

Supporting Teachers' Retention Through Influence of Leadership Dimension and Job Satisfaction Towards the Principle of Best Practice

Cong Huang^{1, 2, *}

¹ Graduate School, Adamson University, CO 1000, Manila, Philippines

² Guangxi Police Academy, Nanning, Guangxi, China

* Corresponding author Email: daisy_2008guilin@163.com

Abstract: This study determined the leadership dimension of the school administrators as the entry point to explore the influence on teachers' job satisfaction and their decision for retention. This study collected questionnaire data of teachers from 5 universities in Guangxi Province, sorted out and analyzed the demographic characteristics of teachers, the self-evaluation of teachers' job satisfaction, the evaluation of school administrators' leadership ability, and the correlation and differences of related factors. The research results show that administrators' leadership dimensions seem to work against teachers' differing personalities. The researcher recommends encouraging teachers to open dialogue with school administrators; school administrators could initiate activities for team building and provide training to attain esprit de corp and nurture collegiality on the campus that can resonate in the faculty rooms and classrooms. This fosters a culture of belonging within the learning environment and invites regular resource persons for personal and professional guidance to address individual issues.

Keywords: Leadership; Teaches' Job Satisfaction; Leadership Ability.

1. Introduction

This part of the manuscript discusses the importance of the research framework chosen for the study. It discusses the relevance of the topic in the background of new order for the demand of time.

Background of the study. Higher education has grown dramatically since the 1980s in terms of both students and institutions. In like trend, educational institution has seen variety in the student population, in programs, and in the setting and organizational design of institutions. Higher education institutions cannot thrive in the ever-changing higher education market without maintaining exceptional faculty members who are inventive and creative. In like view, higher education institutions need strong leadership to keep excellent teaching personnel within the institution. The ability to retain teachers and sustain strong leadership practices are essential to the institution success. Thus, increased teachers' staff and leadership functions retention could entail keeping them happy satisfied and well committed and in doing so could further significant productivity gains. This study was prompted by global concern on the exodus of teachers from the teaching profession. (Ism, March 2022, downloaded 2023). additionally, high teacher turnover has harmed students that resulted in uncertainty in academic achievements, performance, and engagement, high level of job dissatisfaction among teachers that impact their effectiveness. Continually losing faculty has a high cost for school administrators in terms of organization and finances. Recruiting and training new teachers involves many expenses—more than your school may realize or have the budget for. It can also make it difficult for schools to implement key policy changes or adjustments. (The Source, downloaded 2023).

2. Review of Related Literature

Business-related challenges include faculty job satisfaction and retention in higher education, since a 5% improvement in retention might result in a 10% decrease in expenses (Wong & Heng, 2009). Similar Increases in retention can lead to further significant productivity gains (Heng and Wong, 2009).

Teacher talent is the core of the development of colleges and universities. Especially for higher vocational colleges, the development of teacher team is related to the survival of the school. However, compared with undergraduate universities, higher vocational colleges have certain disadvantages in terms of school running level, faculty strength, capital investment and scientific research strength, which makes it difficult to retain talents. How retain teachers in higher vocational colleges is a difficult problem. This study can provide some management ideas for the development of institutions of higher learning. By analyzing the relationship between leadership and teacher retention, it can improve the organizational atmosphere of the school, reduce the brain drain for the school, and stabilize the faculty members of that institution.

Increased work satisfaction and improved faculty retention policies lessen the need for expensive faculty selection and recruiting, and greater retention increases the institution's financial stability (Sinkford and Froesch, 2009). Long-term faculty members gain knowledge and skills that lessen the need for expensive training for newly appointed faculty (Sinkford and Froesche, 2009). Businesspeople and entrepreneurs are aware that genuine durable advantage frequently results from innovations and inventiveness (Mutjaba, 2009). Higher education institutions cannot thrive in the ever-changing higher education market without maintaining exceptional faculty members who are inventive and creative. According to Mutjaba's claim, higher education

institutions with strong leadership practices are more likely to keep excellent faculty personnel, which might help them beat rivals and strengthen their financial position. Therefore, my second hypothesis for the current study is based on the claim that the academic and financial status of higher education institutions is significantly influenced by the link between leadership styles of academic administrators and faculty members' work satisfaction.

Higher education has grown dramatically since the 1980s in terms of both students and institutions, and has seen variety in the student population, in programs, and in the setting and organizational design of institutions. The global financial crisis and the requirement for government financing to shift to health as the population ages have both resulted in funding reductions at the same time in several nations. As Zou et al. (2012) argued, these considerations have led to a great deal of public anxiety over the standard of higher education.

There has been a significant shift toward mass higher education across all countries, which is accompanied by a growth in the number and variety of higher education institutions (Zou et al. 2012). Due to national and worldwide economic globalization, the development of sophisticated communication tools, and also information technology, the teaching and learning profession in colleges and universities is constantly increasing geographically. Regarding the aforementioned, the emergence of knowledge as an economic good puts pressure on higher learning institutions to guarantee that they provide a quality education that is effective and secures their place in the economy. hence, educational quality has become a priority.

Using the quality assurance method, one can make sure that the business is effective. Given their environment and their circumstances, many people have varied interpretations of quality assurance. differing stakeholders, may embrace differing perspectives of quality. Certain of the beliefs about quality include: quality as exceptional and having clear and distinct characteristics, as unique and related to outstanding performance or meeting requisite standards, quality as flawlessness or uniformity, quality as fitness for a specific objective and how well the good or service fulfills its intended use; quality as the value of finances; and quality as transformation entwined with the idea of qualitative shift and development (Harvey & Green, 1993). Considering the aforementioned, it has fallen to the leaders, generally, to secure that certain qualities are made for their staff, and in the case of academic institutions, faculty. Their leadership has become one of the major telling factors of the potential and eventual success of a learning department or section.

Several researchers have outlined numerous leadership philosophies that support improved performance and follower happiness through a moral leadership ethos. By adopting advancements and motivating people to pursue their responsibilities in the school, through transformational leadership improves faculty happiness and the quality of life among the members of certain departments (Tucker & Russell, 2004). When their requirements are taken into consideration when job assignments are allocated, following of transformational leaders have a stronger desire to succeed and experience greater job satisfaction. By raising awareness of concepts like freedom, justice, peace, and equality, transformational leaders relate to their followers. Their followers are more motivated and interested in the long-term achievement of the organization because they tend to be less centralized, more intimate, and sensitive with them (Okçu,

2014).

3. Statement of the Problem

This study determined the leadership dimension of the school administrators as the entry point to explore the influence on teachers' job satisfaction and their decision for retention. The key problems explored in this study are as follows:

- 1.What is the demographic profile of the teacher-respondents in terms of ;
2. What is the assessment of respondents on the leadership dimension of the school administrators in terms of :
3. Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the respondent- teachers on the leadership dimensions manifested by the school administrators when compared according to their demographic profile?
- 4.What is the self-assessment of the respondent teachers of their job satisfaction in terms of;
5. Is there a significant difference in the assessment job satisfaction when their demographic profile is compared?
6. What is the self- assessment of teacher-respondents on their reason for retention in their current workplace?
7. Is there a significant relationship between the assessed leadership dimension and their decision for retention in their current workplace?
8. Is there a significant relationship between the assessed leadership dimension and their job satisfaction?

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1. Profiles of Teacher-Respondents

Variable	Indicators	Frequency	Percentage
Sex	Male	172	48.0
	Female	186	52.0
Total		358	100.0
Major Field	Education Program	227	63.0
	Non-Education Program	131	37.0
	Total	358	100.0
Age	Less than 25 years old	117	33.0
	26-35 years old	132	37.0
	More than 35 years old	109	30.0
Total		358	100.0
Educational Level	Bachelor's Degree	148	41.0
	Master's Degree	123	34.0
	Doctorate Degree	87	24.0
Total		358	100.0
Years of Teaching Experience	Less than 5 years	163	46.0
	6-10 years	86	24.0
	11-15 years	63	18.0
	More than 15 years	46	13.0
	Total	358	100.0

This portion of this manuscript contained the tabular data there were collected, its respective analysis and interpretation. The data collected were subjected to statistical analysis using

the SPSS. The research questions found in the introduction, were revisited and sequential presentation of the findings as well as the analysis and presentations are herein indicated.

1. Demographic profile of the teacher-respondents

Table 1 presents the profiles of the respondents, the above table revealed that majority or 52 % of the teachers are female, while male comprise 172 or 48%. In terms of major field, wherein most of the respondents consisted of 227 or 63 % are in Education program with 131 or about 37 % are non-Education professionals. The age groups revealed that highest frequency of teachers is those in the age brackets by 26-35 years old that comprise 132 or 27 % followed by age bracket that belongs to less than 25 years old making it with 123 or 34 percent. In terms of education level, it showed that those who have attained Bachelor degree comprising 146 or 41 %, There are also good numbers of teachers who finished their Masters' degree amounting to 134 or 34 %, and those with Doctorate degrees have about 87 or 24 percent. Finally, the years of teaching experience demonstrated that a great number of 163 or 46 % percent 'those who have rendered for 6-10 years make up 86 or 24 %; there are those who rendered 11-15 years comprising 63 or 18 % teachers had served their respective institutions for more 15 years than 46 percent or 13 years old.

2. Assessment of respondents on the leadership dimension of the school administrators

The summary assessment is marked by a mean value of

1.99 with SD 1.00 indicating disagreement of the teachers' trust. Of all the variables of the leadership dimensions of school administrators, the *teacher's trust* was placed on top priorities which underscore the crucial role of leadership dimension among administrators in earning teacher/ trust, and followed closely by second rank item "*teacher's work-life balance* and teacher's support". Teachers highly disagreed that the dimension of leadership was presented in a negative way completely manifested by their respective school administrators. This finding is showing the true color of their academic administrator, who lacked the expected attribute to have been an ineffective academic administrator.

Table 2. Overall Assessments of Respondents on the Leadership Dimension of the School Administrators

Variables	Composite			Rank
	Mean	SD	Interpretation	
Teacher's Work-Life Balance	2.03	1.03	Disagree	2
Teacher's Support	2.02	1.04	Disagree	3
Transparency	1.97	0.99	Disagree	5
Mutual Respect	1.87	0.93	Disagree	6
Teacher's Trust	2.05	1.00	Disagree	1
Teacher's Self-Development	1.98	1.00	Disagree	4
Overall	1.99	1.00	Disagree	--

Scale: 4.00-3.51=Strongly Agree; 3.50-2.51=Agree;2.50-1.51=Disagree; 1.50-1.00=Strongly Disagree/

Table 3. Post Hoc ANOVA Test on the Differences in the Assessments of Leadership Dimension of the School Administrators by Respondents' Educational Level

Variable	Educational Level	Mean	Bachelor	Master	Doctorate
			2.98	1.63	1.00
Teacher's Work-Life Balance	Bachelor	2.98		*	*
	Master	1.63	*		*
	Doctorate	1.00	*	*	
Variable	Educational Level	Mean	Bachelor	Master	Doctorate
Teacher's Support	Bachelor	2.99			1.00
	Master	1.59	*	*	*
	Doctorate	1.00	*	*	
Variable	Educational Level	Mean	Bachelor	Master	Doctorate
Transparency	Bachelor	2.86			1.00
	Master	1.58	*	*	*
	Doctorate	1.00	*	*	
Variable	Educational Level	Mean	Bachelor	Master	Doctorate
Mutual Respect	Bachelor	2.67			1.00
	Master	1.53	*	*	*
	Doctorate	1.00	*	*	
Variable	Educational Level	Mean	Bachelor	Master	Doctorate
Teacher's Trust	Bachelor	2.97			1.00
	Master	1.69	*	*	*
	Doctorate	1.00	*	*	
Variable	Educational Level	Mean	Bachelor	Master	Doctorate
Teacher's Self-Development	Bachelor	2.89			1.00
	Master	1.58	*	*	*
	Doctorate	1.00	*	*	

*Significant at a .05 level.

3. Differences in the assessment of the respondent- teachers on the leadership dimensions manifested by the school administrators when compared according to their

demographic profile

3.1 Post Hoc Analysis on significant findings with educational level

Table 4. Post Hoc ANOVA Test on the Differences in the Assessments of Leadership Dimension of the School Administrators by Respondents' Years of Teaching Experience

Variable	Years of Teaching Experience	Mean	< 5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	> 15 years
			2.89	1.73	1.00	1.00
Teacher's Work-Life Balance	< 5 years	2.89		*	*	*
	6-10 years	1.73	*		*	*
	11-15 years	1.00	*	*		
	> 15 years	1.00	*	*		
Variable	Years of Teaching Experience	Mean	< 5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	> 15 years
			2.90	1.67	1.00	1.00
Teacher's Support	< 5 years	2.90		*	*	*
	6-10 years	1.67	*		*	*
	11-15 years	1.00	*	*		
	> 15 years	1.00	*	*		
Variable	Years of Teaching Experience	Mean	< 5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	> 15 years
			2.78	1.66	1.00	1.00
Transparency	< 5 years	2.78		*	*	*
	6-10 years	1.66	*		*	*
	11-15 years	1.00	*	*		
	> 15 years	1.00	*	*		
Variable	Years of Teaching Experience	Mean	< 5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	> 15 years
			2.61	1.58	1.00	1.00
Mutual Respect	< 5 years	2.61		*	*	*
	6-10 years	1.58	*		*	*
	11-15 years	1.00	*	*		
	> 15 years	1.00	*	*		
Variable	Years of Teaching Experience	Mean	< 5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	> 15 years
			2.88	1.81	1.00	1.00
Teacher's Trust	< 5 years	2.88		*	*	*
	6-10 years	1.81	*		*	*
	11-15 years	1.00	*	*		
	> 15 years	1.00	*	*		
Variable	Years of Teaching Experience	Mean	< 5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	> 15 years
			2.81	1.66	1.00	1.00
Teacher's Self-Development	< 5 years	2.81		*	*	*
	6-10 years	1.66	*		*	*
	11-15 years	1.00	*	*		
	> 15 years	1.00	*	*		
Variable	Years of Teaching Experience	Mean	< 5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	> 15 years
			2.61	1.58	1.00	1.00
Mutual Respect	< 5 years	2.61		*	*	*
	6-10 years	1.58	*		*	*
	11-15 years	1.00	*	*		
	> 15 years	1.00	*	*		
Variable	Years of Teaching Experience	Mean	< 5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	> 15 years
			2.88	1.81	1.00	1.00
Teacher's Trust	< 5 years	2.88		*	*	*
	6-10 years	1.81	*		*	*
	11-15 years	1.00	*	*		
	> 15 years	1.00	*	*		
Variable	Years of Teaching Experience	Mean	< 5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	> 15 years
			2.81	1.66	1.00	1.00
Teacher's Self-Development	< 5 years	2.81		*	*	*
	6-10 years	1.66	*		*	*
	11-15 years	1.00	*	*		
	> 15 years	1.00	*	*		

Table 3, shows the post hoc analysis using a Sheffe Test, the post hoc ANOVA analysis showed that there were significant differences between Bachelor degree holder when paired with other Master' level or doctorate level that assess the leadership dimensions of school administrators across all pairs of educational levels as assessed by the teacher-respondents.

3.2 Post Hoc Analysis with significant findings in years of teaching experience

The post hoc analysis shown in Table 4, Use Sheffe Test, the post hoc ANOVA analysis showed that there were significant differences in the assessment of respondents based

on their years of teaching experience. The paired comparison established post hoc analysis have registered significant pairing with other cluster groups by years of teaching experience. In general, the teachers with less than 5 years of rendered service are paired significantly with those who rendered, 6-10 years ,11-15 years, and 16 years of service. This shows the importance of how teaching service influence perspective in assessing leadership dimension. Additionally, it shows the need for training to address the challenges and opportunities associated with teaching service.

4. Self-assessment of the Respondent Teachers 'Job Satisfaction

Table 5. Overall Self-Assessment of Respondents on their Job Satisfaction

Variables	Composite			Interpretation	Rank
	Mean	SD	Descriptor		
Work Satisfaction	2.01	1.00	Disagree	Less Satisfied	1
Possibilities for Growth	1.99	1.00	Disagree	Less Satisfied	2
Organizational Management	1.85	0.92	Disagree	Less Satisfied	5
Compensation and Benefits	1.89	0.93	Disagree	Less Satisfied	4
Interpersonal Relationships	1.94	0.96	Disagree	Less Satisfied	3
Overall	1.94	0.96	Disagree		

Scale: 4.00-3.51=Strongly Agree/Very Satisfied; 3.50-2.51=Agree/Satisfied; 2.50- 1.51=Disagree/Less satisfied; 1.50-1.00=Strongly Disagree/ Unsatisfied

The overall assessment pointed to mean 1.94 with SD at .096. Indicating that teachers are less satisfied in the workplace. Of all the variables of the teachers' job satisfactions, the work satisfaction was placed on top, according to an article in positive Psychology, (downloaded April 2024) work satisfaction is the measure of workers commitment with the job or individual aspect or facets of the job such the nature of work and the type of supervision. The findings are congruent to the one mentioned by WuWang,

2021 Teachers are less satisfied with on these aspects of job satisfactions in their workplace. Rank 2 is the possibilities for growth and interpersonal relationships. Third is Interpersonal relationship, fourth rank is Compensation and benefits and Organizational management.

5. Difference in the assessment job satisfaction when their demographic profile is compared

5.1 Differences in terms of educational level

Table 6. Difference in the Self-Assessments of Teachers on the Job Satisfactions by Respondents' Educational Level

Variable	Educational Level	Mean	F-value	sig	Decision Ho	Interpret
Work Satisfaction	Bachelor	2.92	337.802	.000	Reject	Significant
	Master	1.64				
	Doctorate	1.00				
Possibilities for Growth	Bachelor	2.90	311.641	.000	Reject	Significant
	Master	1.60				
	Doctorate	1.00				
Organizational Management	Bachelor	2.64	243.234	.000	Reject	Significant
	Master	1.51				
	Doctorate	1.00				
Compensation and Benefits	Bachelor	2.70	258.969	.000	Reject	Significant
	Master	1.54				
	Doctorate	1.00				
Interpersonal Relationships	Bachelor	2.79	274.329	.000	Reject	Significant
	Master	1.58				
	Doctorate	1.00				
Overall			285.195	.000	Reject	Significant

Table 6 shows the comparative analysis among the teachers with regard to their attained education level. Using ANOVA or F-Test, the various categories of educational level such as Bachelor degree, Master's degree, and Doctorate level were compared with their self-assessment. The overall data shows an F-value of 285.195 with a computed sig value at .000 , rejects the null hypothesis. This means that there exist a significant difference among those teachers with Bachelor

degree compared with teachers who attained higher educational level than them. This means that educational level matters in their self-assessment of the indicators of job satisfaction. In term of work satisfaction, possibilities for growth, organizational management, compensation & benefits and interpersonal relationships.

5.2 Differences in terms of years of teaching Experience

Table 7. Difference in the Self-Assessments of Teachers on the Job Satisfaction by Respondents' Years of Teaching Experience

Variable	Years of Teaching Experience	Mean	F-value	sig	Decision Ho	Interpret
Work Satisfaction	< 5 years	2.84	225.000	.000	Reject	Significant
	6-10 years	1.74				
	11-15 years	1.00				
	> 15 years	1.00				
Possibilities for Growth	< 5 years	2.81	207.066	.000	Reject	Significant
	6-10 years	1.68				
	11-15 years	1.00				
	> 15 years	1.00				
Organizational Management	< 5 years	2.58	170.816	.000	Reject	Significant
	6-10 years	1.55				
	11-15 years	1.00				
	> 15 years	1.00				
Compensation and Benefits	< 5 years	2.63	179.756	.000	Reject	Significant
	6-10 years	1.59				
	11-15 years	1.00				
	> 15 years	1.00				
Interpersonal Relationships	< 5 years	2.71	187.205	.000	Reject	Significant
	6-10 years	1.65				
	11-15 years	1.00				
	> 15 years	1.00				
Overall			193.969	.000	Reject	Significant

Table 7 presents the that follows with significant finding when the self-assessment on *years of teaching experience* was considered. Using ANOVA or F-Test, the overall data yields an F-value of 193.969 with a computed sig value at .000, it rejects the null hypothesis, therefore there exist significant difference among categories of years of teaching experience. It showed significant difference among their categories along with their views in assessing job satisfaction, at their current

workplace regardless of the years of teaching experience in terms of *work satisfaction, possibilities for growth, organizational management, compensation & benefits and interpersonal relationships*. Note worthy is the fact that being a newbie in service *-less than 5 years* seemed to manifest a feeling of satisfaction on the job.

5. 3 Post Hoc Analysis with years of teaching Experience

Table 8. Post Hoc ANOVA Test on the Differences in the Self-Assessments of Teachers on the Job Satisfaction by Respondents' Years of Teaching Experience

Variable	Years of Teaching Experience	Mean	< 5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	> 15 years
			2.84	1.74	1.00	1.00
Work Satisfaction	< 5 years	2.84		*	*	*
	6-10 years	1.74	*		*	*
	11-15 years	1.00	*	*		*
	> 15 years	1.00	*	*		
Variable	Years of Teaching Experience	Mean	< 5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	> 15 years
			2.81	1.68	1.00	1.00
Possibilities for Growth	< 5 years	2.81		*	*	*
	6-10 years	1.68	*		*	*
	11-15 years	1.00	*	*		*
	> 15 years	1.00	*	*		
Variable	Years of Teaching Experience	Mean	< 5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	> 15 years
			2.58	1.55	1.00	1.00
Organizational Management	< 5 years	2.58		*	*	*
	6-10 years	1.55	*		*	*
	11-15 years	1.00	*	*		*
	> 15 years	1.00	*	*		
Variable	Years of Teaching Experience	Mean	< 5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	> 15 years
			2.63	1.59	1.00	1.00
Compensation and Benefits	< 5 years	2.63		*	*	*
	6-10 years	1.59	*		*	*
	11-15 years	1.00	*	*		*
	> 15 years	1.00	*	*		
Variable	Years of Teaching Experience	Mean	< 5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	> 15 years
			2.71	1.65	1.00	1.00
Interpersonal Relationships	< 5 years	2.71		*	*	*
	6-10 years	1.65	*		*	*
	11-15 years	1.00	*	*		*
	> 15 years	1.00	*	*		

The post hoc test is present in Table 9. Using a Sheffe Test, the post hoc ANOVA analysis showed that there were significant findings on the paired comparison between years of teaching experiences with the job satisfaction dimension. It shows that teachers with *less than 5 years of teaching* are significant paired with those who have long been teaching, re: 6-10 years, 11-15 years and those who have had more than 16 years across the dimension of job satisfaction. This may seem to indicate that the those who are new in service may have already been so satisfied being at work with regard to possibilities for growth, organizational management, compensation and benefits and interpersonal relationship. Perhaps the euphoria of being a teacher is part of the reason for satisfaction. and among the self-assessments of teachers on their job satisfactions at their current work place across all pairs of the years of teaching experiences. Puspita & Lian (2019) investigated on the impact of general management techniques on job satisfaction. General management techniques and job satisfaction was also shown to have a high positive correlation. In addition, the survey discovered no statistical variation in employee satisfaction levels while taking into accounts respondents' age, gender, and duration of employment profiles.

6. Respondent-Teachers Self- assessment on their reason

for retention in their current workplace

In terms of the retention of teachers in their current workplace, the above data disclosed that there were no teachers who answered on the indicator such as a reasonable pay as one of their reasons to stay in their current workplace. This implied that reasonable pay has not considered by the teachers for them to stay in their current workplace. Of all the indicators, the highest frequency observed among the reasons of teachers for staying in their current workplace was apparent by the fringe benefits that are provided.

Table 9. Teachers' Self-Assessments for Retention in their Current Workplace

Indicators	Frequency	Percentage
Collegiality among teaching staff.	25	7.0
Reasonable pay	0	0.0
Supervision is flexible.	77	22.0
Work load commensurate to the job title.	14	4.0
Fringe benefits are provided.	86	24.0
Equity and accessibility of the workplace (opportunity and non-discrimination)	44	12.0
Workplace environment is favorable.	27	8.0
Achievement/ worthy contribution to the institution is given due recognition.	85	24.0
Total	358	100.0

Table 10. Relationships between the Leadership Dimensions of School Administrators and Job Satisfactions of Teachers

Leadership Dimensions of School Administrators	Statistical Treatment	Job Satisfactions of Teachers					Overall
		Work Satisfaction	Possibilities for Growth	Organizational Management	Compensation and Benefits	Interpersonal Relationships	
Teacher's Work-Life Balance	<i>Pearson r</i>	.995**	.993**	.950**	.960**	.972**	.974**
	<i>sig</i>	.000	0.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	<i>Decision Ho</i>	Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject
	<i>Interpret</i>	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
Teacher's Support	<i>Pearson r</i>	.992**	.989**	.952**	.959**	.968**	.972**
	<i>sig</i>	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	<i>Decision Ho</i>	Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject
	<i>Interpret</i>	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
Transparency	<i>Pearson r</i>	.988**	.995**	.965**	.975**	.988**	.982**
	<i>sig</i>	.000	0.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	<i>Decision Ho</i>	Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject
	<i>Interpret</i>	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
Mutual Respect	<i>Pearson r</i>	.955**	.961**	.995**	.993**	.977**	.976**
	<i>sig</i>	.000	.000	0.000	0.000	.000	.000
	<i>Decision Ho</i>	Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject
	<i>Interpret</i>	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
Teacher's Trust	<i>Pearson r</i>	.992**	.982**	.940**	.947**	.963**	.965**
	<i>sig</i>	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	<i>Decision Ho</i>	Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject
	<i>Interpret</i>	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
Teacher's Self-Development	<i>Pearson r</i>	.993**	.996**	.958**	.970**	.983**	.980**
	<i>sig</i>	.000	0.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	<i>Decision Ho</i>	Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject
	<i>Interpret</i>	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant

**Correlation is significant at a .01 level

This was followed by the achievement/ worthy contribution to the institution which is given due recognition

and the flexibility of supervision. According to Eaton et al. (2015), early and continual exchanges, critiques, performance evaluations, and adaptability are essential to attract and retain productive faculty members. In like manner, a business-related challenges include faculty job satisfaction and retention in higher education, since a 5% improvement in retention might result in a 10% decrease in expenses (Wong & Heng, 2009).

7. Relationship between the assessed leadership dimensions of school administrators and job satisfactions of teachers.

The utilization of a Product Moment Correlation Coefficient or Pearson *r*, revealed findings indicating the significant relationship of the significant relationship between the leadership dimensions of school administrators and the job satisfaction of teachers across all pairs of variables

This suggests that leadership dimensions of school administrators highly influenced the job satisfactions of teachers in their current work place. It plays a pivotal role in fostering a teachers' job satisfaction in the workplace. The degree of correlations is very high as indicated by the *r*-value of .9 and above, as indicated by overall findings. The rejection of null hypothesis at .01 level of significance underscores the robustness of the relationship between the leadership

dimension and teachers' job satisfaction, emphasizing the importance of effective leadership practices in promoting innovations within the school setting. It is helpful to teachers respond positively and respond quickly in the face of difficulties and setbacks, so as to promote their growth and development. In the study, the relationship between the transformational leadership of the school administrator and the job satisfaction of teachers, as well as the analysis of the intermediary effect teachers' retention are based on the organizational situation of colleges and universities. Therefore, this paper focuses on the study of leader dimension and job satisfaction the participating schools in the group college in order to help focus attention on to this group and "make them stay and retain in the workplace. (Li, 2021). In same view, (Wu & Wang, 2015) stated the Transformational leaders foster their satisfaction (Wu & Wang, 2015). When their requirements are taken into consideration when job assignments are allocated, following of transformational leaders have a stronger desire to succeed and experience greater job satisfaction. By raising awareness of concepts like freedom,

8. Relationship between the assessed leadership dimension and their decision for retention in their current workplace.

Table 11. Relationships between the Leadership Dimensions of School Administrators and the Decision for Retention of Teachers in their Current Workplace

Leadership Dimensions of School Administrators	Decision for Retention of Teachers in their Current Workplace			
	Chi-Square (X ²)	sig	Decision Ho	Interpretation
Teacher's Work-Life Balance	1326.419	.000	Reject	Significant
Teacher's Support	843.497	.000	Reject	Significant
Transparency	928.346	.000	Reject	Significant
Mutual Respect	1085.486	.000	Reject	Significant
Teacher's Trust	881.899	.000	Reject	Significant
Teacher's Self-Development	786.425	.000	Reject	Significant
Overall	975.345	.000	Reject	Significant

Using a Chi-Squared Test, the relationships between the leadership dimensions of school administrators and the retention of teachers in their current workplace generated significant findings at a .05 level of significance to reject the null hypothesis. The overall degree of correlation observed at 975.345 with a computed sig value at .000 rejected the null hypothesis. This suggest that leadership dimensions of school administrators are highly associated with the decisions of teachers to stay in their current work place.

5. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. Respondents' profile.

In terms of the profiles of the respondents, the above table revealed that majority of the teachers were female wherein most of their major fields was education program. The age grouping revealed that highest frequency of teachers was evident by 26-35 years old followed by less than 25 years old. The educational level showed that many the teachers obtained a Bachelor's Degree. There were also good numbers of teachers who finished their Masters' and Doctorate Degrees. Finally, the years of teaching experience demonstrated that many of the teachers had served their respective institutions for less than 5 years.

2. Assessment of respondents on the leadership dimension

of the school administrators.

Teacher's Work-Life Balance. The data indicates that the assessment of teachers on the leadership of school administrators disagreed with the leadership of their school administrators in implementing work-life balance for teachers. The teachers highly disagreed that school recognizes time-up for work and personal time. Similarly, teachers claimed that the their compensation and incentives were not equal to the service they rendered. and seemingly denied of the vacation time available to them readily available when needed and the incentives that are given by the school for their extra services. These assessments of teachers seemed was not shared among the teachers as described by the large value of standard deviation. This means that enhancing the leadership dimension could be align with satisfaction of the teachers to stay.

Teacher's support. Generally, assessment of teachers on the leadership of school administrators indicate that teachers have a gap with the leadership of their school administrators in manifesting teacher's support. Though the assessment was not common to all as indicated by high value of standard deviation. The teachers claimed that none of these was done by administration in conducting regular dialogue about the development and potential changes, experience feedbacks from the administration supported by potential solutions and

give due consideration to recognize their voice by the management. To address this short fall could be crucial in fostering satisfaction and intention for the teachers to stay connected with the school.

3. Difference in the assessment of the respondent- teachers on the leadership dimensions manifested by the school administrators when compared according to their demographic profile

In terms of sex. The assessment of sex revealed varying perceptions between the male and female teachers. It reveal gender-related perspectives in the varied opinions on the leadership dimensions of their school administrators in terms of teacher's work-life balance, teacher's support, transparency, mutual respect, teacher's trust and teacher's self-development. The significant differences between the male and female teachers indicates how the leadership dimension is perceived. Thus it is expected for the school administrators concerned to take heed of the variation to create equal opportunity in guiding them for increase retention and satisfaction.

In terms of major fields. The evaluation on the teachers assessment regarding school administrators 'leadership dimensions significantly vary in terms of teacher's work-life balance, teacher's support, transparency, mutual respect, teacher's trust and teacher's self-development. This findings indicate that equal and equitable opportunities for service be given corresponding attention to attain the quality instruction rendered by the teachers to their students. At the outset it could promote healthy environment to cultivate interpersonal relationships among peers.

4. Self -Assessment of teachers' job satisfaction

Work satisfaction. The assessment indicates that this indicator be given priority in building the best attention possible .The utmost consideration to work satisfaction is the link to motivation that teachers have even after realizing their potential. The findings suggest that work satisfaction was less evident in the work place as the level of contentment has passed and made them realized that missed opportunity pointed to the autonomy and flexibility at work which were found low. The stringent work schedule and coupled with inattention on their personal ability development and heavy workload are contributory to their hard decision to stay in the school they are affiliated with.

Possibilities for growth. The self assessment of the teachers on their job satisfaction in terms of possibilities for personal growth was less evident as influenced by leadership dimension of their administrators. Teachers who sought satisfaction at work is seemed discouraged by the school failure to contribute to development their personal development as a teacher, discouraged by the schools promotion system and therefore could lost opportunities for their own promotion. However, there is room for decision to either leave the school for another where their professional circumstances are considered and recognized.

5. Difference in the assessment of job satisfaction when their demographic profile is compared

In terms of sex. The findings manifested significant differences in the assessment in terms of sex. It was observed in significant variations in the assessment of job satisfaction between male and female teachers in terms of work satisfaction, possibilities for growth, organizational management, compensation & benefits and interpersonal relationships. Assessment related to job satisfaction suggest enhancing environment conducive for collaborative

workplace where equal opportunities are recognized for women who are minority.

In terms of major fields. The findings on the assessment in terms of major fields rejected the null hypothesis indicating significant difference with regard to their job satisfaction at their current workplace in terms of work satisfaction, possibilities for growth, organizational management, compensation and benefits and interpersonal relationships. This implied that workplace should provide opportunity to equalize to prove their worth , so that appropriate recognition is well -deserving regardless of their major field.

6. Self- assessment of teacher-respondents on their reason for retention in their current workplace.

The findings on the self-assessment on the teachers' reason for retention in their current work place. In terms of the retention of teachers in their current workplace, the data disclosed that there were no teachers who answered on the indicator such as a reasonable pay as one of their reasons to stay in their current workplace. This implied that reasonable pay was not considered by the teachers for them to stay in their current workplace. The highest frequency observed among the reasons of teachers for staying in their current workplace was noted by the fringe benefits that was provided. This was followed by the achievement/ worthy contribution to the institution which is given due recognition and the flexibility of supervision.

7. Relationship between the assessed leadership dimensions of school administrators and job satisfactions of teachers.

Employing the Product Moment Correlation Coefficient or Pearson r, revealed a significant relationship between leadership dimension and its impact on job satisfaction across all variables . the among the relationships between the leadership dimensions of school administrators and the job satisfaction of teachers generated significant findings at a .01 level of significance to reject the null hypothesis. This implied that leadership dimensions of school administrators highly influenced the job satisfactions of teachers in their current work place. The degree of correlations is very high emphasizing the importance of good leadership practice in fostering job satisfaction for teachers at work.

8. Relationship between the assessed leadership dimension and their decision for retention in their current workplace.

The assessment of association between the leadership dimension and reason for retention for teachers to stay in the current work place was found significantly associated. By employing Chi-Square it generated significant findings at a .05 level of significance to reject the null hypothesis. This implied that leadership dimensions of school administrators was highly associated with the decisions of teachers to stay in their current work place.

6. Conclusion

The profile of the respondent teachers are the personal circumstances that can be that can be utilized in making objective assessment of dimension of leadership of school administrators, that can be bases for assessing their own job satisfaction and disclosing reasons to stay in the workplace with reference to varying age, sex, major field, educational level, years of teaching experience.

It can be concluded that teachers can freely express their opinions about their observed assessment of leadership dimension of school administrators at will. The expressed disagreement on the manner in which school administrators

carried out their duties and functions in managing teachers within the scope of work satisfaction, possibilities for growth, compensation and benefits and interpersonal relationships are bound for evaluation.

The differences in the perception of the teachers are inherent to their profile categories particularly with age, sex, major field, educational level, years of teaching experience where differing comparative assessment is likely to occur.

The respondent -teachers in the study manifest different degree of contentment that they experienced concerning their roles and expectations in the school, specifically , these are personal-driven within the context of work satisfaction, possibilities for growth, organizational management, compensations and benefits , and interpersonal relationship.

Since job satisfaction differs with the teachers' personal circumstances, it requires identification of factors that impact with their well-being causing variations in the viewpoint as well.

The correlational analysis reveal relationship between the superiors and the subordinate school administrators and teachers that are analogous to the association between school administrators and teachers in the context between leadership dimensions and job satisfaction, and between leadership dimension and teachers retention. Thus, it implies that relationship are not collegial if detection of inequities in the correlated variables are obviously felt.

7. Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions, the hereby suggestions are offers:

In the study, it seems that administrators leadership dimensions work against teachers' differing personalities, with the administrators in best possession of the dimensions who seemed to control the situations, find ways to make or confer with the person concern about the conflicting situations.

Encourage teachers for an open dialogue with school administrators, since there are ways for each of the conflicting parties to deal with unmet needs.

Collaborate with peers or colleagues on matters that pertains to sustained better working relationship.

School administrators could initiate activities for teambuilding and provide training to attain" esprit de corp".

Nurture collegiality in the campus that can resonate to faculty room and classrooms. This foster a culture of belongingness within the learning environment.

References

- [1] Barbuto, J. E. (2005). Motivation and transactional, charismatic, and transformational leadership: A test of antecedents. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 11(4), 26-40.
- [2] Barbuto, J. E., & Hayden, R. W. (2011). Testing relationships between servant leadership dimensions and leader member exchange (LMX). *Journal of Leadership Education*, 10(2), 22-37.
- [3] Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of se emotional and material rewardsrvant leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 31, 300-326.
- [4] Bayram, H., & Dinç, S. (2015). Role of transformational leadership on employee's job satisfaction: The case of private universities in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *European Researcher*, 93, 270-281. 108.
- [5] Bonhak, K. Yu, J.,Chua,B, LeeS, & Han , H. (2019) Relationship among material and emotional reward, job satisfaction, burnouts, affective commitment, job performance and turnover intention in Hotel industry. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality and Tourism*, 21(4). 371-401.
- [6] Bryant, S. E., (2003). The role of transformational and transactional leadership in creating, sharing, and exploiting organizational knowledge. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9(4), 32-44.
- [7] Chang, C.-S., Liu, E. Z.-F., Sung, H.-Y., Lin, C.-H., Chen, N.-S., & Cheng, S.-S.
- [8] (2014). Effects of online college student's Internet self-efficacy on learning motivation and performance. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International*, 51, 366-377. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2013.771429> 109.
- [9] Cronin, L. D., Arthur, C. A., Hardy, J., & Callow, N. (2015). Transformational leadership and task cohesion in sport: The mediating role of inside sacrifice. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 37(1), 23-36. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2014-0116>.
- [10] Darley-Baah, K. (2010). Job satisfaction and motivation: Understanding its impact on employee commitment and organizational performance. *Academic Leadership*, 8(4), 11.
- [11] Eaton, C. K., Osgood, A. K., Cigrand, D. L., & Dunbar, A.-M. L. (2015). Faculty perception of support to do their job well. *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*, 10, 35-42. 110.
- [12] Engelbrecht, A. S., Heine, G., & Mahembe, B. (2014). The influence of ethical leadership on trust and work engagement: An exploratory study. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 40(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v40i1.1210>.
- [13] Gao, Y(2021) An empirical study on the influence of principal's reform leadership style on teachers' attitude towards reform. *Education Guide*, 2021:2 41-50. 10.16215/j.cnki.en44-1371/g4.2021.02.006.
- [14] Hauserman, C. P., & Stick, S. L. (2013). The Leadership Teachers Want from Principals: Transformational. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 36(3), 184-203.
- [15] Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intentions to leave: A multilevel explanation. *Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 518-542.
- [16] Jung, D. I. (2001). Transformational and transactional leadership and their effects on creativity in groups. *Creativity Research Journal*, 13(2), 185-195. Kelali, T., & Narula, S. (2015). Relationship between leadership styles and faculty job satisfaction (a review-based approach). *International Journal of Science and Research*, 6(3), 1917-1925.
- [17] Kovjanic, S., Schuh, S. C., & Jonas, K. (2013). Transformational leadership and performance: An experimental investigation of the mediating effects of basic needs satisfaction and work engagement. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 86, 543-555. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12022>.
- [18] Liden, R. C, Wayne, S. J., Meuser, J. D., Hu, J., Wu, J., & Liao, C. (2015). Servant leadership: Validation of a short form of the SL-28. *Leadership Quarterly*, 26, 254-269. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.12.002>.
- [19] Liu, B., Hu, W., & Cheng, Y.-C. (2015). From the West to the East: Validating servant leadership in the Chinese public sector. *Public Personnel Management* 44(1), 25-45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026014555995>.