some who are just so busy with putting out fires, that they don't have time to mess with you. And they're saying, “I hope you're doing what you're supposed to,” and “I'm going to let you go” because we do have some very laissez-faire managers who just, you see them once a week and wave, they're fine. And then you have the micromanagers who get us. I've had some who, you're making a phone call in the office you got to document, we talked to you from 8:15 to 8:25, and so it just depends.

As far as if they know I've dropped in and out, I'm going to say no, they don't; but it comes with the level of trust that I have with them. And then the managers from the leadership aspect, the site managers, they understand that what my job entails, what I'm accountable for, and they make sure that that's getting done. And then up above and from central, of course, my supervisor knows my job inside and out, and then everybody else, they do treat me. And I get the impression that they respect me as a professional in my area, and then I respect what they're doing,—either at special services or education—you went to school for that. You know it, and so I'm going to trust your judgment until you give me a reason not to. So that's how it is.

Interviewer:
Okay. Okay. Thank you for that information. I don't think you answered this one. Describe how well your immediate supervisor recognizes your potential.

Participant 0024:
My immediate, she's really good in the point to where I see where she sees us as individuals in my component. And she sees that we have strengths and we have weaknesses. From what I've seen so far, she's given us job duties to make her job easier. If I'm really good at this task, it's only going to make her a better manager, instead of something that I'm kind of weak, because our team is just like that to where some people are really strong in A, B, and C and a little weak in E, D, and F. So she's very good at that, where the last one, not so much.

Interviewer:
Okay. And I may go back to that later. In that same frame of thought, describe how well your upper managers recognize your potential, those above your immediate supervisor.

Participant 0024:
I think they see it, especially as they recognize it, going through [my upper degree] program is not easy, so there's a new appreciation of hey, he's knowledgeable in his component, but there's something else there too. I'm comfortable going the switch in-between. I know some support staff who are maybe all nervous when you're addressing the CEO or the CFO, but to me, it's we're all the same people. We just have different skillsets, but I think they do see my potential.

Interviewer:
Okay. Do you find that managing up is the reason why that takes place? Do you think they would still see your potential if you didn't manage up?
Participant 0024:
That's a tough question. I think because I'm so involved in different committees I'm on, they do see my potential because I'm on [different committee meeting] or whatever, that they see where my position doesn't dictate the extent of my influence. I think they appreciate that as well.

Interviewer:
Okay. Some of these I think you've answered already, but I want to go back to the time when you had a leader who you felt didn't appreciate what you brought to the table. But you can talk more about it, give it some direction as to what you definitely want the wording to be. Describe when that immediate supervisor, when there was a riff, or when there wasn't a good exchange, what motivated you to continue to do your work even when the exchange was poor?

Participant 0024:
Well, for one thing, I recognized it for what it was. I didn't take it. It was difficult not to take it personally, but it was classic (low) LMX. At the time, I was going through my [advanced degree]. That's what I was working on. I knew what it was. And I saw it as maybe my, at the time, the direct supervisor’s insecurities. I got the feeling that, how could I describe it? Of course, it’s all very subjective, but to me, it was like, there’s a pie. If I get a bigger piece of a pie for me, it means that there’s less for you. And my current supervisor is, we got a big pie. If we run out of this, we got another one in the fridge.

The other one is like, I’ll give you a good example. Of course you understand, we have this [company meeting] and [other stakeholders] are in the [meeting] and whatever. For some reason, she couldn't do it. She assigned it to me, and I did it, and I thought I handled it well. I engaged with the parents, the support staff, and the executive leaders, and she came back. Everybody told her I did a good job, satisfied with what I did, but she'd be unappreciative. Instead of saying, “Hey, you did a wonderful job. He's helping me look good,” it was, “I can't let him do that again, he's making me look bad.” So that was the last time I was asked to help in that capacity, not because I didn't know my stuff. It was because, “I can't make him make me look bad.” And the thing is, like with this theory of management, it changes. Sometimes, like I mentioned earlier, I was in the doghouse and other times, I was getting choices. It just depended on what triggered it.

Interviewer:
Yeah. That's interesting. I understand it. I'm saying interesting, but I certainly understand it. I'm really impressed with your followership, part of the exchange with that. Do you find that, or was there a better relationship with upper management during that time?

Participant 0024:
Yes. Most definitely. There definitely was. And I'll tell you, it was difficult to keep a positive mindset because, with a nonprofit agency like Head Start, it's not like you have your annual, what is it called, debriefing or whatever, and you get a bonus and a raise. It's not like this here. So it was a different motivator. With what motivates you, the children, and working with staff, professional development. It was difficult for me to maintain a positive outlook. And I think sometimes you have people, and I can speak for myself with what I'm saying is, maybe don't
have that positive outlook, and it affects their work. That was tough because we have a biased opinion and that's kind of tough to do, is to keep it positive.

Interviewer:
You mentioned that you felt support from upper management during that time when you were going through that. You felt the motivation, you were able to stay. I don't want to put words in your mouth, but your ability to stay motivated was influenced by the superior of that immediate supervisor?

Participant 0024:
Well, it was by people at central, yes, because they did appreciate, and then again, on ground level, with the site managers, they also appreciated the work because I was made to feel [as a] valuable part of the team and you contribute to it. The staff at central did that as well, but in my own little scope—my own little, I guess, fishbowl of a component—it wasn't that way.

Interviewer:
I'm going to turn a little bit from leader member exchange and dual leadership and go into turnover intentions, but I'm going to do a two-fold with you because you currently have a very comfortable—and basically looking at the demographic as far as turnover, your intent to turn over appears low—but I also want to talk about the times when you had issues with that immediate supervisor. You will be asked, probably answering the question, looking at it from both angles, and I’ll document this. But first, describe how often you think about leaving the organization, currently.

Participant 0024:
Currently. Well, now that I'm finishing my program, it's more than it's been a year ago or two years ago because I'm looking and I'm thinking, well, is there something at the state level or federal level I can get into. And it's not because of a person or policies that I want to leave. I think that's a unique thing because it's growth. My degree is equipping me to get out the door for positive reasons. It's been more, my wife and I talk about it. It'd be wonderful if Head Start had a position and the salary that was commensurate to what I can do in my degree, but a nonprofit this size, I don't see it, but it'd be great if I could.

Interviewer:
Think about the times when—the years—when you had difficulty with your immediate supervisor. Talk about your desire to leave during that time and what motivated you to stay?

Participant 0024:
It was quite often. What motivated me to stay at the time, it had to deal with the flexibility of the program. It had to do with the necessity. I have two [children in private school]. And what I did, for about three years, I had a part-time job. During those times, I enjoyed my part-time job more than I did my real job. And at the time, I was going through a [advanced degree program], so it was very difficult. But I did think about it, and when one's married, you know, my wife says, “Why are you still there?” And it's like, “Well, Head Start affords me the flexibility, and
schedule, and planning to leave early”. I'll leave early today, later, another day at another position that wouldn't be.

Interviewer:
It's pretty broad, but describe how often you look forward to coming to work each morning. Very simple question, but describe the feeling of going into work each morning.

Participant 0024:
This year, it's kind of funny because of the COVID-19, but I don't dread going back to work. I haven’t in a long time because of this supervisor, right? I feel positive to contribute. We're working from home. I look forward to doing my work here at home, and I enjoy the processes of a new school year, to where before, it was a dread. I was trailing from one center to another center, as why am I even doing this? But now it's like, “Hey, I'm going to a new center. I can help out families.” And a lot of that had to do with keeping a positive attitude. And it had a lot of personal and spiritual and professional growth for me, where I see that I matter where before I think that I didn't.

Interviewer:
Yeah. That's rich. Okay, describe how likely you would accept another job at the same compensation level and similar time off.

Participant 0024:
At this stage of my professional growth, I would. I mean, I need more responsibility. I need more pay and a bigger position to where I feel I've grown into.

Interviewer:
So you would stay where you are until that opportunity comes?

Participant 0024:
I don't know. Depends on the day of the week.

Interviewer:
Yeah. Same pay.

Participant 0024:
Yeah, I have to go and I've outgrown the nest. So I definitely have to go, and I look forward to going, but to go for the same pay, I might as well stay here.

Interviewer:
Okay. If a center—and I know you're a specialist, but I guess we can look at this from a teacher perspective, but you can answer from a specialist perspective, but thinking about centers—if a center is experiencing a lot of turnover, in your opinion, who is responsible, site manager or upper management?
Participant 0024:
I think from the teacher's point of view, it would have to be from the site manager because what I've learned is, when people accept a position, it's more the company or for the agency. And I've seen that people leave, it's more because of a person, not because of the company. It's always a person. Some site managers are wonderful, and then there's others who, they're not so wonderful. And you can see there's some teachers that struggle, some need maybe somebody to help mentor them. We have a lot of Master’s level teachers now. And I think that intimidates some site managers who only have maybe a Bachelor's degree and they don't know how to handle that, not that the Master degree teacher is better, but I think coming from the opinion and the perception of the site manager, it's a little daunting.

Interviewer:
Yeah, okay. So let's switch gears, not just center-wide, but agency-wide, if there is a lot of turnover within the agency, looking at it from up above, for lack of better words, who is responsible? Is it going to be the immediate supervisor or is it going to be top management?

Participant 0024:
I think it's going to have to be their immediate supervisor because even at the specialist point of view, a specialist is not going to leave because of a site manager or issues within a teacher or somebody in a comparable position, but it has to be with their supervisor.

Interviewer:
Is it important that you feel valued by both your immediate supervisor and top management? Is it important to you that both of them or all of them value you?

Participant 0024:
I do, because with Head Start, value is not determined by monetary. What I've learned is that my value is not how much I make by the hour, but the value I bring to the hour. It's good to feel valued or respected and appreciated at the—one I'll call it in the trenches, or the ground level—at the sites, and then also at central. What makes it better for me now, which, it's all three—the site managers, my immediate supervisor, people at central. I feel that that's going in the right direction to where I'm appreciated for the expertise I bring to the component, and I guess the comfort level they have with working with me.

Interviewer:
And you actually answered this. My final question was, do you feel valued by both leaders? And I think you answered that one.

We talked about followership. I think that you gave a different perspective than what I've been hearing. You gave some good information on that as far as managing up that's impacting LMX, so I definitely wrote that in. That's an interesting perspective to add into this piece. Do you have any other comments, anything you want to add regarding the LMX and the dual leader relationships that you notice within the organization?
Participant 0024:
Yes. One thing that's night and day is with our immediate supervisor. She's very respectful and accommodating to other components. She'll work with them. It's a team approach, so she expects that from us too—work with your site manager, work with education, special services, to where before, that was not the case. Before, we work in silos, don't help them, don't contribute to them. It's us. Don't make yourself available to them. Just do what your job is, keep your head down. And it was sad because they came from the top because that supervisor had a horrible relationship with [another] supervisor who helped [in another department]. And so it trickled down to us on the ground, so we had to work around that quite a bit, but that's no longer the case.

Interviewer:
Okay. That's all of the questions that I have for you. I'm going to go ahead and stop recording right now. All right. That's all I have. I appreciate you taking the time to reach out to me.
Participant 029 Interview

Interviewer:
Okay. Okay.

Participant 0029:
Okay.

Interviewer:
I think it's okay. So, you were saying-

Participant 0029:
You sure you can hear me okay?

Interviewer:
I can. Yeah. You said your old Head Start is different from the new Head Start, and this one you've been having the issues, yeah.

Participant 0029:
Yes, ma'am. And, because of the fact that, I'll give you an example for this, Monday is my day to work this week. And then my co-teachers, they come in together and work on Wednesdays and Thursdays. It's like a buddy-buddy system there, and I've been telling them I don't like this because of things that happened. And, I've had issues in the past, so my supervisor is aware of it.

Participant 0029:
And, from outside the room to meet the needs of the kids for the virtual learning. We didn't have space, so I made it very comfortable. I talked about how to look at it. I say, "What do you think about [this idea], is it okay?" I had my outline up, everything. How I was going to do it. I get a text yesterday morning from my co-teacher, "I like how you did the room, but I'm going to make some changes." So, that's a first example. Then I said, "Well, I already looked at this with my boss." And so, she got on the phone and called me from my home in the room. Mrs. [Smith] called me on my off day on three-way with her, talking about, "What did I agree to?"

[Inaudible]

Interviewer:
Say the last part. What did she... I think you may have to take off bluetooth because we’re getting some interruptions.

Participant 0029:
Okay. I can. I can.
Interviewer:
Yes.

Participant 0029:
So, can you hear me. I can't hear you.

Interviewer:
Oh. Okay.

Participant 0029:
It's spaced out.

Participant 0029:
Okay. Can you hear me now?

Interviewer:
Yeah. I can hear you better now. So, you were saying that there was a third teacher who called and what was that that she said?

Participant 0029:
She called my supervisor and was asking her about: “What did she feel about everything?” And then, the supervisor called me on three-way yesterday.

Interviewer:
Oh.

Participant 0029:
I mean.

Interviewer:
I see.

Participant 0029:
I've been dealing with this for two years. And, I called them. I said, "Let's not cause this mess." And I told them I had a big headache yesterday. I just didn't want to be dealing with it. I'm off, and y'all call me with this mess. Back and forth. And then, so because like I told them, we still virtual right now.

Interviewer:
Right.

Participant 0029:
So, what is the big deal?
Interviewer:
Yeah.

Participant 0029:
And then like I told her, one teacher trying her one way, and one teacher trying me. Just because... And this is all had to start with at work. Every teacher's case is different. Just because you can call this one doesn’t mean you can call another. And, that's how they are there. They don't look at it. And, then my teacher assistant, don’t really know much about her. She knows more of Head Start, and she'll tell you that. So, she's thinks big of herself.

Interviewer:
Mm-hmm (affirmative) So, you're saying you're—

Participant 0029:
And so, it's like—

Interviewer:
Is this your supervisor you're saying?

Participant 0029:
—Attacking you before they know you’re guilty.

Interviewer:
This is your supervisor?

Participant 0029:
Ma'am?

Interviewer:
You're saying your supervisor?

Participant 0029:
My supervisor.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0029:
But, she always—they like buddy-buddies, so I always gets this bad end of the deal.

Interviewer:
Okay. So, there are three teachers in there. You and two other teachers. Do you feel the buddy-buddy is with the other?
Participant 0029:
Yeah. It’s me and the teacher that text me that night, and the third teacher, but she's like a floating teacher.

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0029:
But, she still has the same credentials that we have.

Interviewer:
I see. Okay. Okay.

Participant 0029:
And, she [third teacher] doesn't never come, because she'll sit there and she don't do anything. So, I asked them, "What is her job?" You know? So, it doesn't make sense to me.

Interviewer:
Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Participant 0029:
So, how they run—because, I never had this problem when I was at the other Head Start. You know your job. It's either you going to assist the teacher, and it is not so many teachers in the room.

Interviewer:
Right.

Participant 0029:
And then, you ain't got to worry about who cleans up the room. Who makes the lesson plans.

Interviewer:
Mm-hmm (affirmative). So, what is the supervisor's responsibility in your opinion, in that type of conflict? And, I think you're frozen. I think you... let me see.

Participant 0029:
Are you able to hear me?

Interviewer:
Yes. I can hear you. I got... Yes. I heard everything you said. So, the question I was asking you was in that conflict that's going on, what is your supervisor's role in that conflict that you guys are having as far as that shared responsibility? What is your supervisor's role? Does she understand it?
Participant 0029:
They always tell us to work it out.

Interviewer:
Gotcha. Okay.

Participant 0029:
They don't... and then the other co-workers go behind my back and then I end up basically being the one that's in trouble, in a sense.

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0029:
Because I've had other issues, and they always—because they've been there longer, so they—and they all buddy-buddy friends outside of the place. The staff is more family than anything. So, it's like, I don't have a chance to resolve it.

Interviewer:
I see. How long have you been with this center?

Participant 0029:
I've been there for two years.

Interviewer:
Okay. Okay. So, two years with this center? Two years with Head Start, or just at that center?

Participant 0029:
Two years with Head Start.

Interviewer:

Participant 0029:
I worked at other Head Starts [different grantees], but only two years with this Head Start program.

Interviewer:
And, this is the only center that you've worked at [in this Head Start program]? The center that you're in right now?

Participant 0029:
Yes.
Interviewer:
Okay. Gotcha. Okay. So, let's talk about this. Do you have an ed specialist as a supervisor? Or, just the site manager? Who's your supervisor?

Participant 0029:
This was [Ms. Smith].

Interviewer:
Well, I don't mean name, but is it a site manager that's your supervisor, or ed specialist?

Participant 0029:
Oh. Ed specialist.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0029:
We do have a site manager, too.

Interviewer:
Okay. So, when I'm talking about supervisors, you're talking about your ed specialist, right?

Participant 0029:
Yes.

Interviewer:
Okay. So, the question that I have now is what is the site manager's understanding of these issues?

Participant 0029:
She goes the same way. She's told us we got to get along, or she can get us out of there.

Interviewer:
Okay. That's interesting.

Participant 0029:
They don't have no solution. They keep putting me with... I can say so much within the two years I've been there.

Interviewer:
So, I want to go back to what you said. So, in essence, a site manager has told you all need to get along or she can get you out...? What have you heard said by your site manager when it comes to your current issues?
Participant 0029:
Yeah. That's from another issue that I've had, and during the issue that I'm having now.

Interviewer:
Right. But, you said—

Interviewer:
So, you said that a site manager has said to you, "You guys, you need to get with it."

Participant 0029:
She basically said we got to get it together or she can get us out of there.

Interviewer:
Okay. All right.

Participant 0029:
We handle it or she can get us out of there.

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0029:
We can be replaced.

Interviewer:
Wow. I'm so sorry.

Participant 0029:
And then, the person that I had problems with the last semester, it's like our rooms are right there, so she keeps coming over. It's like, it's not a door like I have it there. So, instead of her moving us away from each other. But, it's still technically right there.

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0029:
And, she moved me away from my kids. In early Head Start, you're supposed to stay with your kids for three years.

Interviewer:
Okay.
Participant 0029:
I started off with 30 kids. She moved me from my kids. Kept me in the [toddler] room. I've been in the [toddler room] twice now. Two years. And last week, she moved, and she put the girl I was having trouble with, she moved up with my kids. That wasn't fair for me and the other coworker. We're not. It started off with the original kids, and now we're not even with our original kids. They [kids] don't even have a familiar place. Parents were confused about it, but... And then instead of her... It's like, they try to make it look like I'm the problem, but she won't look at the video and see the problem. I’m going to say it's not going to matter to put a door because we share the same little area. It has the sink back there. To wash the kid’s hands, and the cubbies, it's tight in there and we're sharing it. She's coming over yelling, or whatever, a psycho. I'm taking a break, and her in her room, and she's coming over there with all our kids. It's just like she can't stay in her area.

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0029:
So, I don't know how this is going to work with this zoom stuff.

Interviewer:
Right.

Participant 0029:
And, she's already... She wasn't even supposed to be there yesterday. She came up there just yesterday.

Interviewer:
Wow.

Participant 0029:
So, it's like, that's insane.

Interviewer:
Yeah. That's... Okay.

Participant 0029:
We have protocol, but they're not following it.

Interviewer:
Yeah. Okay. How does that, and my questions are here, but I'm moving around with my questions based on what I'm hearing you say. So, when I looked at your survey that you did, you marked when it comes to how often you think about leaving this agency, you marked down a three. You know, maybe monthly, but it could be more?
Participant 0029:
Because, I think about it all the time.

Interviewer:
Yeah. And so that's what I kind of figured. I kind of thought—

Participant 0029:
Yeah. They gave us a raise, then I noticed... I'm sorry.

So, they gave us a raise and even noticed with that. And so, even with that raise being paid, it was probably the highest paying job I have ever had. But, sometimes it's not worth that stress.

Interviewer:
Mm-hmm (affirmative). Gotcha.

Participant 0029:
So yes, I do look all the time, because it's hard to come home with a headache where... I haven't had headaches. Because, I had told them I had a headache because of all the different things going on there. Then they would have thought, "Oh, geeze. Go home because you got Covid." They're like, "You were sneezing."

Interviewer:
Right. Right.

Participant 0029:
They would think that. And, it's not true. I'm more stressed with the different things going on there.

Interviewer:
I understand. Absolutely. So, I'm going to say that you think about leaving often, a lot. More than once a month.

Participant 0029:
Yes.

Interviewer:
Yeah. And, I can understand. I could see that with all of that type of friction.

Participant 0029:
I have actually actively started looking.
Interviewer:
Yeah. Absolutely

Participant 0029:
I used to think it. But, I've actually started looking. Yeah.

Interviewer:
Absolutely. Yeah. I understand. Yeah. Now let me ask you this. How would you describe how the ed specialist recognizes your potential? Do you think the ed specialist recognizes your potential?

Participant 0029:
She's never really said.

Interviewer:
She's never said?

Participant 0029:
She's never really said. But I mean... Let me ask you a question because I know we discussed the problems there. When you asked me about the pros and cons, I cannot answer that.

Interviewer:
Absolutely. Yeah, absolutely.

Participant 0029:
Okay. Because I have another issue where when we do bereavement things. They're not fair in that situation. They're not fair in a whole lot of situations. And, our-

Interviewer:
I think you froze again.

Participant 0029:
I had a death [some months ago]. My family member passed. And so, I mentioned this to my education specialist, and she said, "Well, you don't get bereavement pay for that. We fixing to go out anyway." I left it alone.

Interviewer:
Yeah.

Participant 0029:
I said, "Okay." So, then my grandfather passed back in April, while we was out for the Covid stuff. So, I mentioned it to them my grandfather passed. I had to go back and forth [out of the area] and make arrangements and then I had to go back. Normally what they're supposed to do is
tell everybody, put it however they do it on the site or whatever. And, let people know somebody passed. They collect something for them. This and that. I didn't get that. My grandfather passed on that Sunday, he had been dead over a week. They waited until midnight that Saturday night to text, my coworker texts and said, "Keep her in your prayers as they lay her grandfather to rest." They did this late that night.

Interviewer:
Wow.

Participant 0029:
Nobody texts and say nothing. I said okay. I left that alone. Then when somebody had a wreck in our center, they posted that everywhere.

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0029:
Said, "Oh keep him in prayers, this and that." Then another coworker, she had her house or something burn down. They collected money. I haven't gotten money. Still. No consideration to me. Then my aunt just recently passed. And, still the same thing. They didn't say anything. I had a long drive from Texas to where I'm from. They didn't say nothing. My ed specialist, I told her. Still nothing. Okay. Come shortly after, just a few weeks ago, her family member passed. My ed specialist. The one I keep telling all this. And, they sent so many texts that I got sick of looking at my phone. And, I called and told my coworker. I said, "What makes her..." And I broke down crying. "What makes her any different than me?" They collected money, they even borrowed money to give her a hotel room. They put it on the system where all the staff can know that. They just made a whole ordeal. What makes her any different than me?

Interviewer:
Right. I understand.

Participant 0029:
That made me feel some type of way.

Interviewer:
Yeah. Yeah. I can imagine. Absolutely.

Participant 0029:
And it still, and I still feel I? I mean, I couldn't understand that.
Participant 0029:
But, she did me wrong all of this time. And even when my sister passed, she called me, "Are you taking a whole three days?" I had to go to Mississippi. She knows that. Well, I said, "Yeah, I'm talking whole three days." She said, "Well, most people don't take their whole three days bereavement." I said, "I'm not most people."

Interviewer:
Yeah. Wow. I just—

Participant 0029:
I didn't get a card or nothing. But, I fussed about it about my uncle. Then I get a little card, but my boyfriend lost a son last year, and the daughter was there. She had made sure they got me a card, and a plant. So, I knew it was supposed to been done.

Interviewer:
Yeah.

Participant 0029:
And, that was not even my son.

Interviewer:
Yeah. Yeah.

Participant 0029:
So, for my own family members, I haven't gotten any. No respect whatsoever.

Interviewer:
Yeah.

Participant 0029:
And, I don't feel accepted.

Interviewer:
Yeah.

Participant 0029:
So, that's why I'm like I add up all of this, and you see why I do not want to be there.

Interviewer:
Yeah. That's perfectly understandable. You're absolutely right. And so, I noticed that you mentioned the ed specialist. You said the site manager has the same view, in your opinion the same—
Participant 0029:
The site manager goes the same way as the ed specialist.

Interviewer:
Right. So, you feel the same disconnect with both of them?

Participant 0029:
The only thing she asked me when we got back, when we came back to the center last week, "So, when did you get back?"

Interviewer:
Gotcha. I see.

Participant 0029:
And, I had a little card. Not even all the staff's names on it. Just a little card, just something quickly they drew up.

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0029:
Because, some of them told me, "Oh, we didn't even know."

Interviewer:
Wow.

Participant 0029:
They have their picks.

Interviewer:
Right. There's a lot of things that you said. So, some of the questions I don't have to ask, because you gave enough for me to be able to see where things are

Participant 0029:
That's why I was ready for this interview. Because, I honestly don't care if you do say my name. Because I'm like, it needs to be brought out. I don't know how you're going to put up with it.

Participant 0029:
They keep telling me I'm a part of the family. I don't think I'm a part of the family.

Interviewer:
Yeah.
Participant 0029:
I'm like, "What part of the family?"

Interviewer:
Let's talk about this one. How often do you look forward to coming to work? In the morning?

Participant 0029:
I don't.

Interviewer:
You don't.

Participant 0029:
These my babies. I love the babies. They are my joy.

Interviewer:
Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Participant 0029:
They're my joy.

Interviewer:
Yeah. Do you feel that this is impacting your health?

Participant 0029:
It is.

Interviewer:
Okay. In a center, and you're a great candidate for this question because you're a teacher. So in a center, if a center is experiencing a lot of turnover, if teachers want to leave. Okay. In your opinion, who is responsible? Site manager, which is upper management, or your direct supervisor. And then, I'm going to take that question a little bit further. But in your opinion, if teachers feel the way you feel right now, who is ultimately responsible in your opinion?

Participant 0029:
I feel like that... I think the site manager's responsible for this. Not the site manager, but the educational specialist is responsible, but the site manager's responsible for us all.

Interviewer:
Right.

Participant 0029:
I feel a lot of people are leaving, but it's a lot of people that have been there for a long time.
Interviewer:
Gotcha. I see. Okay. So, you feel that for teachers is mostly the ed specialist or it's mostly the site manager? In your opinion?

Participant 0029:
Because I think now, when I first started, the ed specialist, I mean the site manager was leaving to another center. And then I guess they locked him out or something.

Interviewer:
I see. Okay.

Participant 0029:
And so, they brought a new site manager over there and I've always had the same ed specialist.

Interviewer:
I see. Is it important to you that you feel valued by your ed specialist? Is that important to you, that you feel valued by her?

Participant 0029:
I want to be valued as an employee all over, just like everybody else. I want to be treated equally. So, that goes for the ed specialist too.

Interviewer:
Okay. So, let me ask you this-

Participant 0029:
I don't want her, for her to call me yesterday, I don't feel she should have picked up and called me. I felt she should have waited. She could have handle that herself without calling me.

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0029:
Or, waited until I came back.

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0029:
That was like some messy stuff going back and forth. And, she had her on one and had me on another line. I don't feel she know how to deal with conflict.
Interviewer:
I see. Gotcha.

Participant 0029:
[Conflict] In a good way.

Interviewer:
Gotcha. So, let me-

Participant 0029:
It's like she causes more conflict.

Interviewer:
Okay. So, hypothetical, in that same scenario, let's say the education specialist did not value you. If the site manager valued you, would you still feel the same way? Even if the ed specialist didn't value you, but your site manager valued everything about you and you had a relationship you can go to her. How do you think things would be different?

Participant 0029:
It may be different, but I guess by me looking at them two and buddy-buddy also and going out for lunch, I guess it wouldn't even be no different.

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0029:
Because, I would have trust issues just by looking at them.

Interviewer:
Gotcha. I see.

Participant 0029:
Because, I sit there when I'm on my break sometimes, I can sit there and see things. You see that they say don't do what they do.

Interviewer:
Right.

Participant 0029:
To that scenario.
Interviewer:
Yeah. Is it because you see them talking a lot, or is it also because the way the site manager has treated you? Is it from your experience with the site manager that you don't trust her?

Participant 0029:
So, yes.

Interviewer:
Oh, okay.

Participant 0029:
Experience.

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0029:
Experiences with her.

Interviewer:
Okay. Because that's important.

Participant 0029:
But, it has been times where I've been able to go to my site manager and talk to her. But at the same time, I didn't feel 100% comfortable talking to her.

Interviewer:
Gotcha. So, let's take it a step further. Do you feel valued by whoever your site manager's, boss is, do you feel valued by that part of Head Start? Top management?

Participant 0029:
No, because of some recent things that have went on, and because I had went to my site manager and my education specialist so many times about the issue, that they let it get out of hand that it almost cost me my job because they didn't handle their job.

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0029:
When it got to him [main office representative], he called me in and he was like, "Well, you should have did the grievance." I said, "I didn't know anything about a grievance."
Interviewer:  
Gotcha. I see.

Participant 0029:  
And he was like, "Because, you didn't file a grievance." I don't remember that.

Interviewer:  
Yeah. Yeah,

Participant 0029:  
It didn't matter if you're going to tell me that, why didn’t my boss tell me that- I should have went to the grievance.

Interviewer:  
Yeah. Yeah.

Participant 0029:  
You know what I'm saying?

Interviewer:  
Mm-hmm (affirmative). Yeah, I understand.

Participant 0029:  
So, it's like I want to tell you this is the way. And then on top of that, she tells me one thing. And, I do it. Then I get written up for something that happened two months ago.

Interviewer:  
Yeah.

Participant 0029:  
Because, situation was crazy.

Interviewer:  
Yeah. Yeah.

Participant 0029:  
You tell me about this. so, it's like it's hard to explain because they contradict themselves.

Interviewer:  
Mm-hmm (affirmative).
Participant 0029:
They'll say one thing and then just to cover their tracks, they go back and do something else. what you think was a conversation about one thing, turned into something else.

Interviewer:
Gotcha. This is my last question for you on this part, and then I'll stop recording. But, describe how likely you would accept another job at the same, compensation level and similar time off.

Participant 0029:
You said would I?

Interviewer:
Yeah. So describe how likely you-

Participant 0029:
Repeat it one more time. I got distracted.

Interviewer:
Yeah, no problem. So, describe how likely you would accept another job at the same compensation level and similar time off. So, the exact same job paying you the same. How likely would you leave and just get paid the same amount of money?

Participant 0029:
Quickly. Quickly.

Interviewer:
You said quickly. You didn't hesitate.

Participant 0029:
Yeah. Yes ma'am. Quickly.
I'm ready for applying somewhere. This is crazy.

Interviewer:
I didn't get my pen ready.

Participant 0029:
Because, like I said if you don't have a clue what's going on in a person's personal life. When you go to work- sometimes for the person, coming to school is a way they get away from whatever they dealing with home.

Interviewer:
Yeah.
Participant 0029:
So, if I'm leaving home from whatever is crazy or something I have at home, to go to work for some calmness. But, I'm still going into craziness, that's not adding up.

Interviewer:
That's beautiful. Absolutely.

Participant 0029:
Just makes me don't even want to come.

Interviewer:
Yeah. That's beautiful. I mean, I get what you're saying. You're right.

Participant 0029:
So I, sometimes that's my peace.

Interviewer:
Going to work?

Participant 0029:
So it's because I love being around the babies, because they're my kids.

Interviewer:
Yeah. Yeah.

Participant 0029:
But my coworkers, no.

Interviewer:
Yeah. And that's—do you think there other employees that feel the same way in your center? That feel the same way that you feel? Do you think that there are others who feel the same way?

Participant 0029:
I feel a few of them, I do feel a few. The ones that's not in cliques, there are a few that I can name. Yes.

Interviewer:
Yeah. Okay.

Participant 0029:
They probably feel the same.
Interviewer:
Yeah. Okay. So my research is centered around—

Participant 0029:
—But people are scared to speak up because they are afraid for their jobs.

Interviewer:
Yeah.

Participant 0029:
People are scared to speak up because of that.

Interviewer:
Yeah. And that's important that people have to have a safe space. Yeah. Do you think that... Well, I think you already answered that question, but. So, my research is about dual leadership. A supervisor and a top manager, the relationship that everybody has, and employees turning over quitting or wanting to quit. You answered all my questions. Is there anything that you want to add to that from your experiences with working with top management and this immediate supervisor and your desire to want to leave, and how you don't feel valued? You want to add anything else on your own to that?

Participant 0029:
No ma'am. I think I expressed everything.

Interviewer:
Yeah. Okay. Okay. All right. So, I'm going to stop recording.

Participant 0029:
They bring in people that like I say, for the third person in the room. The third is supposed to be in there to help. Instead they're either on their phones, or they're on their watches or ear pieces. It's like you're left by yourself.

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0029:
And then, nothing gets happened to these people, and you don't dare to go say something because, you know what I'm saying? Because, if they're watching cameras and stuff like they're supposed to, they should see this.

Interviewer:
Gotcha.
Participant 0029:
And so, it's a lot. I guess you could say to keep from being neglected or something anyway, even if you think about the time we'd been out these two days. The two days that we're allowed there. I don't see anything that has been done. And I did my part on my own, just recent. But honestly, nothing has been done since we got out in March.

Interviewer:
Gotcha. Yeah.

Participant 0029:
So, as long as it's exactly like it was, I just said, "I got to finally do something." So now all of a sudden, they didn't have to actually do the training stuff. So it's like, what did you... I mean, why should you be allowed to do something different when you haven't done this since March? And you've been in that room on and off.

Interviewer:
Right.

Participant 0029:
And so it's like, my supervisor is not going to back me up like that. But, you could probably call me back Monday right? when I go back Monday it's probably nothing going to be different.

Interviewer:
Right.

Interviewer:
There is a concept or a theory that's called followership. Followership, it's how employees follow, how leaders lead and how employees follow. Do you think that you as an employee, do everything you can to make your work environment better, as far as the relationship with your supervisors. Do you feel that you do—

Participant 0029:
I try.

Interviewer:
All right, I'll explain that's not... I'm sorry it's coming out the wrong way. Explain to me, talk to me about what you do in that relationship with your supervisor to make it better.

Participant 0029:
Yes ma'am. I try to do everything I possibly can. I speak. I greet. Even if they don't speak or talk. I try to create a positive environment when I walk in.
Interviewer:
I got you.

Participant 0029:
And, regardless of how their attitude is, I make it.

Interviewer:
Yeah. Okay. Okay.

Participant 0029:
I did try.

Interviewer:
Yeah. Yeah. And it's my personal opinion, it's not your responsibility to create the climate. It's theirs, but I'm curious just so I can see some dynamics. So, I'm going to stop recording right now. Hold on one second.

Participant 0029:
Okay.

Interviewer:
Okay. Let me try stop recording. Okay. So, we're done with the questions that I have and all of that. Do you have any questions for me about the process? Or anything?

Participant 0029:
No ma'am.
**Participant 030 Interview**

Speaker 1:
I am re-recording participant 0030.

Interviewer:
Between you and your supervisor, your understanding of turnover. We're going to talk about dual leadership, specifically. What I mean by dual leadership is your immediate supervisor and then that supervisor's supervisor. You can have—depending on your position, let's say you're a teacher—a teacher would have the ed specialist and then the site manager. The site manager will have—I'm not sure [inaudible 00:00:39] right now. I think there's like an associate director and it kind of moves up like that. If you're a specialist, you may have to answer to your resource associate or the site manager when you go into the centers. I'm looking at all of those different dynamics. The first question I want to ask you is, can you discuss the pros and cons of your job and your immediate supervisor's knowledge of it?

Participant 0030:
Well, the pros and cons of my job, I guess that depends on the individual. For me, I enjoy working here. That's a pro. I enjoy the work. I think it's meaningful. It gives me satisfaction. Cons, I guess it can be physically challenging. There's a lot of stooping and get up and down on the floor with young children. It can be physically demanding. It can be emotionally demanding for some people, but for me, I wouldn't consider that a con, because like I said, I enjoy the work. But I do see that.

Interviewer:
You see it in coworkers?

Participant 0030:
Yeah, yeah.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0030:
Then what was the second part of the question?

Interviewer:
What do you think your immediate supervisor's knowledge of it? If you're a teacher, it would be the ed specialist. Her knowledge of your ... You said you enjoy your work. You find it meaningful. Do you feel that your supervisor believes the same thing, the con that it's physically challenging? Does your supervisor actually know that it's physically challenging for you?
Participant 0030:
I think she does. I would describe her as knowledgeable, and that she is aware of those things. I don't know if she thinks about them all the time. Because it's different when you're not in the classroom. You don't necessarily think about that aspect of it. You think about [inaudible 00:03:05] on paper. Sometimes you don't think about the physical or emotional drain that can happen when you're working with [inaudible 00:03:19] it encompasses a lot. This is offering more than you asked. They encouraged me to apply for that position once. I had only been at Head Start for two years. I didn't feel like I had the experience mostly, but also I would have preferred to work in class.

Interviewer:
Are you saying ed specialist or site manager? Which one?

Participant 0030:
Ed specialist.

Interviewer:
Ed specialist.

Participant 0030:
She's my direct supervisor. She's immediately over me.

Interviewer:
Gotcha. So you were encouraged to apply for ed specialists before. That's what you're saying? Okay. Who encouraged you?

Participant 0030:
My site manager. When the position was open, I just told her, "I'm not ready to do that right now."

Interviewer:
But she saw something in you. Why do you think she would say that if you felt you weren't ready?

Participant 0030:
Well, I appreciated that she suggested that I apply, and that I would have the potential for the job. I think at the time she had only been here for a few months. Maybe she thought that that was something I'd be interested in, but at the time, you have to take into consideration, I think I told her that there's women working here that have been working here for 15 years, and I've been working here for two years, and I don't feel like I've learned enough. No, I'm still needing to ask questions about certain things. I wouldn't be comfortable being in a supervisor position. [inaudible 00:05:03] to make up for me to learn. I'd just rather learn naturally [inaudible 00:05:07].
Interviewer:
Okay. I certainly understand that. You cannot give me too much information. What will probably happen, it's probably later on in my list of questions, and I'll just skip over that. Don't ever feel that you're giving too much information, but that was valuable. You touched on this, because my next question was, does your immediate supervisor's knowledge of how satisfied or dissatisfied you are on your job? Discuss it. Discuss how your ed specialist is aware of how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with your job.

Participant 0030:
Okay. I would say she's well aware of it. I have been working with her now for about four years, three to four years, at least three and a half years, three and a half to four years. We've developed a relationship over time. She's probably just seen how I do my job, that I'm dedicated to it. We've had many conversations about it too. I feel like I have communicated to her. She knows that I like working here. I think it shows in my work, from everything from the details to how I set up the room, [inaudible]. She knows I like it here.

Interviewer:
Yeah, yes. Okay. Now, you touched on this already, your site manager. It appears, based on what you told me, and I don't want to change what you said, but what I heard you say was that your site manager understands your dissatisfaction or satisfaction based on her wanting for you to apply for this position. Do you still feel that way? This was when you were six months into your job. Do you feel that your site manager still has that type of knowledge of how satisfied or dissatisfied you are?

Participant 0030:
Oh yes. The two of them together, they both know. I communicate with them really well. If there ever is something I don't like, and there has been in the past, we have had differences. I am not shy about expressing that, because I think it's important, especially because a lot of the decisions that they make, or that they have to tell us about, well we have to implement them. If there's something that obviously I'm not happy with it, I'm going to say, "Why?" and try to get in a mutual understanding so we can work that out. And we have in the past. I think they respect that.

Participant 0030:
We have like a mutual respect. I respect that they respect me, but actually to clarify, I was here for two years when my site manager started. I've been here for almost six years now. At the time when she encouraged me to apply for the ed specialist position, that was about four years ago, so I had been here for about two years. To me, it just wasn't a lot of time. You can learn a lot in two years, but there's so much to learn with Head Start, the performance standards and everything, it's a lot.

Interviewer:
Yes. Just making sure I capture everything. Okay.
Participant 0030:
I think some people, if they're not happy, part of the problem is either they're not in the right job, first of all, or they're lacking in communications skills. They're just not pressing. They're not speaking up for themselves. They're not trying to [inaudible 00:09:12] to get a common ground or something.

Interviewer:
Yeah, that's important.

Participant 0030:
Yeah.

Interviewer:
Yes.

Participant 0030:
Some people just throw their hands up like, "Oh well. I can't do anything about it." I was like, "Well, maybe you can. I don't know." I'm trying to have a understanding to make me feel better about it.

Interviewer:
Right, and you appear to have a positive attitude. Would you agree with that?

Participant 0030:
Yeah, totally.

Interviewer:
Okay. Do you think that could be the difference, as far as what you're saying that some people who may not be happy, their inability to communicate their problems, not being able to, I call it manage up? Do you think that has a lot to do with that positivity?

Participant 0030:
Oh yeah. Attitude is everything. People pick that up right away. Obviously, little kids do. Even babies can sense if you're happy today or not. Certainly that comes across and affect your communications, even if you don't intend it to. But yeah, definitely having a positive ... you know.

Interviewer:
Yes, okay. I don't want to repeat questions, so somethings you're answering and I don't have to ask, so I'm going to skip over. I think you answered that one. You've answered this one too. For example, I'm skipping questions like, "Describe how well your immediate supervisor recognizes your potential." As a matter of fact, I want you to talk to me about that, because I got the answer
regarding your upper level manager, which is your supervisor. Describe how your immediate ed
specialist, how she recognizes your potential.

Participant 0030:
I would say that she does. They've been very supportive of me, encouraging me. They're great
bosses. They really are. I mentioned that I'm working on another degree, and I reached out to my
ed specialist to ask if she would be open to the idea of me getting my [school] hours here through
the organization, and what that would mean. She was very supportive of it. That's another
indication for me.

Interviewer:
Absolutely, yeah. Is it both supervisors who are supportive of you during your [schooling]?

Participant 0030:
Yeah.

Interviewer:
Okay. That's very important to be in that type of environment.

Participant 0030:
Yeah. I'm very blessed.

Interviewer:
Yes, yes. A lot of these you've answered. These questions are under leader member exchange
and dual leadership. I'm looking at the commonality and the similarities of the exchange between
your immediate supervisor and the exchange between your upper manager supervisor.
Sometimes it's different, and yours are aligning very well. We'll talk about this towards the end if
you have any questions, but when they align well, that does a lot. You probably been discerning
that. A lot of people can pick that up, but it does impact turnover when they don't align well.
Describe how often you think about leaving the organization. These questions are about
turnover. If I'm not mistaken, you marked it too, but it's really because what your vision and goal
is for your life. If you want to discuss how often you think about leaving.

Participant 0030:
Well, just thinking about my plans for the future, as you know I'm working on [another] degree.
Once I finish the program and have my [degree], there's a lot of possibilities with that. I could end
up staying with Head Start. I could stay here, or I could specialize in like play therapy and start
my own practice, or I could work as a college counselor. It's a the very flexible degree, which is
one of the reasons why I chose it. But I did so because although I do love working in a toddler
classroom.

Participant 0030:
Likewise, it would really be zero to five that whole age group is what I'm really comfortable
with, but I just don't feel like I could see myself doing that the rest of my life. I just feel like I
could pull to do something slightly different. Something that I could still be working with young children, but maybe in a less physically demanding way and out there. Have greater potential for higher pay, professional development, and stuff like that. When I think about leaving Head Start, like I said, I could stay with and work with mental health. For my [studies], actually I was going to inquire with mental health if they would be willing [crosstalk 00:15:07] and teach me their ways. [inaudible 00:15:14].

Interviewer:
Okay. It's good to have definitely the options, but to have that support is so important. Then you're absolutely right. The [degree], there's so many doors that can open up for you with that within the early childhood field and out even administratively, so yes. I'm so glad you have support during this process.

Participant 0030:
I am so grateful.

Interviewer:
Describe how often you look forward to coming to work each morning.

Participant 0030:
I look forward to coming to work almost every day. If I'm not feeling good, if I had a migraine or slept really badly, I might not as much, but generally even if I'm not outwardly looking forward to it for whatever reason, although I usually am I would say 90% of the time. Usually, by the time I get to my classroom door, and it's all decorated and everything, and I can feel the vibe, I'm like big smile and you just turn it on because you have to. I do take my attendance very seriously. I miss maybe one or two days a year generally. At the most, outside of personal days, like for sick days, but I try to come in. Even if I'm not feeling that well, like if I have a headache or whatever [inaudible 00:16:50]. I would say nine out of 10 days, I do. I look forward to coming here.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0030:
I love my co-teacher. I have to say that.

Interviewer:
Oh, yeah, yeah. You're right, that is important.

Participant 0030:
We're really good friends.

Interviewer:
Okay. That's important. Do you think that she feels the same way that you do?
Participant 0030:
Oh yeah, yeah.

Interviewer:
That's interesting. I have to write that down, because I haven't heard that so far.

Participant 0030:
Yeah. We do things outside of work together. We go shopping or we go out. I go to her family's functions and she would come to mine. We've become really good friends. I've been working with her, I guess it'll be four years now. We just hit the four year mark. We just hit it off right away. Before her, I did have a couple of co-teachers that did not like the job, just kind of were just showing up for a paycheck kind of thing. That was not a happy time for me. I was very grateful I have the co-teacher that I have currently came on, because she, like me, loves working with this population and loves working with that age group, is happy in her work. That just makes all the difference in the world. When you're working with somebody directly that's like, "Oh, I don't want to be here. I just want to be at the house."

Interviewer:
Let me ask you this. How did that impact your ... The question that I asked you before, how often do you enjoy coming to work?

Participant 0030:
Oh, if you had asked me that then, I would have said, "Never." I probably would have said, "I don't." I really didn't. I actually wasn't sleeping well. It was not good for my health. That's how rough it was. That was a whole year. I had a six months with one teacher and another one for another six months. Both of them were ... While we eventually developed an understanding, they were really not there for enjoyment. They didn't [crosstalk 00:19:18] and it showed. They would say it regularly. They would say, "I don't want to be here today. I don't want to come in. I don't want to do this." This and that. Just a lot of negative comments. That's very irritating.

Interviewer:
Right, right.

Participant 0030:
I do feel incredibly grateful that I have great a supervisor, ed specialist, site manager, and my co-teacher is solid for four years. I think that also our leadership sees how well we work together. They recognize when people work really well together and how it's working for them, because sometimes they have to split people up based on need. [inaudible 00:20:10] What we have is working so well. We haven't been disturbed.

Interviewer:
That's important.
Participant 0030:
Yeah. So having a strong teacher pairing is good.

Interviewer:
Yes. Okay. You've given me a lot of information. I'm checking some things off. We're almost done.

Participant 0030:
I'm a big talker, yeah.

Interviewer:
No, you're doing absolutely amazing, thank you. We're going to talk a little bit about dual leadership, which we did talk about. Then the reason why I don't have to ask a lot of the questions is because there's an alignment in your satisfaction with your leaders. Some of the questions here, I don't have to go into ... like to explain people about the difference between your immediate supervisor or the agency leader. Agency leaders, they pretty much represent the organization to an employee depending on what level they are. You're an agency leader, [inaudible 00:21:30] site manager, of course, because she represents Head Start by way of policies and procedures.

Then you have your direct supervisor who runs the day-to-day operations for education component. The agency leader also includes upper management. It could include those resources associates for the education specialists. When I'm talking about the dual leadership, when I'm talking about site managers, I'm also grouping those upper level leaders too, and what we're doing in this discussion.

Interviewer:
If a center is experiencing a lot of turnover, in your opinion ... I go back, this one is involving site manager and ed specialist with this question. If a center is experiencing a lot of turnover, in your opinion, who is responsible in the education component?

Participant 0030:
Okay. Well, I don't think it can be ever just one person's responsibility, because there's always a dynamic that's involved with that. I've seen a good amount of people come to work here that's not a good fit for them. Sometimes that's just the case. Then other times, maybe things could be improved if they had a different attitude, communicated better. Because I feel like all-in-all it's a great job if you enjoy it. It does pay differentially based on your education. That's hard for some people you know working here, that they feel like it's not there because they're doing the same job essentially, but this is their level of education. They get paid markedly less.

Participant 0030:
I think that that's difficult for some people to swallow. Now, maybe they feel they can just make more money. Sometimes you might even like this job. I was in a position once where I was offered a job that I loved making like $8 an hour, but then I was offered another job making almost twice as much, and I took that job even though it wasn't really enjoyable work for me, but
I needed the extra money. Whose fault is it? It's not just one person that's involved. It's a combination of individual needs and whatever, if the job is a good match for them based on that. I don't know.

Interviewer:
Yeah, no, you can't get these questions wrong. You're doing great. You answered this, [inaudible 00:24:59] want to elaborate more. Is it important to you that you feel valued by both supervisors, the ed specialist and the site manager? Is that important to you and why?

Participant 0030:
Yes, that is very important to me personally. In my opinion, I want them to recognize that I do care and that I do my best work here, and that I'm always trying my best, even if I get something wrong that it my intensions were to try to do the best job that I can all the time. We haven't always had the best relationship actually. To be perfectly honest, I feel like when they were new, especially my site manager first, my site manager was new. I had only been here for about a year and a half and she came in. First, they're feeling everybody out, kind of like gauging what your standard is for your work, because everybody has a different one, kind of like your level of commitment to your job and your regular performance.

Then we got the new ed specialists because I didn't want the job. Actually, since I've been here, we had a lot of different ed specialists. I think the ed specialists that I have now is like the fourth or fifth one. She was like the fourth or fifth one in my first two years here. It was kind of a revolving door on that position. My current ed specialist, we didn't hit it off well. I would say we didn't hit it off well at all. Sometimes that just happens, so you have to work that out. I'm all about that. I consider myself a problem solver. If I have a problem with somebody, I'm going to do whatever I can to fix it, because I just have a can-do, positive attitude. As I talk it out and get a mutual understanding where I'm coming from and smooth things over.

There's no reason to have conflicting relationships in the workplace. A lot of times, when you have that, I think it just comes from a lack of understanding. To be humble sometimes, and some people just don't like to do that, but I want somebody to do that for me. Or if I'm coming across the wrong, because sometimes it's just a matter of different personalities. A lot of problems come from just a clash of personalities. Nowadays, that you have to work with, -just something about them that's just irritating or whatever, or the way they talk, they might not be meaning things the way you're perceiving them, so you just have to lay it all out.

Over the past four years, we worked through any kinks that we had. It's been really smooth sailing for the last two or three years. I think me getting a co-teacher that I mesh with really well had a lot to do with that, because in the year when I was working with two other people over the course of that year where it was very challenging for me, where I'm kind of almost doing the work of two people, because my co-teachers were not involved with the job and didn't want to be there, so that made it hard for me to express that I liked this job. You know what I'm saying?

Interviewer:
Yes, absolutely.
Participant 0030:
Sometimes when you have a challenge in your position, it might make you appear like you don't like your job when you do, it's just you're having some kind of conflict or a situation that's preventing it from showing.

Interviewer:
Yeah, right, right. Absolutely, yes. You seem to have great conflict resolution skills what I'm hearing from you. I'm just taking a guess at that. This is a general ... We're actually finished with the questions that I had listed. I'm going to ask you two questions just based on what I heard you say. This is your opinion, what can a manager do to improve engagement relationships when they are poor?

Participant 0030:
I would say that ...

Interviewer:
Or even an ed specialist. I'm so sorry, a manager or any leader, in your case, education specialist or manager. What can they do to improve engagement?

Participant 0030:
In addition to like, we have group staff meetings. Maybe meeting with people one-on-one individually, whether it's at a regular review or just separately to just talk about a lot of things we've been talking about. Satisfaction with the job, and what can I do as a manager to like improve your level of job satisfaction. Let them know that we know how important you are as a staff member and your happiness is important. If you're happy, you're doing better work.

Interviewer:
How often would you need ... You mentioned a review. I think you mean the yearly review. Would that be enough if the relationship is poor? How often would you want your manager or a site manager to meet with you if you felt uncomfortable or if something was going on? Like your first year, when you first got there and those co-teachers, they didn't work well, didn't mesh well with other teacher. How often do you think you needed to meet with somebody to talk about that?

Participant 0030:
Oh, I could have talked about that every week, but maybe once a month maybe. Once every month or two.

Interviewer:
Until the issue's resolved, but at least once a month. Yes, okay, yeah. Okay, that's good information. Okay, you mentioned having several ed specialists in the certain period of time. In your opinion, from your viewpoint, what did you see that would make you question? What do you think the reason was that there was so much turnover with the ed specialist in that timeframe? What do you think was going on?
Participant 0030:
I think it's a combination of things. I think it is a combination of that it is a highly demanding position. It doesn't pay that much more than being in the classroom with a bachelor's degree. The level of pay difference doesn't really line up with the increased responsibility and the amount of work that you have to do. In addition to that, I think that that helps make that position a stepping stone position, because somebody gets to the position so now they're a manager and they can put that on the resume.

It's also an incredibly tough position, and they could make more money. For that reason, I saw people are using it as a stepping stone, "Okay, I'm going to take this job and work it for six months. I'm under so much pressure and I can make a little more money." That's what I think. I didn't want to do that. I don't want to do that. I don't want to take this job. I'm going to hate it, and then I'm going to want to leave. I didn't say that exactly, but ...

Interviewer:
No, I can understand that. Absolutely.

Participant 0030:
You definitely need to have a lot of experience.

Interviewer:
Well, which position, the site manager or ed specialist?

Participant 0030:
Either one.

Interviewer:
Either one, okay.

Participant 0030:
Or at least have had a lot of experience in the manager position somewhere else.

Interviewer:
Okay, okay. All right, that's all the questions I have. Do you have any questions for me or anything that you want to add that you think is important to understanding the relationships that managers and secondary managers have with their employees to prevent or to keep their employees in their positions, that engagement?

Participant 0030:
Well, I guess I can just make a comment on, like we mentioned or talked about, I'm super grateful that I'm able to do my [studies] here. Having that level of support, having the agency, be supportive of my personal development goals is super meaningful to me. We have another co-teacher. She's still here. She was working on her bachelor's degree in education. She was needing [extra time to study] and at first she thought she was going to be able to do it here, and then they
said no. It came back from higher management. Said, "We can't do that." She did switch her
degree plan. Me? I wouldn't do that. I would've left. I wouldn't change my degree plan based on
how everything’s going right now, basically, the only reason I was even allowed to do my [work]
here is because of the pandemic. That became an option for me-

Interviewer:
I can't hear you very well. I believe you're [crosstalk 00:35:40].

Participant 0030:
Oh, sorry.

Interviewer:
That's okay. Just that last part, where you were talking about the pandemic.

Participant 0030:
I was still going to stay here, even though would've been really hard for me to work 40 hours a
week and then have to leave and work 16 hours a week outside of work. I was still going to do
that. I was really grateful now that they did when it became an option for me to be able to find
[assistance] here in the agency. That was just amazing to me.

That was really meaningful to me, to feel like a few years ago, when this other teacher
was wanting that, I really felt like I really wanted to actually just talk to somebody in the central
office to talk about how it would be a really good idea to try to work with teachers more who
were trying to get higher education. That can pay off for you in so many ways. I just thought that
there'd be a lot of benefits to that. [inaudible 00:36:56] Right now, there's benefit to the agency I
guess, because any volunteer time I do, that counts as volunteering, and we're losing [crosstalk
00:37:04] because we can't have parent volunteers.

Anyway, yeah. I just feel like it could be mutually beneficial. I think that we
should do more of this for staff. Even if it means we'll always work here. It's just going to happen
anyway. People are going to leave anyway. You might as well work with your staff. Turnover's
going to happen, but like I said, I may stay with Head Start. It's a great organization and they've
treated me really well. Who knows?

Interviewer:
Yes, listening to you, you've been very fortunate. I'm going to stop the recording right now.
Participant 031 Interview

Interviewer:
Okay, sounds good. At any time you don't want to answer a question or you don't feel comfortable, you're able to do that, okay?

Participant 0031:
Okay.

Interviewer:
Tell me about, or discuss the pros and cons of your job and your immediate supervisor's knowledge of it. Do you fall under an ed specialist as a supervisor, site manager as supervisor, or

Participant 0031:
So you're saying what my position is now?

Interviewer:
Well, the pros and cons. If you're a teacher or a specialist, I'm not sure what the dynamics are in your program because some programs have an ed specialist who supervises teachers, some have a site manager who supervises. Some of them have the site manager, and then above the site manager is upper management. So I'm directly talking about your immediate supervisor.

Participant 0031:
Oh, okay.

Interviewer:
So, discuss your—

Participant 0031:
[crosstalk 00:01:04]

Interviewer:
Yeah.

Participant 0031:
—specialist, because I'm actually just a teacher.

Interviewer:
Okay. So yours is an ed specialist. Okay. So the ed specialist would be your immediate supervisor.

Participant 0031:
Right. And we also do have a site manager on site as well.
Interviewer:
Good. Okay. So when we're talking about dual leadership, I'm looking at it that way. You have your ed specialist, then upper above her would be the site manager, that's that dual leadership.

Participant 0031:
Right.

Interviewer:
All right. So now discuss the pros and cons of your job and your immediate supervisor's knowledge of it.

Participant 0031:
The pros and cons of the job right now, of course with everybody being virtual it's been tough just trying to transition into the best way to, I guess, handle it all, is what I've noticed. The agency as a whole is not on the same page.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0031:
Just within the agency, I know they had announced there are several centers. And each center is kind of doing their own thing, which I kind of feel like that doesn't make sense.

Interviewer:
Right. Yeah.

Participant 0031:
We're an agency, and we're working under an umbrella, right? We should all be on the same playing field. When I say that, I can elaborate and just say that for the virtual learning tools, like the platforms that we're using. First, we're using ClassDojo. And then I'm hearing some other centers are using something called Google Classroom, or stuff like that. But essentially, of course we all need a platform to use in order to reach the students, which I agree with. But why aren't we all on the same platform?

Interviewer:
That's interesting. Okay.

Participant 0031:
But they basically just pretty much say, "Do what works best for your center." But I just kind of feel like, as an agency, as a whole, why aren't we doing the same thing? And my supervisor, my immediate supervisor, her knowledge of it is just not as great as I would like for it to be. I would prefer for her to know more. A lot of times when I go to her it's kind of like a, "I don't know." Or
she'll say one thing, then I may begin to work in that area that she said. Then she come back, and I have to redo it.

Interviewer:
Mm-hmm (affirmative). Right. Yeah.

Participant 0031:
So that's very frustrating. And so it's gotten to a point where now, after going to her, which is she's my immediate supervisor, I may have to go a step above and go to the site director.

Interviewer:
Right. Absolutely.

Participant 0031:
Because in essence, that's also happened in instances before we were virtual. So even in the classroom, just doing our day-to-day things, and doing thing that she's asked us to do like paperwork. With Head Start, there's a ... Just Head Start period because I work for Head Start, in [another state] for five years. And just Head Start as a whole is just a lot of paperwork. A lot of it I think is unnecessary. Not saying that ... I'm sure with the program being funded the way it is, they have to have a paper trail.

Interviewer:
Yeah.

Participant 0031:
Because of the funding, okay, we got to show. "Okay, this what you're doing? Need to see it." I get it. But some of it is just ... Like they do home visits and they- The way it works right now, who wants to go to somebody house? I don't. Don't feel safe, which we don't go alone. We take someone with us. But I just, a lot of times, the teachers, we're women. So okay, even if we're together, what are we going to do?

Interviewer:
Yeah. Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Participant 0031:
So it's one of those things. And it's just a lot of, to me, just the agency, just overall, they're just not together. And then when you ask questions, you never get a direct answer. And a lot of back and forth. A lot of, "Do it this way." There's always something. I know that can be a possible in any job. But I just feel like, "Why can't we get together?" Or why can't somebody ... Whoever's in that particular education department, if y'all need to sit down and really hash all this out before it's handed down to us, to do our job, and we're doing it correctly, and we're not having to do it. Then we go back and re-do, or it's not redone all the time.
Interviewer:
Okay. Now did you find-

Participant 0031:
[crosstalk 00:05:05] all the time.

Interviewer:
Okay. Did you find this inconsistency in [the other state] as well? So you're saying that Head
Start in general you-

Participant 0031:
Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Interviewer:
Okay. Gotcha.

Participant 0031:
Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0031:
Now I feel like I [inaudible 00:05:17] coming here because [North Texas] was bigger. But I feel like it's worse here, just because I've worked in both entities. And i had high expectations. I thought it would be better because it's a bigger ... Because even though they had their issues, their own separate different issues, it still was one of those situations where I feel like it's worse here. I felt like in [the other state] we were more so [inaudible 00:05:47] as a whole when I say everybody on the same page. We were on the same page there with all the centers doing the same thing versus here, where everybody's doing their own thing. Why?

Interviewer:
Okay. Okay. I don't write as fast. I'm just trying to make sure I got it all out in detail.

Participant 0031:
[crosstalk 00:06:08]

Interviewer:
But no, that's good. So it's interesting that you ... What's good about it is that you have a perspective from another Head Start program in another state.

Participant 0031:
Right.
Interviewer:
So you're actually seeing some similarities, and then some differences. So that's actually very good.

Participant 0031:
Right. And there, too, I worked as a Pre-K teacher there. And here, what they do, they have a partnership with ISD. That's similar too.

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0031:
And so when I got here, and I went into the classroom, with [The other state] there was just two of us. There was co-teacher and the Pre-K teacher. But when I got here, it was the ISD teacher, a Head Start teacher, and another teacher. So it was three teachers in the room. I was like, "Why are there three teachers in the classroom?" It was just, it was different. [crosstalk 00:06:58] Well, now they have gotten to the point where they've taken the third teacher out of here. So it is just two teachers now.

Interviewer:
So it's an ISD teacher and one of Head Start's teachers? Is that-

Participant 0031:
Yes. That's what they've done now.

Interviewer:
Oh, okay.

Participant 0031:
But when I got here, they were doing the three teachers in the room. Now they've gone to just two. But that was really interesting for me to see. I thought that was strange. I was like, "What?" It was different because I was like, "This doesn't make sense to have three bodies in the room. It's only 16 kids, right?"

Interviewer:
Right. So is the ISD teacher supervised by the Head Start ed specialist? Or does she have another supervisor.

Participant 0031:
I don't know. Not necessarily. She will say things to the ISD teacher, but they're pretty much managed by ISD.
Interviewer:
Interesting.

Participant 0031:
If it's something as far as Head Start goes, or things that they need to know as far as Head Start, she will tell them stuff that they need to know. But a lot of times, that falls back on us because she feels like we're the Head Start teacher, we should make sure. Since we're in the role together, we should make sure that they know the things that Head Start needs, Head Start ways, and things that needs to be done in the room. And so they can't do things that they're not supposed to. But she pretty much ... She will say some stuff to them, but a lot of times it comes from their ... Because they have coaches, and they have a principal, and all that. So they come out to the center frequently in person.

Interviewer:
Gotcha. So does their coach and principal impact what you do directly? Do they speak to you directly? And do you have to follow any direction?

Participant 0031:
No.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0031:
Not really. They talk to us when they come in the classroom. They may give feedback to us or whatever. But it's just them saying we're doing a good job, we're working well together, or something like that, to that effect. But it doesn't go beyond that.

Interviewer:
But you follow leadership from your ed specialist?

Participant 0031:
Right.

Interviewer:
And your co-teacher follows leadership from ISD?

Participant 0031:
ISD.

Interviewer:
That's interesting.
Participant 0031:
And that's another thing that's weird to me because they have their own set of goals they have to master. So it's times when we're doing maybe small group or something like that, they have to pull certain kids to test. And it's just ... I'm like, "What?" It's different. It's really different. I've gotten used to it now. But that's just, it's tough because we have our own set of assessments for Head Start. But that's the thing to me. If they have a partnership with someone like ISD, why are we not- And just like school started back. Head Start decided to start back on the 17th of August. ISD is just now coming back.

Interviewer:
Right. Yeah.

Participant 0031:
Well they wanted to use another platform called Seesaw.

Interviewer:
Yeah, I've heard of that.

Participant 0031:
Well, we've already been engaging with our parents and our students via Class Dojo.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0031:
My question to my ed specialist was, "We already struggle with these parents we have now trying to get them to get on this platform that we're using. How is that going to work?" Even some of the parents asked us, "Why are we starting without ISD?"

Interviewer:
Yeah. Right.

Participant 0031:
They're starting ISD. It's almost like there's not a good medium. Even though they have the partnership, there's not a good medium there between them. Or somebody's not talking. Something's missing in the middle of the partnership because it's always ... It just doesn't make sense. And so now when the ISD teachers come in, they give us this whole schedule of how they're supposed to do their learning. We look at them like, "No, this not how we been doing it. This is what we've been doing." And so now it's one of those things where Head Start's decided to say, "Well, ISD has to follow what we're doing because we were already doing it."

Interviewer:
Gotcha. It sounds frustrating.
Participant 0031:
Yes.

Interviewer:
Yeah, it sounds ... And I'm not putting words in your mouth. I'm telling you what I hear. It sounds frustrating. And you mentioned that your immediate supervisor ... How do you perceive she understands that frustration? Your immediate supervisor. And then we'll talk about how your site manager perceives that frustration.

Participant 0031:
I think she understands it to a certain degree. I don't think she totally understands it because at this point all the teachers are at that same level of frustration. As a matter fact, we just had a teacher transfer to a whole other center because she said she couldn't take it anymore.

Interviewer:
Who transferred?

Participant 0031:
Another teacher.

Interviewer:
Another teacher. Okay.

Participant 0031:
Another center. A different center.

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0031:
And I've spoken with her since she left, and they're doing things totally different. Again, that's what I'm saying. You're at another center, and we're all under the same agency, so why are things being done so differently? She's less stressed now because the center she's at, they're not doing things the way that we were doing at our center. So it's less stress. She was frustrated too, so she was just like she couldn't take it anymore.

Interviewer:
Right. And this was another co-teacher, or just another teacher?

Participant 0031:
This is a teacher in another classroom.
Interviewer:
Another teacher. Yeah. Okay. Gotcha

Participant 0031:
But I don't think she ... I voice my opinion. And I'll ask her questions like, "Why are we doing this?" Or I'll ask her, because she has a boss too. It's called the education manager. And she comes to the site too and visit. And so I've asked her, I said, "Well, can you call her and ask questions like, "Why are we having to go back? Why are we having ..." Because it's almost like assignments that we've completed, they're wanting us to go back and redo because now they've realized, "Oh, we didn't do it like they wanted us to." So we got to back two, three weeks and try to ... That's extra work. You want me to do that and still so what I'm ... so I'm frustrated.

So I'll tell her, and sometimes she'll say stuff like, "Well, maybe you need to take the day off?" Or, "Do you need to go home?" I'm like, "No, I don't need to go home. I can do my job. I just want clarity." And I ask a lot of questions. And then, and like I said, when it gets to the point where she just can't answer me, I just go to the site manager. And then with him it's like let him find out. Because by him not being up under the education department, it's only so much he knows. And him and her apparently don't communicate a lot.

And when they have meetings, of course they're having site manager meetings. So I don't guess they talk about a lot of the stuff that goes on from the education people with them. They should, so they would know. But I know this last meeting that they had with him, they did go over some stuff. So he did bring ... We had an actual meeting with him and with the ed specialist. And he went over some stuff with us. But I don't know if that's something they just started to do or-

Interviewer:
Gotcha. So in terms—

Participant 0031:
I don't know. I mean, he said to understand better what they were asking of us to do. And he knows that we're frustrated because all the teachers just went in his office one day, and we was just like, "Look. Something has got to change. This is too much." And he was like, "What's wrong with y'all?" And we was like, "We [are] frustrated."

Interviewer:
So he didn't know beforehand, the site manager?

Participant 0031:
No. I don't-That's why I'm saying I don't think he knew. Because of course normally we don't talk to him. We speak, and we converse that way. But as far as what goes on in the classroom, we don't talk to him because he's really not our immediate supervisor. We talk to her. But like I said, at that point it was like we weren't getting anywhere of getting answers so it was just like something has to give.
Interviewer:
Right. Yeah.

Participant 0031:
But after we talked to him, he said that he was having a meeting with the guy that's all over the sites, the schools. He was having a meeting with the site managers. And so once they had that meeting, he had a meeting with all of us, then the ed specialist. And then he went over the PowerPoint that they went over with them.

Interviewer:
Good.

Participant 0031:
So it made more sense to him what they were asking for us to do because he didn't know.

Interviewer:
So how does that ... And again, I'm not putting words in your mouth. I'm only saying what I'm hearing. It sounds like a disconnect with the knowledge that the site manage has of your frustration, until recently.

Participant 0031:
Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Interviewer:
And your ed specialist's knowledge, she knows that you're frustrated. That's what I'm hearing.

Participant 0031:
Right.

Interviewer:
So how does that play into your ... And I'm going by how you scored yourself on your demographic form

Participant 0031:
Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Interviewer:
How does that play into your intention to not be satisfied or wanting to leave? How does that play into that?

Participant 0031:
I think about it often, about leaving. But at the same time, I've built relationships with the parents and the students. And ultimately, I think about where that would leave them.
Participant 0031:
I'm passionate about what I do. So it's like even though I get frustrated, even though I might get burned out, even though I could be all of those things, I still think about them.

Interviewer:
Exactly.

Participant 0031:
How would this impact them? Because some of those kids we service really only ... Even now I feel bad that they've been out of school all this time because they had times they'd get a hug from us, or just a ... They don't get any of that at home. So it's hurtful that-And then not only that. With some of the kids that I haven't been able to connect with via Zoom or anything, I feel like they're missing so much because for them not to even be able to get on at least one Zoom with me? I'm like, "They're not getting anything." That's my view.

Interviewer:
Yeah. That's a teacher who cares. Yeah, absolutely.

Participant 0031:
So, yeah. I'm like, "If your mom can't take the time to get on one Zoom so I can see your face and go over this overview, then I feel like you're not getting anything at home."

Interviewer:
Right. Yeah.

Participant 0031:
The parent says, "Oh, I have other kids." I get that. We all have kids through this. Is this baby not important?

Interviewer:
Absolutely.

Participant 0031:
When I think about that, I think about leaving all the time. I look for jobs. I put resumes in. I do all of that. I've done it. It's just that overall me just wanting to just leave them in a situation. Because with that center that I've been at, the turnover rate has been high. Those kids, for the classrooms that I've been in, they've been through, I know, three teachers within not even the last year.
Participant 0031:
So those kids were totally not connected with anybody. For the past year, they had a room full of
kids that was just doing the most because behavior, it was all over the place because they had no
stable teacher. They had a different ISD teacher come in that ended up with the head Start
teachers that was in there, one of them left. One of the other ones, she was still in there. But then
they let her go. Then they pulled another teacher out of another classroom and put her in. Those
kids weren't familiar with her. And so that room has been through a lot. And so I'm in there now
only because the teacher that was there, she quit.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0031:
So the teacher, she quit. She left and actually ... She left here altogether. She went to a whole
other school. The ISD that was in there, she left. So there's a new ISD in there. And I'm in there,
and that's not my classroom. Because I had taken a floater position. So I float. So I don't have a
classroom.

Interviewer:
Oh, okay. That's interesting.

Participant 0031:
So I'm just in there. I'm only in there because she's not there. They don't have a teacher, and
they're in the process of hiring somebody.

Interviewer:
I see. Okay.

Participant 0031:
So not only will they have a new ISD teacher, they will have a new teacher. Some of these kids
are returning. So some of them are coming back, and going to have two new teachers. And
they're going to be like – what?

Interviewer:
Oh. Oh, wow. Yeah, that be hard.

Participant 0031:
—That they had this issue with before.

Interviewer:
Yeah. Yeah. I understand. I understand that frustration too. You mentioned a lot. So my
questions are so simple, a lot of times the information that you give me can answer quite a few
questions. So if it sounds repetitive, I'll make note of that. So the next question would've been,
"Discuss your upper manager," which would've been the site manager's, "knowledge of how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with your job." First of all, do you believe that your immediate supervisor knows that you're dissatisfied? Are you confident or sure that she knows that you're not satisfied?

Participant 0031:
Yeah.

Interviewer:
Okay. So what about your site manager? Does he actually know that you're dissatisfied with your job?

Participant 0031:
He probably doesn't know to that degree. He's the type ... He's new to the site manager role because he used to be [in another role]. So he's still learning. So with him, he's one of those he'll come in, "Hey, you okay? Is everything okay? Is there anything I can do?" The other day he asked me, he was like, "You okay?" I was like, "No. I'm not okay." And he was like, "Well, is there anything I can do?" I was like, "No." I mean, there's nothing you can do. It's just the work that is stressing me out. It's not-

Participant 0031:
... the job itself. It's the workload, the pressure that they're putting on us. It's not coming directly from him. It's coming from my immediate supervisor to me. Oh yeah, she's one of those ones that she's always either emailing all the time ... She almost like a micromanager. I don't like that. Tell me what you want me to do, give me a deadline, let me do it.

Interviewer:
Right.

Participant 0031:
Now if I don't do it within that timeframe, okay, yeah. Then you got every right to say something or whatever. But she's one of those ones. And so when we're there in the center, of course the kids aren't there. So we're working three days a week in the center, and we work two days from home. So the three days we're there, she's constantly in the classroom, "Oh did you do ...?" I'm like, "I can't do nothing because you keep coming in this room." Like, "Get out, lady. Leave me alone. I'm working."

Interviewer:
So have you ever talked to her about that micromanaging?

Participant 0031:
We all have. She'll ask us do we want her to email us? And we be like, "No. Don't email us." Because we already know what to do. You know? It's almost like once you've told us once ...
We're not the set of teachers ... I ain't saying everybody like this. But we're not the set of teachers that you got to constantly remind.

Interviewer:
Yeah.

Participant 0031:
You've already given us the blueprint. They've already given us the outline of how we're supposed to do things every week. And we've been doing it. So that's how I'm just like, "Okay, we been doing it." So and a lot of it, I think the issue is now that we been trying to play catch up because she made us go back three weeks to redo some stuff. So that put some of our other stuff behind. So it's kind of like, "You can't expect us to do all this, and get all this caught up, and then still do this other stuff too." So it's like, "What do you want first? What's more important, basically?"

Interviewer:
Right. Right.

Participant 0031:
She wants all of it really. That's impossible. Because on top of that, we still have to do Zooms with the kids. We still have to call parents. We still have to call them in between all this stuff she wants us to do. So I'm just like-

Interviewer:
Yeah. Two questions. How long has the new site manager been in that role?

Participant 0031:
Not quite a year.

Interviewer:
Okay, so under a year. okay.

Participant 0031:
Less than a year. Yeah, less than a year.

Interviewer:
And you've been there a little over a year, right?

Participant 0031:
October will be two years.
Interviewer:
Okay. Okay. In your opinion, what can your site manager do? Because it's already clear that the ed specialist is aware of how dissatisfied you are with your job, and it appears by what you're saying that, is not helping, is frustrating you.

Participant 0031:
Mm-hmm (affirmative). Yeah, she is.

Interviewer:
And your site manager, from what I'm hearing, has an idea, but may not know the depth, from my understanding, because he's relatively new? Or he can't ...

Participant 0031:
Yeah, I think he might know the depth of it all. And then too, like I said, this is probably the first time we actually said something to him about it. Because I guess its gotten so ridiculous, I guess. And when the kids were in the center, and we were doing things face to face, the workload wasn't ... It was still a lot. Don't get me wrong. We still filed paperwork. But it was more so you could control it because the kids are in the building. It's not controllable now because they're not there.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0031:
And so a lot of the stuff that she's asking us to do, it's not nothing we can do about it because some of these parents are unreachable. They're not responding. They're not ... So it's almost like I can only do so much. I can't make the ... If the kids are here, I can do whatever I need to do because they're here. But by them not being here, I can't.

So what they're wanting us to do, on Mondays, we do a whole group Zoom session. That's supposed to be with all the kids. On Tuesdays and Wednesdays, we're supposed to split out and do individual sessions with each child. We schedule those with the parents. Well, some of them kids, like I told you, I have not seen.

Interviewer:
Right> yeah.

Participant 0031:
And I can't reach the parents.

Interviewer:
Okay.
Participant 0031:
So in her mind, she's saying, "Okay, if you can't reach them, or can't get them on individuals Zoom, have the parent ..." So we're supposed to provide them two goals that we need to work on. So with those goals, they're not getting on the Zoom because that's my way of seeing if they're mastering the goal. But if they're not going on, I don't know if they ... The parent could tell me they mastered it, but if I can't see it, or I don't see any evidence, I don't really know that.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0031:
So in her mind< she's telling us, "Well, try reaching out to the parent, asking them can they either take a video of the child matching the goal, or send you a picture." They're doing neither. They won't even get on the Zoom. So how do you expect for them—

Interviewer:
Right. Right.

Participant 0031:
—to get on a Zoom call because we're able to record it, and it goes to the agency. So that way, if they want to pull it and see, they can do whatever they want to do because it's on the agency. They can pull it. Even with our homes, everything's recorded. So it's like whatever you want to see, you can see.

Interviewer:
Right. So let me ask you this. Before virtual. Before COVID moved us all virtual, was there a problem with engagement?

Participant 0031:
Oh, yeah.

Interviewer:
Okay. So regardless if this is COVID or not, it's the same engagement issues with the supervisor

Participant 0031:
Yes, it's the same engagement issues. You're going to have the same, yeah. But I feel like as a teacher, we can control it more because the child is there. But the issue with the supervisor would still be the same.

Interviewer:
Okay.
Participant 0031: Whatever the work she wanted us to do, it was always a constant something.

Interviewer: Gotcha. Okay.

Participant 0031: Yeah.

Interviewer: So COVID didn't change anything with leadership, it just compounded it.

Participant 0031: It just made it worse.

Interviewer: Gotcha. Yeah. So describe how well your immediate supervisor recognizes your potential.

Participant 0031: She always says, "Oh, you're doing a great job." She gives us praises and stuff like that. I really feel like she's fully aware and know that we're more than capable to do our job. But at the same time, you'll say those things and then you turn around and do the other stuff. So it kind of make me feel like, "Really? Do you really feel like I'm capable of doing these things if you constantly ...?" You know.

Interviewer: So the actions don't match the words.

Participant 0031: Right.

Interviewer: Okay.

Participant 0031: Doesn't match what you're saying.

Interviewer: Gotcha. And what about your site manager? Do you think he knows?

Participant 0031: I think he knows because he does the same that she does. He'll come in like, "Guy, you're doing a great job. I appreciate everything you do for the kids, for the parents." So he does. I feel like
his is a bit more genuine ... Because, of course, he's not the one who's going to come back and say anything different because of being he's not our immediate supervisor. So he's not going to come back and be like, "Oh, well you didn't do ..."

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0031:
He's not going to do that.
I see. So when he comes and give us something, that's pretty much it. It stays there.

Interviewer
I see. Okay. And that makes a lot of sense. Okay. I think you've answered some of these other questions about working relationship. So let's talk about turnover. That was all ... Leader member exchange or engagement and dual leadership. So I'm going to combine two questions. How often do you think about leaving the organization? And how often do you look forward to coming to work each morning?

Interviewer:
Let's try before virtual. Let's try before virtual because you actually had to get up and go.

Participant 0031:
Right. It was a different ball game. Before virtual, I probably thought about it ... Let's see. October will be two years. I probably thought about it maybe once or twice before then. And I actually sought out other employment maybe once or twice before

Interviewer:
So you still had issues? You still had the desire to want to leave even before COVID?

Participant 0031:
Yeah.

Interviewer:
Okay. And of course COVID compounded it because of all the issues.

Participant 0031:
Yeah.

Interviewer:
Yeah, and usually that's what's happened. Yeah. If you want to elaborate more on that, you can. But talk about how often you look forward each morning ... Describe to me your desire each morning about going to work.
Participant 0031:
I was excited to go. And before I took the floater position, which I just took the floater position within the past year. So I was ... I had a classroom. I was in a classroom. And so the classroom that I was in, I had gotten comfortable with them. I miss the parents. Had built a relationship with the ISD teacher. At that point, it was still three teachers in the room. So, it was the ISD, myself, and another Head Start teacher. So we had built a great working relationship, so I looked forward to going in there every day because I was excited to see the kids, and to work with them and see, "What can we accomplish today?"

Of course each classroom had its own issue. Whatever child might've had whatever going on. So we tackled that. So in our room, we probably had about two or three of them. So it was like, "I know who my kids are I got to go in here and might have to give a little extra little nudge, or a little love."

Interviewer:
Mm-hmm (affirmative). Right.

Participant 0031:
So that made me excited to go to work. But now I'm at a point where like, "I just want to go home." Because I'm just like, "No. I'm not even excited to be there."

Interviewer:
Yeah. Okay. I think you answered this, but I'm going to ask it anyway. Describe how likely you would accept another job at the same compensation level and similar time off?

Participant 0031:
I probably absolutely would. And I think that's a lot of the issue that I ran into when I was seeking other employment and looking. What I've learned with Head Start is that by them being federally funded, and getting the funds that they get, they're able to compensate us more than some of these other entities, like the private sector. When I tell them how much I make, they be like, "Oh, yeah, we couldn't pay you that " And I'm like, "Uhhh. Guess what. I can't take this job." I can't take pay cut.

Interviewer:
Right. Yeah.

Participant 0031:
So being in a situation where if I were offered the same amount of pay, I probably will.

Interviewer:
Okay. And we're almost done. This is talking about dual leadership. Those two leaders.

Participant 0031:
Okay.
Interviewer:
And then we'll go into upper management if needed

Participant 0031:
Okay.

Interviewer:
So if your center is experiencing a lot of turnover, in your opinion, who's responsible?

Participant 0031:
At my center, I would say the ed specialist because she pretty much is the one that pretty much is dealing with the teachers. And that's where the turnover is coming in at, for our center. I can speak for our center because that's where the turnover rate's coming in at our center. Because we can see this. Because we've lost, since I've been there, one, two, three, maybe four people.

Interviewer:
In one year? Wow, that's a lot. Okay.

Participant 0031:
One of them, she ended up firing. The other one, the one I was telling you that just transferred to a different center. But one, she quit, and went to another job. And then the other, she ended up just quitting too.

Interviewer:
Okay. So have there been any promotions of teachers since you've been there?

Participant 0031:
Not since I been there.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0031:
Typically, from my understanding, when they do have promotions, they prefer to promote. If you do get a promotion, you can't stay in the same center. You have to go somewhere else. So if the position is available ... Because they had a [another] position that I was interested in within our center. So if I had applied, I wouldn't have gotten it anyway because they don't like—

Interviewer:
Hmm. Oh, wow.

Participant 0031:
—working in a center that you already work in
Interviewer: 
Really?

Participant 0031: 
They'd rather you apply for something ... If that's the position you're seeking, they're okay with you applying for the job internally. They're okay with that. They'd rather you apply for something in that area, if that's what you're seeking, at another center.

Interviewer: 
Oh, wow. Okay.

Participant 0031: 
Which I thought was weird because I'm just like, "Okay, if I'm teaching, and I want to move to another position and there's a position here at the center, and I'm still wanting to service the children and then families I've already been working with ...”

Interviewer: 
Mm-hmm (affirmative). Yeah.

Participant 0031: 
So we had another position, but they ended up hiring another lady to come in

Interviewer: 
From outside the agency?

Participant 0031: 
No, she had already worked for the agency before, so they rehired her.

Interviewer: 
I see. Okay. That's still outside.

Participant 0031: 
I think she was a teacher. She was a teacher before. And she left. And so they rehired her as a family advocate.

Interviewer: 
Interesting. Okay.

Participant 0031: 
Yeah, I thought that was too because I was like, "What?"

Interviewer: 
Right.
Participant 0031:
Really strange.

Interviewer:
Okay. My last question. Is it important to you that you feel valued by both of your supervisors?

Participant 0031:
Absolutely.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0031:
Absolutely. Because it makes you feel like you appreciate not only the job that I do, just appreciate me as a person. Because, like I say, even with the positioning that I hold now, I interact with not just the children, I interact with the parents too. It's a dual position job. I'm not just dealing with the kids.

Interviewer:
Right. Right.

Participant 0031:
And then we still have to interact with everybody in the agency as a whole. Like we have a special services department. We have health. So we have to deal with everybody. So they got questions. Who they going to come talk to? The teacher. Because a lot of times, they don't know.

Interviewer:
Right. So do you feel valued by both of them? I know it's important to you. Do you feel valued by both of your supervisors? Both levels equally?

Participant 0031:
I don't know if equally. I would say the site manager, I feel like he values ... I mean, like I said, he's new to the center, and he's new to the position. I feel like he may value more than the ed specialist. I kind of feel like sometimes she paints a picture of, "I have your back. If anything were to come up, I got you." But I don't really think if something were to ... If something really bad were to happen, and I would really get myself in a position where I couldn't get myself out of, I don't think she really would have my back totally.

Interviewer:
Okay.
Participant 0031:
I think she would be more so willing to cover herself so she's covered. And then I can be just pretty much hung out to dry. And I say that because, In the situation with the teacher she fired, I feel like she did some things that were unethical. And I don't think they dug into that enough. But she did enough of paper trail for herself, to cover herself.

Interviewer:
Gotcha.

Participant 0031:
So that she didn't look bad. She made the teacher look bad.

Interviewer:
Gotcha. Okay.

Participant 0031:
And I knew the lady because we actually got hired in together. So we did all our training together. In training at the time, we didn't know we were going to the same center. But we ended up going to the same center

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0031:
Just some of the things she did to that teacher, and how she just ... Some of the stuff was just ridiculous. And I was like, "So they just going to fire you, and they just ... What?"

Interviewer:
Right. Okay. Okay. Those are all the questions that I have. Is there anything that you want to add, as it related to engagement? As it relates to how the engagement, or the exchange that you have with your immediate supervisor and/or your upper management supervisor?

Interviewer:
Yeah, when it comes to your feelings of not being satisfied, or even wanting to stay, is there anything else that you want to add to that?

Participant 0031:
I think I pretty much put it out there. I just think the agency as whole has to do better because in order for them to survive, and to keep the livelihood of it, and to keep the teachers because the turnover is high. And as I've seen here, I will say this, the turnover here is greater. Far greater than the turnover is in the other state. And I feel like that's probably because of either management issues in the center, be it ed specialist or site manager, and things like that. And it's just the lack of everybody doing their own ... We're just not all on the same page. And I just
think things should be done in a way where we all on the same page. Because if we're all on the same umbrella, why are we operating so differently?

And then of course the program hours are longer, and I feel like that was strange for me out here. I had to get used to that because back home the program operating hours were not as long. So I think I understand why they do it out here, just because of the parents working, and the distance, and the travel, and all. So maybe that's why. But that didn't make sense to me. But I had to get used to it. And then they do this split up schedule. So from August to December, you may work the early shift. And then the other teacher and you switch work hours. So that's weird. But, I mean—

Interviewer:
Do you have a choice in that? Or is it determined for you?

Participant 0031:
Generally, I guess when I started, by me coming in, I guess and me being new, they put me on the late shift. And then once I'd worked that, then they flipped me to the earlier. But I don't really think you have much of a choice. The only way I think I ended up getting a choice was because I was in the classroom where it was nobody else for me to choose with.

Interviewer:
I see. Yeah.

Participant 0031:
Then once I became the floater, it didn't really matter. I have a totally different schedule from everybody else anyway because I don't have a classroom anymore, per se.

Interviewer:
What I mean by choice is, let's say two co-teaching teachers, can they decide, let's say—They can say, "You know what? I worked 8:30 to 5:30 last year. I'm going to continue to do that." Do you—

Participant 0031:
Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Interviewer:
Oh, okay. So you do have a choice if you want to.

Participant 0031:
Yeah. Sometimes that's what it is. They just will say, "Well, you guys figure out who wants to do what." She will say that. That has happened.

Interviewer:
Gotcha. Okay.
Participant 0031: 
She will say that.

Interviewer: 
Okay.

Participant 0031: 
But yeah, just as a whole, just them getting all on the same page, and just figuring out better ways so that the turnover rate is not bad because like I said, the parents that we serve, and the kids, they do need good teachers, and they do need that with them not doing what they're doing to some of the teachers.

Interviewer: 
Right. Exactly.

Participant 0031: 
The turnover rate is so high people saying, "Okay, I'm fixing to leave." They can have that. I mean, but it's just ... And then we do have a new CEO. But she's been there.

Interviewer: 
Yes.

Participant 0031: 
She just actually officially, I guess, got the role or whatever. She was acting CEO because the guy that was ... He's been gone. But I think, from my understanding, she's been at Head Start forever. So she's not new

Interviewer: 
Okay.

Participant 0031: 
So that's why I'm just like—I just feel like it's just dropping the ball so much. People act like they forget, I guess, when they get into those upper levels, that they've been in the center, or they've been ... You forget about all this stuff that go on here?

Interviewer: 
Mm-hmm (affirmative). Yeah. I understand.

Participant 0031: 
So I think that's important for them to remember.

Interviewer: 
Okay. Yeah. That's a wise statement. Yeah. Okay. So that's ... I'm going to stop recording.
Participant 0032 Interview

Participant 0032:
... The kids are my number one thing that I liked in my job.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0032:
My second thing that I like in my job is the co-worker, the co-teacher that I work with.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0032:
The most thing that I like in my job too, is more of the atmosphere a little bit.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0032:
Yeah.

Interviewer:
You said that the pro is working with your co-teacher. What do you like about that? What makes that relationship work?

Participant 0032:
I like more working with my co-teacher because first of all, we do get along, and our communications skills, we communicate with each other a lot.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0032:
She's patient with me and I'm patient with her.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0032:
We're different on one level and then we're the same. Why I say we're different, I'm more the decorator and she's more of the person that is the computer person, let's put it like that.
Participant 0032:
When I asked her about the computer or something, she don't get frustrated or nothing. She's really the one that really helped me with the computer stuff when I came into the Head Start program.

Interviewer:
Okay, okay.

Participant 0032:
Like I said, our number one thing is we communicate. We don't never, what do you call it? Dislike about our classroom with each other. When we do, it's something real simple. We'll take care of the matter right then.

Interviewer:
Okay, okay.

Participant 0032:
We'll see what it is and why and we're both, like, "I wish this wouldn't have happened," or whatever. No, in the end it don't take much. Me and her have really worked on the same level as with the kids.

Interviewer:
Yeah.

Participant 0032:
I do all this and she does all that, or I do all this and she does all that. If I see me doing too much of the same thing, I would take it into consideration and say, "You want to quit? You do this and I'll do that." If she's seen me doing it, she'll go, "Hey, maybe you want to do this and I'll do that," and we'll go, "Sure." I get along pretty good by me being that it has started [inaudible 00:02:38], I get along with my co-teacher real good.

Interviewer:
Okay. That's good. It sounds like you guys have a good relationship and that does a lot for your working. Tell me about cons. What are some things that you may not like?

Participant 0032:
Okay. What I may not like in my job is sometimes it's miscommunication with the head manager versus the teacher. Sometime I don't like that. We might get an email or something. For instance, when we was doing the COVID, we had a Zoom meeting, right? I'm ready to get on this Zoom meeting, but I guess it got changed just like that. I'm a person like, "Okay, I've got a Zoom
meeting in the morning," but I know the Zoom meeting was about 10:00 or 11:00, but it got changed to 8:00 or 8:30. Well, I didn't know that. I was doing my Zoom meeting through my tablet. I did not know that it had switched that fast.

Interviewer:
Right.

Participant 0032:
I was upset because I know I'm not a computer person, but it made me feel like if I'd have checked my tablet or whatever, or my email faster, I would have saw it. It made me like I got physical with them because it made me feel like I failed to not check my email so fast. I didn't like that.

Interviewer:
Yeah, yeah.

Participant 0032:
It confused me. I was like, "If you all could tell somebody," so everybody would know I'm not a computer person. For somebody to change their email that fast on me, it really made me like I was doing something wrong.

Interviewer:
Right, right. I understand that.

Participant 0032:
I did not like it. I could see that maybe sometime it looked like the Head Start side get a little more attention than the Early side sometime.

Interviewer:
Okay. Tell me about that.

Participant 0032:
We see it or whatever; if we see it or Head Start hasn't seen it yet. My other thing I really don't like is more like if we need some supplies or whatever and we don't have it right then, it mostly looks like that Early still has to go inside of the resource room and we'll get some of the idea that Head Start had already had or had done.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0032:
There's stuff there for us sometimes. Sometime we get second-hand and sometimes I don't like that, mm-mm (negative).
Interviewer:
Is Head Start and the Early Head Start in the same building, the classroom?

Participant 0032:
The Head Start and the Early Head Start?

Interviewer:
Yes. Are they in the same building?

Participant 0032:
Uh-huh (affirmative), and we share the same resource room as far as the butcher paper and the construction thing and crayons. We all share that the same. If we need something, then that's the room that we go to. Most of the stuff that we get is because of Head Start not using it anymore. We feel like it's not that bad, but I feel like it's second-hand to me because, let's say that we need something and we go, "Oh, okay. Head Start is not using this anymore. I could use it in my classroom now."

Interviewer:
Gotcha, okay, okay.

Participant 0032:
Sometimes, we'd be like, "Well, why do we have to get it second?" That's the way we be thinking. We just work it out.

Interviewer:
Right. Tell me about the hierarchy for you. Is it an education specialist and the manager or is it just a manager with Early? How does it work at Early Head Start?

Participant 0032:
Okay. We have a site manager. A regular guy is the head supervisor. Then we have our educational specialist that will [inaudible 00:07:12] before the site manager. The site manager, she runs the whole building.

Interviewer:
Gotcha, okay.

Participant 0032:
The educational specialist is our supervisor.

Interviewer:
I see, okay. Who's responsible for the supplies, the issue with the discrepancy with the supplies, as far as the Head Start and Early Head Start, as far as the supplies not being equal?
Participant 0032:  
The education specialist.

Interviewer:  
The educational specialist, okay. All right. Okay. In the example that you gave about having to use supplies that the Head Start teacher may have left behind, you said the education specialist is responsible for making sure you have those supplies?

Participant 0032:  
Yeah, but I think in order for her to ensure that we have a supply, I think she has to get it okayed with the site manager, I think, because both of them might work together.

Interviewer:  
Gotcha.

Participant 0032:  
But to keep the room together and everything it's for the educational specialist.

Interviewer:  
I see, okay.

Participant 0032:  
It actually calls for both of them but I think the site manager (ed specialist) can't give out no supplies or something until she gets it okayed with the site manager.

Interviewer:  
I see, okay. Okay.

Participant 0032:  
I guess the site manager has to get it okayed from the Head Start. When I came to Head Start, I always worked in daycare so when I came to Head Start, a lot of this stuff was brand new to me.

Interviewer:  
Okay, mm-hmm (affirmative).

Participant 0032:  
Some of it seemed weird to me, but then after I got the really, really learning it, it made sense. I never understood. I always heard about how you are in the infant room and you move with your kids. I never understood that at first.

Interviewer:  
Okay.
Participant 0032:
Then it didn't make sense because in daycare when your child turns an age, they go to another classroom.

Interviewer:
Yes.

Participant 0032:
Well, I learned that Head Start, when your child is turning an age and it's time to move, the teacher moves with the kids.

Interviewer:
I see.

Participant 0032:
A lot of our parents always asked us how that worked, and now look at me and how I used to look at the other teachers like, "Huh?" I said, "It sound[ed] weird," but it make sense.

Interviewer:
Yes.

Participant 0032:
I thought if I could have it my way, I would feel like when the child moves or get another age, they should move on with another teacher. These teachers get some more kids while you have to literally stay with those kids for two straight years.

Interviewer:
Gotcha, okay.

Participant 0032:
Because the way I see it, is that you're not letting the child get used to another teacher. When they try to go to Head Start, it's like they've got to get started when they can get used to other teacher, knowing that when they try to go to Head Start, they'll be getting ready to get used to the child's Head Start teacher. How are they going to do that when they only know these two teachers from day one, from being a baby and being a newborn? That's a big step.

Interviewer:
Yes, yeah.

Participant 0032:
Like I said, I only worked as a [inaudible 00:10:26] and go with whatever worked at the house.
Interviewer:
Right, I understand. You said your main concern or the cons- You listed the pros, the kids and your co-teacher, you guys have a good relationship as far as communicating with each other.

Participant 0032:
Yeah.

Interviewer:
The con things that you are not [crosstalk 00:10:50].

Participant 0032:
Sometimes they mess up with the communication.

Interviewer:
Miscommunicating.

Participant 0032:
The communication for it.

Interviewer:
Okay, okay. Then I put also the discrepancies are, as far as the aid that Head Start, the larger classes, as far as the age group, as far as resource and Early Head Start resources may not be the same, the resources that you guys have.

Participant 0032:
Yeah, we don't. Yeah.

Interviewer:
The discrepancies with that, okay. Tell me about your immediate supervisor, that would be your, you said your education specialist. Tell me about her knowledge of your pros and cons.

Participant 0032:
To be honest, I guess the pros with her, I really like the education specialist because she will help us all. I think she really tries to get along with everybody. I think some people, the way I've seen it, I'll tell you, when I first got to Head Start and we worked with our [inaudible 00:12:06] that we had to go that week, we heard a lot of negative things about her. Really, my call I was really scared just to go to Head Start because when people ask you, "What's your work site you're working in," and I tell them, they all had negative things about her. How am I doing? I really want this job? But I know a person like me, you can tell me anything, but I have to learn you on my own.

Interviewer:
Right.
Participant 0032:
And to me, I didn't see that, but I've seen it with other teachers. They had negative vibes about her, but I didn't get a negative vibe about her.

Interviewer:
Okay. Do you think she understands the things that you were saying about your frustration with the miscommunication and your frustration with supplies? Do you think your immediate supervisor understands that?

Participant 0032:
I think they understand it. It's just that I really take it as well - Sometimes when stuff happened like that or whatever, I always say they're probably frustrated with their job too, because they have to do a lot of stuff in the database too. I don't get frustrated and mad. I tell them like, "Okay, I'll do that. But just give me a little time" because if you push a lot of stuff on me, I tend to get nervous and they know me.

Participant 0032:
I don't really just get upset with them because I really know that they have a lot to do. I know they have a lot of work to do because if we've got to move stuff on the database, I can imagine them. Sometimes they let us know they have to get this out, get that out in a certain amount of time. I try not to take it personally like they didn't give us this or get us that on a time or something like that, because I look at them having a lot of stuff to do too.

Interviewer:
Okay. When you say they, are you saying your site manager and the specialist?

Participant 0032:
You've got to work with, and I don't want to say deal with, but yeah, you really do. When it comes down to anything you've got to do it, you're not only dealing with the education specialist, you're dealing with the site manager too.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0032:
To be honest, if you've got a situation of whatever is doing with the education specialist, she's going to let the site manager know.

Interviewer:
Yeah.

Participant 0032:
I feel that it's a job too. It ain't nothing that you're going to do with the education specialist that she don't tell the site manager. Both of them going to know. That's why I never noticed and I never say her, I say both because both of them work together. They're close like that.

Interviewer:
Okay. That's what I'm paying close attention to. That's important because you're saying, ”They” a lot, which is very interesting because you see them moving as one.

Participant 0032:
If you talk to anyone about it from my feeling, they're not going to just for the education specialist. They're going to put both of them together because that's how both of them work.

Interviewer:
Okay. You see them working closely together?

Participant 0032:
Yeah.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0032:
Yeah. They're like best of friends.

Interviewer:
Okay, gotcha. Okay.

Participant 0032:
You're not going to go into my education specialist's office and talk about stuff and the site manager don't know. That's how close they are.

Interviewer:
Gotcha, that's good to know.

Participant 0032:
You're talking to both of them when it comes down to a situation.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0032:
It don't matter if you take your situation to the education specialist or the site manager. It doesn't really matter because both of them going to know anyway.
Participant 0032: We all learned not to tell each other though.

Interviewer: Okay. Now I'm going to ask you, and I don't need to know what center it is because I don't know the centers of the people that I'm talking to, but did the person who referred you to me, do you work at the same center with her?

Participant 0032: Yes.

Interviewer: Okay. That's important for me to know because I look for similarities, but yeah. Okay.

Participant 0032: Yes.

Interviewer: Okay. Describe the support that you receive from your immediate supervisor and the [inaudible 00:16:38] and the site manager. Describe the support that you receive.

Participant 0032: The support? Seriously, I get a lot of support from my education specialist.

Interviewer: Okay.

Participant 0032: I have relationship when I deal with people, when I say I have a relationship because everybody, I don't act the same way or treat the same way because everybody has got different personalities.

Interviewer: Okay, yes.

Participant 0032: I know from my experience, a lot of other people always say something bad about the education specialist. I really don't have nothing bad about her because she knows me and I have learned her. When I go to her and I talk to her, because I'm a people person, she really listens to me and she explains stuff to me. She breaks it down. I tell you, I'm not a person that you can say
something to me and I go like, "Now, what are you saying?" No, she learned me as well. She breaks a lot of stuff down to me.

Participant 0032:
With the site manager that when I talk her, but we, we meaning us teachers, but me personally, I try not to go to the site manager for anything if I can help it. I know I need to go to my education specialist because she's really my supervisor.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0032:
I always talk to my education specialist.

Interviewer:
Okay. Do you feel that the site manager supports you overall, whether you talk to her, like you do the ed specialist or not? Do you think that your site manager supports you? Do you feel supported by him or her?

Participant 0032:
Yeah. I think she supports me. What I'm saying is she supports me, but some of the teachers, they'll be like, she blows them over, but she don't blow me over, because, like I said, when I asked her for something, on top of that, I really don't ask her for anything. I ask the education specialist for stuff, but if I talk to her or whatever, she pretty much helped me out.

Interviewer:
Okay. All right. Some of what I was going to ask you, I can actually skip because you're actually answering a lot of the questions that I was going to ask you, but I have one more in this section: describe how your supervisors recognizes your potential. Describe how they recognize it. I know you mentioned that when they changed the time on the Zoom call, it bothered you because you're not as knowledgeable with technology for those quick changes. Tell me about how they understand or recognize your potential or the things you're unable to do.

Participant 0032:
When I go to them and I have a question or whatever, and I tell them, "How do I get into this?" or whatever and they have looked at me and then they'll say, "Okay, we're going to open this up," and I write it down. She opens and she tells me stuff or whatever. I write it down and I learned it for a minute. I'm hands on.

Interviewer:
Okay.
Participant 0032:
You could tell me that if I touched the mouse and do it myself, I could learn it that quick. That is the type of person I am and they know that. It always frustrates them, but I try not to ask a lot of stuff because I don't want people to get frustrated because they've got to help me. I really try to learn it a lot by myself, but if I don't, I'm going to be honest, I cannot lie or nothing; if I ask them stuff, even if they don't come right then, they're going to come and help me. I can't say that they don't.

Interviewer:
Do you think they recognize your potential, things that you're very good at? Do you think both of them recognize how great you are as a teacher?

Participant 0032:
Yes. Do you want to know why? Because we had a Zoom meeting last week and our education ... No, the site manager, we were on a Zoom meetings for my job our site manager went to us one by one and told us about what she liked, what she sees in us and everything. We were all quiet and she said, "Why is everybody quiet?" I specifically said, "Because you just stood up here and told all of us, our own personalities, and what you liked about us and all along, maybe some of us didn't even realize that you realized and that you noticed that in us." She'll push you and coming along, she'll talk to us a little bit, play with one of the kids and she's going to the next room. During that time, you never saw all along that somebody recognized you, so everybody was quiet. She really does be paying attention to me, she does. She did do that, she did that about two weeks ago.

Interviewer:
That's very good. Yeah, you're very fortunate to have someone, a supervisor who would do that type of engagement.

Participant 0032:
Yeah, that was that site manager.

Interviewer:
Okay. Let's switch gears. Describe about how often you think about leaving the organization. Describe how you feel about that.

Participant 0032:
Sometimes, probably twice a month and not because I don't want to be there with the kids. I want a job that pays me more money because sometimes, to be honest, I feel like it's not fair that you get paid less than the people that make 20 some dollars an hour when both of you all are doing the same job.

Interviewer:
Gotcha, okay.
Participant 0032:  
I don't think that's fair. If you get frustrated, then you do want to go find another job, but you like the job and you like what you're doing and you like the person you work with. It'll be like, "Okay well, when it happens, it happens and if it don't, it don't." I feel that a lot of us teachers, even the teachers that made more money than us, they'll say that they feel like it's not fair that teachers that have CDAs that we make less, but we've got to do the same work they do. It's around the board that everybody feels like it's not fair.

Interviewer:  
Yes, yeah. Yeah, I can understand that causing some frustration. Describe how you would accept another job at the same compensation and similar time off. Would you leave Head Start for another job that pays the same and same time off? That pays the same but the same time off, would you leave?

Participant 0032:  
If get another job and it pays the same and the same time off, would I leave Head Start?

Interviewer:  
Right, would you leave? Yeah.

Participant 0032:  
No.

Interviewer:  
Right. Yeah, okay.

Participant 0032:  
What would I want to leave for because it's the same? I want to leave Head Start to do better and make more money. I wouldn't leave. No, I wouldn't leave.

Interviewer:  
Okay.

Participant 0032:  
No, I wouldn't leave. Mm-mm (negative), that wouldn't make no sense to me

Interviewer:  
That's great. Okay. We're almost finished. The makeup in your organization, you have your site manager and your ed specialist. We call that dual leadership. One of them is your direct report and the other is responsible for program management. In your opinion, if a center is experiencing a lot of turnover, who's responsible?

Participant 0032:
Who's responsible? Are they watching turnover?

Interviewer:
Yes. If a center has gone through a lot of turnover with teachers and staff, but I'm thinking teachers now, who is ultimately responsible, in your opinion?

Participant 0032:
I'll tell you, the education specialist. It has since I've been there. I came in and we all got sent to the same center and there was about 12 of us. It's only me in Early and Miss [Jones] in Head Start, but all the while, she's on Head Start because she got transferred there from another one, but she was in my group that got hired. All of those people left and they said the same thing about the education specialist.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0032:
Yeah. There's been a big turnover, a lot of teachers left my site.

Interviewer:
Okay, I understand. Have you had the same site manager during this turnover?

Participant 0032:
Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Interviewer:
Both of them have been in place? Okay.

Participant 0032:
Yeah. It would always get back to us that her name would be the one that would be the reason why.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0032:
Okay, put it like this, say it's 10 teachers and 10 of them don't want to leave, probably two or three of them are complaining on the site manager, but the rest of them, plus the other two teachers, they're going to say something about the education specialist.

Interviewer:
Mm-hmm (affirmative). You also said that the ed specialist and the site manager worked closely together.
Participant 0032: Yes, they do.

Interviewer: Okay.

Participant 0032: Yep.

Interviewer: Okay. It's interesting to me.

Participant 0032: Okay. You know how you've got to go to the chain of command, right?

Interviewer: Right.

Participant 0032: Okay. Say you go to your education specialist. To be honest, it's really no use of you going to the site manager because I'm quite sure, and everybody that worked at my job and that works there knows that the education specialist already let the site manager know, so to be honest, what are you going to her for?

Interviewer: Okay.

Participant 0032: You might as well skip her, which a lot of the teachers did that left there and they would email and they will go to the central department.

Interviewer: I see.

Participant 0032: Because they know that those two work and those two are together. I used to say, "Well, if she don't help me and work it out with me. I need to go to her." What for?

Interviewer: Okay.
Participant 0032:
They've got a lot of email and the head place saying that, "What are you going to go to her for when both of them already know? What you want know? Why are you complaining?" They do work. They're close together and everybody knows it.

Interviewer:
Okay. I understand that. Okay, very good. I have one more question for you. Well, two, but you probably will answer the last one with this one. Is it important to you that you feel valued by both the ed specialist and the site manager? Why or why not? Is it important?

Participant 0032:
I feel like I should be valued the same by both, because I think because if I go to the site manager with this problem or the education specialist, I'm going to be the same way. It's not that I'm going to say that I'm playing up to her and all this. It's no way that you can go to them differently. That's what I was saying. It seems real, but it's not. You can't go to neither one of them differently because like I said, they work together. It's no use of you saying, "Okay, if she don't do nothing about it, I'm go to the next person" because they're so used to doing that.

Interviewer:
I see, okay. Now tell me, how do you say your last name? No wait. We'll wait until I stop recording. Let me stop. That's all the questions that I have for you. Is there anything else you want to add about that dual leadership and turnover? Why people want to turnover? I see your reasons for leaving will be for wanting, not even having even a desire to leave, but it would just be for more money, but you've noticed other people have left and have had complaints.

Interviewer:
I'm paying attention. Everything that you're saying, I'm paying attention to, but what's sticking out to me is that the two leaders have a very close relationship and there's still a lot of turnover, but I'm also hearing that some people may not even feel comfortable going to the second leader when there's an issue because they've already brought it to the first one.

Participant 0032:
Yeah.

Interviewer:
Okay.

Participant 0032:
It's no use.

Interviewer:
Yeah, okay.
Participant 0032:
Like I said, I've been here for almost five years and I have seen it. And like I said, I've see it in other jobs where you say, "Okay, she didn't do nothing about it, so let me email her." There's no use of you doing that because everybody knows they already work together.

Interviewer:
Yeah.

Participant 0032:
You get to talk to one of them, you don't talk to both of them. All you know is to go to the main source because they work together. I'm quite sure that head people already learned that, they've heard it so many times.

Interviewer:
Yeah. That's very interesting to me, very interesting. Okay. Anything else you want to add before I stop recording?

Participant 0032:
I don't know. Just if you asked me a question, I'm going to answer.

Interviewer:
Yeah, you're fine. I'm interested though, in hearing from people who have already left under that, because you're there, your only reason for even wanting to leave is really just more money, but you're really happy there and you have a good relationship with both the ed specialist and the site manager. I would like to hear from someone who has left. That's something I need to look into. I don't know. Like I said, I don't ask centers and I still don't need to know the center, but I'm very interested in that dynamic. Anyway, is there anything that you want to add?

Participant 0032:
I'm thinking I'll email somebody that left, but I'm quite sure it's going to be in line with what I just told you.

Interviewer:
Yeah, yeah. The dynamic is very different. I'm going to go ahead and stop recording unless you want to add something to this piece.

Participant 0032:
I'm fine.