

Abilene Christian University

Digital Commons @ ACU

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

4-2022

Teachers' Perceptions of the Impact of Principal Leadership Style on Teacher Transfers in International Schools in South Korea

Caleb Philip Coleman
cxc17c@acu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Coleman, Caleb Philip, "Teachers' Perceptions of the Impact of Principal Leadership Style on Teacher Transfers in International Schools in South Korea" (2022). Digital Commons @ ACU, *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 440.

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU.

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

Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

Nannette W. Glenn, Ph.D.

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

Date: March 25, 2022

Dissertation Committee:

Mary Christopher

Dr. Mary Christopher, Chair

Simone Elias

Dr. Simone Elias

Daniel J. Bishop

Dr. Daniel Bishop

Abilene Christian University
School of Educational Leadership

Teachers' Perceptions of the Impact of Principal Leadership Style on Teacher Transfers
in International Schools in South Korea

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

by

Caleb Philip Coleman

April 2022

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife, Kathrine, and our children, Millie and a soon-to-be-born baby boy. They are the reason for everything that I do and everything I am. I love you all more than I can tell you.

Acknowledgments

I would like to first and foremost thank my wife for her extremely patient encouragement throughout this process. Secondly, Dr. Christopher has been the best dissertation chair that I could have asked for. Her gentle yet persistent encouragement mixed with understanding and care has been what has allowed me to do this while maintaining my sanity.

© Copyright by Caleb Coleman (2022)

All Rights Reserved

Abstract

This qualitative study determined the perceptions of international school teachers regarding leadership and how these perceptions influenced their turnover decisions. Research completed largely in the United States shows that principals are a major factor in teachers' decisions to stay or leave their schools, primarily due to teachers rating their principals highly in communication and support. Over the last 25 years, international schools have experienced a boom in growth, yet research into international schools has lagged. This study sought to build on previous research to find if teacher perceptions in international schools in South Korea mirror those of teachers in previous studies. This action research-based qualitative study used a teacher questionnaire, semistructured teacher interviews, and semistructured administrator interviews to collect data. Teacher participants were foreign-licensed teachers at accredited international schools in South Korea. Administrators were current leaders at the same schools. Teachers at participating schools received an email asking them to complete a questionnaire, at the end of which was a link to participate in an interview to delve deeper into the topic. Administrators at participating schools received an email asking for their participation in the interview. Coding of transcripts made from the audio-recorded interviews allowed for analysis using a general inductive approach. Results showed that teachers and administrators hold very similar opinions about the importance of various factors relating to what teachers need and what influences teachers to stay at their schools. These similarities included the importance of presence, positive feedback, relationships, and approachability. Similarity of perspective should encourage school leaders, as these seem intuitive to lead to positive perceptions of leaders from teachers, which research shows to decrease turnover.

Keywords: international schools, school leadership, retention, turnover, perception

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	ii
Abstract.....	iv
List of Tables	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Background.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Purpose of the Study	4
Research Questions.....	4
Definition of Key Terms.....	5
Summary.....	6
Chapter 2: Literature Review	7
Conceptual Framework.....	8
Research Regarding Schools in the United States	10
Demographics of U.S. Schools	10
Literature Related to Teacher Turnover in U.S. Schools.....	11
Reasons for Teacher Turnover in the United States	13
Impact of Turnover	16
Suggestions for Reducing Turnover	17
Research Regarding Noninternational Schools Outside of the United States	18
Research Regarding International Schools	21
Summary.....	24
Chapter 3: Research Method.....	25
Design and Method.....	25
Setting	26
Population and Participants.....	27
Assumptions.....	28
Limitations	28
Delimitations.....	29
Researcher Role	30
Data Collection	31
Analysis.....	34
Trustworthiness.....	35
Audit Trail.....	36
Ethical Considerations	37
Summary.....	38
Chapter 4: Results	39

Research Questions	39
Demographics	39
Data Collection	41
Analysis.....	42
Audit Trail.....	42
Results.....	42
Behaviors	43
Support of Teachers	43
Staff Treatment	49
Specific Principal Behaviors.....	54
Things to Positively Impact Teachers.....	56
Professionalism	57
Communication.....	57
Approachability.....	62
Feedback	66
Leadership Style.....	71
Conclusion	73
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations	75
Discussion of Research Question 1a.....	75
Discussion of Research Question 1b.....	77
Discussion of Research Question 1.....	78
Conclusions.....	79
Limitations	80
Implications.....	81
Recommendations.....	82
Practical Application.....	82
Future Research	83
Summary	84
References.....	86
Appendix A: Informed Consent.....	98
Appendix B: Questionnaire, Teacher Interview Questions, and Leader Questions	100
Appendix C: Audit Trail	103
Appendix D: Email to Potential Participants	106
Appendix E: IRB Approval	107

List of Tables

Table 1. Years at Current School	40
Table 2. Years in International Schools	40
Table 3. Total Years of Teaching Experience	40
Table 4. Frequency of Job Changes	41
Table 5. Desired Trait	55
Table 6. Undesired Trait	55

Chapter 1: Introduction

Every year, 16% of teachers in American schools leave their schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). While approximately 3% of that figure is due to retirement, the remaining 13% is due to changing schools or leaving the profession (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). Schools based on a curriculum from another country and often focusing on expatriate students, also called international schools, demonstrate similar figures, with studies showing teacher turnover of 14.4% (Odland & Ruzicka, 2009), 17% (Mancuso et al., 2010), and 25% (O’Neil, 2019). Increased teacher turnover negatively impacts instruction (Donitsa-Schmidt & Zuzovsky, 2016; Kraft et al., 2016), in-class student performance (Allensworth et al., 2009; Kraft et al., 2016), and teacher development, leadership, and relationships (Allensworth et al., 2009; Donitsa-Schmidt & Zuzovsky, 2016). Among the most compelling factors for determining if teachers will stay at their school results from teachers having a positive perception of their principal (Allensworth et al., 2009; Boyd et al., 2011; Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Fuller et al., 2016; Hughes et al., 2015; Jackson, 2012; Kraft et al., 2016; Player et al., 2017; Ryan et al., 2017; Sutchter et al., 2016; Torres, 2016). In the last 20 years, enrollment in international schools increased from approximately one million students to a projected eight million in 2024 (Hallgarten et al., 2015). Thus, understanding leadership as described by international school teachers in South Korea will aid in increasing retention and positively impacting international schools.

Background

While the vast majority of young people attend schools based on their own national or state curriculum, a small but growing number of students attend international schools. Nagrath (2011) defined an international school as one that uses a “curriculum different from that of the

host country” (para. 3). For the purpose of this study, an international school is based on two criteria. First, based on Nagrath (2011), the curriculum of the school should be different from that of the country in which the school is located. Second, accreditation of the school within its country of operation should designate it as a legal international school.

Over the last two decades, international schools experienced massive growth. In 2000, approximately one million students attended international schools. By 2014, this number rose to 3.92 million (Hallgarten et al., 2015), and by January 2019, the number of students rose to 5.36 million (ISC Research, 2019). The European Council of International Schools projects that by 2024, there will be more than 8 million students in international schools across the world (Hallgarten et al., 2015). By 2025, an increase of 50% will occur in both the number of workers and schools, growing to nearly 750,000 workers and 15,000 schools (ISC Research, 2019), far outpacing U.S. all-school growth of 25% in the number of teachers and 7% in the number of students (Walker, 2018).

South Korea houses a number of international schools, encompassing American, British, French, and German curricula (Foreign schools, n.d.). In this group, 23 schools hold accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (Listings in WASC, n.d.), with 12 schools listed as International Baccalaureate schools (Listings in International, n.d.), 23 accredited by the Korean Ministry of Education as formal international schools (Listings in MOE, n.d.), and 28 described as alternative university preparatory schools (Listings in Alternative, n.d.). While the Korean government accredits 23 schools like international schools, a number of nonrecognized businesses identify themselves as international schools. Since 2017, the Korean government has attempted to close these illegal schools, officially registered as after-

school English academies. However, this study will only include schools officially recognized by the Korean government as an international school.

Statement of the Problem

Studies show that teachers with a positive view of their principal will more likely stay at their school (Allensworth et al., 2009; Boyd et al., 2011; Fuller et al., 2016; Jackson, 2012; Kraft et al., 2016; Mancuso et al., 2011; Player et al., 2017; Ryan et al., 2017; Sutchter et al., 2016; Torres, 2016). Mancuso et al. (2011), in one of few studies specifically on international schools, found that administrative support was the second-most common reason for teachers choosing to either leave or stay at their current place of work. While research in American schools repeatedly found that shared decision-making (Allensworth et al., 2009; Sutchter et al., 2016), autonomy in the classroom (Sutchter et al., 2016; Torres, 2016), encouragement and communication (Boyd et al., 2011; Sutchter et al., 2016), and other behaviors play an important role in teacher turnover intention, little research exists regarding whether or not these same behaviors are influential in the turnover intention for teachers in international schools (Gardner-McTaggart, 2018b).

Over the last decade, researchers noted the lack of research related specifically to reasons for teacher turnover in international schools (Gardner-McTaggart, 2018b; Mancuso et al., 2010; Odland & Ruzicka, 2009). Previous research (Dos Santos, 2019; Gardner-McTaggart, 2018a, 2018b; Kartika & Purba, 2018; Mancuso et al., 2010) suggested that administrative support will decrease teacher turnover. However, this suggestion largely relied on the results of general studies into a turnover in international schools, rather than specifically on leadership in international schools. It remains unknown how international school teachers feel about the leadership of their schools and the connection with teacher retention.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative study focuses on understanding teachers' perceptions of their leaders' leadership styles and the impact of school leadership on teacher retention in international schools in South Korea. This study considered behaviors and initiating structure behaviors. While developing the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), Stogdill (1963) built on previous work by Shartle (1957), Halpin and Winer (1957), and Fleishman (1957). Although the full LBDQ included 12 sections of questions to fully describe one's behavior, Halpin and Winer (1957) and Fleishman (1957) found that these subscales "could be reduced to two strongly defined factors" (Stogdill, 1963, p. 2).

The first factor involves the initiation of structure, defined by Stogdill (1963) as behaviors in which leaders "clearly defines [their] own role, and lets followers know what is expected" (p. 4). Stogdill (1963) defined the second factor, consideration, as behaviors with which a leader "regards the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers" (p. 4). In support of the use of these two factors in studies of leadership, as opposed to the full 12 factors in the LBDQ, Halpin (1957) stated that these two factors allowed participants to differentiate between two leaders. Researchers found that these two factors were sufficient to allow participants to describe different leaders in significantly different ways.

Research Questions

Q1. What perceptions do teachers hold regarding the impact of principal leadership styles on teacher retention in an international school in South Korea?

Q1a. What characteristics and behaviors of principal leadership do teachers perceive to impact their decision to leave or stay at an international school in South Korea?

Q1b. What characteristics and behaviors of principal leadership do teachers perceive to impact a positive or negative professional experience at an international school in South Korea?

As this is a qualitative study based on interviews and open-ended responses discussed in Chapter 3, responses might vary considerably, resulting in data that leads to a discussion of factors not related to principal leadership. Certainly, the demographics of foreign teachers in South Korea, marriage status, parental status, and a number of other factors could strongly influence teachers. However, the primary aim of this study was to examine principal leadership rather than the myriad factors surrounding teachers and turnover.

Definition of Key Terms

Administrative support. “Administrative support refers to the extent to which principals and other school leaders make teachers’ work easier and help them to improve their teaching” (Boyd et al., 2011, p. 307).

Expatriate. The term expatriate is divided into two categories: self-initiated and organizational (Aydin et al., 2019). Central to both categories is that individuals live or work “in a country other than their own” (Aydin et al., 2019, p. 2).

International school. International schools, as described by Bunnell et al. (2017), fall into three broad categories. The first type has expatriate students and a nonhost country curriculum. The second type uses a globally-focused curriculum, such as the International Baccalaureate, while still having expatriate students. The third type caters to citizens of the country in which the school is located and offers little consistency in the curriculum.

Retention. A school district retains employees when they stay “in the same school district as a classroom teacher from one school year to the next” (Kaden et al., 2016, p. 133).

Turnover. Turnover, in general, involves a situation in which a person is no longer employed at the same organization from one period to the next. The U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics defines turnover as “quits, layoffs and discharges, and other separations” (2019, p. 2). The number of employees that turnover would typically be the same as the number of prospective new employees.

Summary

By 2025, international school researchers project 10-year growth of nearly 50% to 750,000 international school teachers (ISC Research, 2019). With previous studies finding international teacher turnover in the 15% range (Mancuso et al., 2010; Odland & Ruzicka, 2009), schools will need more than 100,000 teachers to replace the loss unless retention increases. To increase retention, leaders in international schools must understand how teachers perceive leadership and how those perceptions impact teacher turnover. This study explores those perceptions. Organized into five chapters, Chapter 2 will review the existing literature on relevant topics. Chapter 3 will discuss the methodology. Chapter 4 will present the results of the study, while Chapter 5 will summarize the study and discuss conclusions and further areas of research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

While every workplace in the world deals with employee turnover, turnover in educational institutions will essentially impact entire countries, as the education of youth impacts society both immediately and long-term. As this literature review shows, teacher turnover impacts many areas of school life, including quality of instruction, student performance, teacher development, teacher leadership, and relationships within the school. While teacher turnover is rarely a matter of a single push or pull factor, research studies consistently found a teacher's perception, defined in various ways below, of their principal as a strong predictor of the teacher's decision to stay or leave their school. Research into turnover and retention in the international school context remained largely absent from literature before the last decade (Odland & Ruzicka, 2009). With a projection of more than eight million students and nearly 750,000 teachers by 2025, nearly matching the number of pupils and exceeding the number of teachers in the United Kingdom (Department for Education, United Kingdom, n.d.), it appears imperative for educators to understand this new and increasingly common context.

The purpose of this study was to understand how teachers in international schools in South Korea perceive leadership at their respective schools and the impact on teacher retention at these schools. As higher rates of turnover, or conversely lower rates of retention, are related to many negative consequences in schools (Allensworth et al., 2009; Donitsa-Schmidt & Zuzovsky, 2016; Kraft et al., 2016), researchers and practitioners need a greater understanding of leadership and turnover in this specific context. Additionally, the international school context includes fewer studies than the American school context. This study will add to the literature and understanding in a new way that will be beneficial for all involved in international schools and education in general.

This literature review begins by examining turnover at schools in the United States (U.S.). The review begins with an introduction to U.S. schools, followed by specific figures relating to turnover in a number of specific contexts, the impact of teacher retention on various aspects of school, and research related to what impacts turnover and retention. The second major section of this literature review presents similar content areas as U.S. schools but through studies based on non-American and noninternational schools, such as public schools in other countries. Last, literature from studies on international schools is presented, including a short history, current figures and projections, figures related to teacher turnover, studies on teacher turnover, and studies on principal turnover.

Conceptual Framework

The framework for this study falls within several areas of study. First, Bunnell et al. (2017) sought to establish the fundamental question of “What makes a school’s claim to be an International School legitimate?” (p. 304). The authors came to the conclusion that there are essentially three types of international schools. The first type, called Type A Traditional, includes students and parents coming from multinational companies and diplomatic corps, generally use English as the primary language, use a nonhost country curriculum, and require a fee but are still nonprofit. The second type, called Type B Ideological, focuses on a global perspective, often through the use of an international curriculum like the International Baccalaureate, which Bunnell et al. (2017) noted is “central to this approach” (p. 305). The third type, called Type C Non-Traditional, are most often for-profit privately-owned schools “offering little more than English-language instruction by home nationals and a token expatriate” (Bunnell et al., 2017, p. 305). Type C schools also tend to cater more to the local population rather than expatriate families, resulting in a homogeneous student body (Bunnell et al., 2017). As Type C

schools vary considerably, having little oversight and a profit motive, this study focused on Type A and B schools.

Second, in a qualitative study of teachers from various non-Western countries, Barnes (2019) noted “strong positive impacts on teacher fulfillment and resilience” (p. 1) when teachers’ personal values match those of the institution, which likely come from the principal or other school leaders. Due to the results of this study, Barnes (2019) noted that schools should encourage teachers and students to identify, develop, and share their values. Additionally, through the applications of well-developed values, “high quality teachers will be recruited into a profession guided by beliefs in something great self or culture” (Barnes, 2019, p. 15).

Last, this study is informed by the work of Allensworth et al. (2009) and Boyd et al. (2011). Allensworth et al. (2009) performed a large-scale study of Chicago Public Schools of nearly 35,000 teachers. This study found that even when teachers measured very high in their school commitment (i.e., measured as two standard deviations above the mean in this study), turnover was still 12% for high schools and 9% for elementary schools (Allensworth et al., 2009). Additionally, the studies found that teachers did not always transfer to schools with higher academic performance or fewer low-income families. Only 61% of high school teachers transferred to schools of higher academic quality, while 54% of elementary teachers transferred to a higher academic quality school. High school and elementary teacher transfers to schools with fewer low-income students occurred only 56% and 54% of the time, respectively (Allensworth et al., 2009). The implication supports the claim that turnover results from more than teachers being committed to the school or profession, the academic performance of one’s students, or the socioeconomic status of students.

The work of Boyd et al. (2011) supports Allensworth et al.'s (2009) findings in a study of New York City Public Schools. While school contextual factors certainly impact teachers' decisions to turnover, "teachers' perceptions of the school administrations serve as the greatest influence on teacher retention" (p. 303). This study focuses on understanding these same ideas in an international school context. As literature in the international school context remains somewhat limited, this qualitative study helps to clarify how teachers describe their school leadership.

Research Regarding Schools in the United States

While this study seeks to understand how teachers at international schools in South Korea describe their leadership, much of the relevant published literature focuses on schools in the United States. Thus, it remains important for the purposes of this study to have an understanding of U.S. schools and demographics, allowing for a comparison with international schools to assess similarities and differences.

Demographics of U.S. Schools

As with any country with a large population, the number of students and teachers in the U.S. is very high. In 2016, the last year for which national numbers are available, the U.S. enrolled 56.4 million elementary and secondary students. Approximately 90% were public school enrollments, totaling 50.6 million students. Private schools accounted for 5.8 million students (U.S. Department of Education, NCES, 2019b).

Public school enrollment followed an upward trend for many decades, increasing yearly from 1990 until 2006 and then continuing upward from 2012 until the present. Projections from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2019b) show that this trend should continue for at least the next 10 years. While total enrollment for elementary

and secondary schools has been on the increase, enrollment in private schools did not show the same trend in the United States. Private school enrollment in 1990 was around 5.6 million, peaking at 6.3 million in 2001 before bottoming out at 5.3 million in 2001 (U.S. Department of Education, NCES, 2019b). While total U.S. enrollment increased by nearly 20% from 1990, private school enrollment in the U.S. increased only 2%.

Though the number of teachers would likely follow similar growth and contraction as enrollment, growth in the number of teachers in the U.S. far outpaced enrollment growth. From 1990 to 2016, the number of teachers in the U.S. increased by 32.5%, from 2.8 million to 3.7 million, compared to a 20% growth in enrollment (U.S. Department of Education, NCES, 2019a). However, 2008 remains the peak year in terms of total and public-school teachers, while the number of private school teachers showed signs of growth in the same period.

Public school teachers skew predominantly towards individuals identified as Caucasian. This group accounted for 80% of all public-school teachers in the 2015-16 school year, down 4% from 1999-2000 (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2018). Teachers identified as Hispanic made up 7% of all teachers, while teachers identified as Black constituted 7% (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2018). Finally, in 2015-2016, 89% of all elementary teachers were female, an increase of 1% since 1999-2000. This contrasts with the secondary level, in which females hold 64% of teaching positions, an increase of 5% since 1999-2000 (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2018).

Literature Related to Teacher Turnover in U.S. Schools

In the 2015 report, the National Center for Education Statistics included a write-up specifically covering teacher turnover. In the years covered in that report, 2012-2013, 84% of all

teachers remained at the same school from the previous year (U.S. Department of Education, NCES, 2019c). There has been no update to that report since that time. With 3.7 million teachers (U.S. Department of Education, NCES, 2019a), nearly 600,000 openings occur each year. Roughly half of those that leave their schools leave the profession, while half will move to a different school (U.S. Department of Education, NCES, 2019c). Though a number of teachers might leave their school or state for reasons such as parental leave or relocating to a different state, the research discussed below will show that a great deal of those turning over cites reasons related to principal leadership as an impetus for their leaving. However, while the rate of those that moved schools remained relatively constant since the late 1980s, the rate of those leaving the profession increased from a low of 5% in 1991-1992 to consistently around 8% from 2004 to 2005 (Di Carlo, 2015).

Between U.S. states, teacher turnover can vary drastically, from a low near 8% in Utah and West Virginia to a high of nearly 24% in Arizona and New Mexico (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017). Arizona and New Mexico held the highest percentage of retiring teachers at around 6%, while only one other state crossed the 5% threshold (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017). At the same time, Utah and West Virginia showed the lowest levels of retirement (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017). Interestingly, states with a low total teacher turnover tended to demonstrate the lowest levels of nonretirement leaving the profession (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017).

Further study of school characteristics revealed that schools with higher levels of free and reduced-price lunches showed higher levels of teacher turnover. Schools with less than one-third of students on free and reduced-price lunches exhibited a turnover of nearly 13%, while schools with three-fourths or more of students on free and reduced-price lunches exhibited a turnover of

22% (Di Carlo, 2015). Similar trends occur in math and science teachers at Title I schools, whose teachers are 70% more likely to turnover than their counterparts in non-Title I schools (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017).

Jackson (2012) found that schools with more minority students are more likely to have teachers leave than schools with fewer minority students. In a study of Chicago Public Schools, similar results occurred. Teachers in a school with a predominance of students of a different race/ethnicity than themselves demonstrated a greater tendency to leave that school than in schools where teachers and students showed similar race/ethnicity. In elementary schools with a majority of African American students, Caucasian and Latino teachers were 5% more likely to leave (Allensworth et al., 2009). In their first year of employment, Caucasian teachers appeared less likely to turnover, staying at a 2% greater rate. However, four years later, Caucasian teachers were 8% less likely to still be at the same school compared to African American teachers (Allensworth et al., 2009).

Reasons for Teacher Turnover in the United States

The National Center for Education Statistics states that 30% of those that leave their position do so involuntarily, while 23% cited personal life factors or school factors (U.S. Department of Education, NCES, 2019a). A study by the Learning Policy Institute found that, among those that leave teaching, 25% cited the pressure of testing policy as a reason, though not necessarily the primary one for leaving. Additionally, 21% of teachers that left teaching claimed a “lack of administrative support” as being a source of their desire to leave the profession (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017). The same report claimed that teachers who rated their administrators as being supportive were less than 50% as likely to leave than those who rated their administrators as unsupportive (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017).

Among the reasons that research found that teachers choose to stay or leave their schools, teachers' perceptions of their principal proved to be a powerful factor (Allensworth et al., 2009; Boyd et al., 2011; Fuller et al., 2016; Hughes et al., 2015; Jackson, 2012; Kraft et al., 2016; Player et al., 2017; Ryan et al., 2017; Sutchter et al., 2016; Torres, 2016). Studies of large school systems in New York City (Boyd et al., 2011), Los Angeles (Fuller et al., 2016), Chicago (Allensworth et al., 2009), and the more general SASS, now called the NTPS (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019) routinely come to the same result: perception of school leadership serves as one, if not the, most important indicator of turnover. While knowing that perception is important, a list of specific behaviors or traits of leadership can allow principals or school leaders to reduce turnover.

Further research delved into the specific behaviors or leadership styles of administrators to determine their impact on turnover. Studies found that positive school culture and positive feedback were important in decreasing turnover in "hard-to-staff schools" (Greenlee & Brown, 2009; Hughes et al., 2015, p. 129). Greenlee and Brown (2009) found that principals should create a positive school culture, create an environment where staff can excel, have "integrity and well-reasoned beliefs" (p. 102), and provide chances for staff to work together. These behaviors appeared as key to lower turnover, especially in schools that tend to be more challenging. More specifically, studies found that teachers are less likely to turnover if they work in a school where teachers perceive the principal to be supportive (Allensworth et al., 2009; Boyd et al., 2011; Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Hammonds, 2017; Hughes et al., 2015; Kini & Podolsky, 2016; Player et al., 2017; Sutchter et al., 2016). However, Boyd et al. (2011) pointed out that the definition of supportive will vary from teacher to teacher. Thus, while research indicates that a supportive principal will lead to decreased turnover, other aspects of leadership

also have a documented impact. Player et al.'s (2017) research found that behaviors such as “communicating a vision” (p. 338) can have an immediate effect on turnover. Additionally, principals rated as good communicators by their teachers have turnover rates that are lower than those rated as poor communicators (Player et al., 2017).

Allensworth et al. (2009) described shared decision-making as an important behavior by teachers who chose to stay in Chicago Public Schools. Studies found that teachers who chose to stay desire and rate their principals highly in collaboration, trust, and respect (Allensworth et al., 2009; Hauserman & Stick, 2013). Player et al. (2017) showed similar results in their study based on the SASS Follow-Up Survey. Other factors beyond principal leadership did not moderate the impact of principal, indicating that principal leadership itself will increase or decrease turnover based on its perceived efficacy.

Additionally, scholars found transformational leadership to be common and/or effective among principals (Berkovich, 2016; Hauserman & Stick, 2013; Sun & Henderson, 2017). Berkovich (2016) described this style as being based “on inspiring followers to ‘commit to a shared vision and goals’” for their school (p. 609) by helping employees improve their “work performance and organizational involvement” (Hauserman & Stick, 2013, p. 187). While Berkovich (2016) described possible adjustments to transformational leadership to maximize effectiveness, others (Hauserman & Stick, 2013; Sun & Henderson, 2017) found it was still an effective and desired style among teachers.

In a study of 100 teachers at eight private Christian schools in the United States, Jones and Watson (2017) measured teacher perception of principal leadership in consideration, initiating structure, and performance emphasis. These perceptions were then correlated to teacher turnover. The study found no correlation between consideration behaviors, such as those that

increase trust and positive relationships, including support from a principal, and teacher turnover. Initiating structure behavior, such as highlighting one's higher or lower position, showed a slight negative correlation (Jones & Watson, 2017). Interestingly, these results run counter to the research of others. Other studies, as cited above, found that increased support from a principal or a positive perception of the principal will most often result in decreased teacher turnover (Allensworth et al., 2009; Boyd et al., 2011; Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Fuller et al., 2016; Hughes et al., 2015; Jackson, 2012; Kini & Podolsky, 2016; Kraft et al., 2016; Player et al., 2017; Ryan et al., 2017; Sutchter et al., 2016; Torres, 2016). Yet, this study in a private Christian school found the opposite. While the authors acknowledged that the result opposed most research, they offered no mediating variables for the lack of correlation. Additionally, work by Stogdill (1963), Halpin and Winer (1957), and Fleishman (1957) showed that the areas of consideration and initiating structure were sufficient to differentiate between leaders. Thus, the inclusion of performance emphasis by Jones and Watson (2017) was the authors' personal choice, though the reasoning for its inclusion was absent.

Impact of Turnover

The negative impact that increased teacher turnover has on schools has been well-documented. While some turnover would likely be healthy in removing teachers that are not a good fit at the school (Jackson, 2012), higher turnover can produce adverse effects on professional development, teacher leadership, teacher relationships, and communities (Allensworth et al., 2009; Donitsa-Schmidt & Zuzovsky, 2016). Additionally, high-quality instruction becomes less prevalent if turnover remains uncontrolled (Donitsa-Schmidt & Zuzovsky, 2016; Kraft et al., 2016). Research suggests high turnover leads to poor in-class performance (Allensworth et al., 2009; Kraft et al., 2016). One study found that 60% of

principals perceived that teacher shortage had a strong impact on “the implementation of school routines and the quality of teaching” (Donitsa-Schmidt & Zuzovsky, 2016, p. 89). Ryan et al. (2017) found that lower academic performance by students also contributed to teachers moving to a different school and leaving the profession, creating a cycle in which lower performance is a push factor for teachers leaving the classroom, which is a cause of lower academic performance.

While the academic, leadership, and teaching community impact of turnover are important, a financial aspect to turnover also exists. Studies estimate that the cost to recruit, hire, and train a new teacher in a rural school can cost \$9,000. In urban districts, this cost can more than double that cost to over \$20,000 (Strauss & Darling-Hammond, 2017). Chicago Public Schools spent more than \$86 million per year on hiring and training new teachers, while Los Angeles spent \$94 million, and New York City spent \$115 million (Carroll, 2007). In total, schools in the United States spend approximately \$8 billion each year fixing the hole left by teacher turnover (Strauss & Darling-Hammond, 2017).

Suggestions for Reducing Turnover

While understanding the why of teacher turnover is important, it appears similarly essential to understand how to lower turnover and increase retention. Holmes et al. (2019) suggested three steps, all based on the understanding that “change must occur with solid leadership” (p. 30). Holmes et al. (2019) suggested that leaders think analytically. Through the use of a SWOT analysis, an analytical tool to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to an organization, or similar tools, leaders can develop a purposeful understanding of teachers’ thinking. Second, new models of decision-making include using the information gained from new analysis tools. The last suggestion focuses on leaders increasing the use of new

methods of external assessment, especially through the use of new technologies (Holmes et al., 2019).

In a study of primarily female elementary teachers, Kim et al. (2018) found that character education programs in schools increased teachers' job satisfaction. Increases in job satisfaction and job fit correlated to an increase in retention (Player et al., 2017; Watson, 2018). Kim et al. (2018) suggested that the use of character education programs in schools could decrease student misconduct and increase teacher career satisfaction, leading to an increase in retention.

Carroll (2007) argued that schools should take three steps in order to stem the tide of turnover. He stated that schools should, first, fully understand the turnover in one's district and the costs that it entails. Second, school systems should see onboarding and preparing teachers as an investment rather than merely a cost with no return (Carroll, 2007). Carroll (2007) said that schools would help develop high-quality teachers, resulting in high-quality instruction and higher academic results. These strategies will combine to make teachers less likely to leave their schools. The final step in Carroll's (2007) plan is to "transform schools into genuine learning organizations" (p. 8), wherein all teachers and staff have bought into the idea that everyone is responsible for the success of the school. In this type of organization, new and experienced teachers and administrators will work together to improve and succeed.

Research Regarding Noninternational Schools Outside of the United States

As this study focuses on schools located in countries outside of the United States, it remains important to understand the local context in which international schools find themselves, even though these schools are fundamentally different from international schools. As defined earlier, the fundamental differentiator between an international school and a noninternational

school involves using a curriculum different from that of the host country (Bunnell et al., 2017). Studies and schools discussed in this section will not fall into the international school category.

In a longitudinal mixed-methods study, Lindqvist et al. (2014) studied 87 individuals graduating as teachers in 1993. Over the following 20 years, Lindqvist et al. met with participants in each of the first 6 years, in addition to the eighth, 15th, and 20th years. Interviews occurred using a semistructured questionnaire to gauge their career trajectory and the reasons for any changes. In the year following graduation, 85% worked as teachers, while 94% did so within 2 years. However, after 5 years, this number reduced to 72%. Lindqvist et al. found that this decrease primarily resulted from the Swedish parental leave system. With parental leave taken into account, no significant difference in attrition appeared between men and women.

Additionally, researchers found that 95% of women taking parental leave returned to the workforce within three years (Lindqvist et al., 2014). Thus, parenthood did not serve as a statistically significant factor in attrition among teachers. This contrasts with results in the United States, which showed only as much as 40% of women return to their teaching jobs after taking maternity leave (Vera, 2013). This result led Lindqvist et al. (2014) to the conclusion that, while American females often leave and stay out of the teaching profession for “family formation reasons” (p. 105), Swedish teachers do not show the same inclination.

Including the parents on parental leave, Lindqvist et al.’s (2014) study found that 87% of teachers were still in education after five years, while only 54% of teachers in the United States (Ingersoll, 2003) and 70% of teachers in England (House of Commons, 2019) were still in education at the same interval. Long-term, Lindqvist et al. (2014) found that, after 15 years, 67% of the subjects of the study were still teaching, still higher than the U.S. figures at 5 years. The author called those that left the profession the “lost ones” (Lindqvist et al., 2014, p. 17).

Researchers described these individuals as less serious about the teaching profession and the postgraduation job search.

Barnes (2019), in a qualitative study with teachers from India, Japan, and Rwanda, found that “alignment of institutional and individual values generated strong positive impacts on teacher fulfillment and resilience” (p. 1). With such a situation, teachers felt an increased “capacity to contribute” (p. 1). The author noted that an increase in value-matching between teachers and the institutions which employ them would likely increase the number of “high quality teachers...into a profession guided by beliefs in something greater than self or culture” (p. 15).

In a study about the reasons that teachers leave rural Zimbabwean schools, researchers found that many teachers simply left for money (Gomba, 2015). Neighboring South Africa offers teachers better salaries and a relatively better profession. Yet, teachers in this qualitative study described reasons for staying that included job security, fear of the unknown, family, and administrator and colleague support. The author found that self-sacrificial leadership was a common theme, with teachers describing their leaders as those “who sacrificed his/her resources for the betterment of the teachers and the school” (Gomba, 2015, p. 59). While leadership was a common theme, Gomba (2015) also noted that money is not an unimportant factor in getting teachers to stay at a school, though it is not an incentive for joining the profession.

In the same vein, Turkish researchers Aydin et al. (2019) found that expatriate teachers in private Turkish schools, though not international schools, felt that their administrators created a supportive environment. However, teachers described their administrators as “insufficient in terms of their competence” (p. 1). In this qualitative study, the mean teaching experience in Turkey was 4.88 years, though 14 of the 25 teachers in the study had been teaching in Turkey for

2 or 3 years, with only three teachers having 10 or more years of Turkish experience (Aydin et al., 2019). The author suggested that studies such as this one could be a source of solutions as the Turkish government seeks to decrease the turnover of expat teachers within Turkish schools.

In a study of schools in the unique refugee and emergency contexts, Ring and West (2015) wrote that different factors impact leadership and turnover in this context than in others. Beyond the “political, economic and logistical constraints” (Ring & West, 2015, p. 108), professional development, curriculum management, local educated adults, and the value of education can produce a challenge. Leadership in this context could become difficult as simply identifying who is in charge can be challenging because multiple organizations might be attempting to lead the situation. Additionally, bribes to school officials can also exacerbate tensions and lead to the leadership of a school feeling as if they are not truly in control (Ring & West, 2015). This difficulty in establishing a leadership structure will, according to the authors, impact retention in this context. However, this study did not conclude the level or amount of impact school leaders will have on teacher turnover.

Research Regarding International Schools

While decades of research on teacher turnover in the United States exists, its study in the realm of international schools remains limited. Notably, Odland and Ruzicka (2009) pointed out that only one study, a 30-participant study in 2001, focused on the primary causes of teacher turnover in international schools at the time of their writing. Nearly a decade later, Gardner-McTaggart (2018b) noted a “paucity of literature” regarding international schools. However, as noted earlier, international schools have experienced a boom in the last two decades. Thus, one might conclude that it has only been recently that research into them is pragmatic. Additionally,

while demographic data of foreign teachers in South Korea would help this study, extensive research found no studies that revealed data of that kind.

While the original purpose of international schools was to educate expatriate families, research showed a trend toward wealthy local families becoming the primary customer (Gardner-McTaggart, 2018b). Across the world, local families make up approximately 80% of students at international schools, while expatriates make up only 20% (ISC, 2013). In China, native Chinese students make up 65% of the 370,000 students (O'Neil, 2019). In this growing market, research also showed that schools have had difficulty filling their faculty positions with native English speakers and those from out of the country. O'Neil (2019) found that 60% of teachers at international schools in China were not native English speakers. Despite this, leadership in international schools continues to be mostly Anglo and Christian groups (Gardner-McTaggart, 2018a). Many leaders see these two characteristics as central to their ability to lead (Gardner-McTaggart, 2018a). Despite this combination of Anglo-Christian leaders and a local population who do not have the same characteristics, projections show that the international school market will continue to grow in the coming years (ISC Research, 2019).

One potential area of concern that could stem from having a higher concentration of Anglo principals is minorities in gifted programs. Grissom et al. (2017) found that schools with white principals were less likely to have minority students in gifted programs, while schools with Black or Hispanic principals had an increase in minority representation in gifted programs. Grissom et al. (2017) suggested a "diversification of the educator workforce" as one way to ensure equity, a factor that international schools should take seriously as they have trended towards having larger numbers of home-country students as opposed to expatriates (Gardner-McTaggart, 2018b; ISC, 2013; O'Neil, 2019).

Research showed that understanding the nature of international schools has been difficult, partially due to the transient nature of the sector (Gardner-McTaggart, 2018b). One researcher wrote that “transience is central to understanding leadership in the international school contexts” (Gardner-McTaggart, 2018b, p. 155). Evidence of this transiency rests that 89% of international school teachers have taught at two or more schools, while only 11% of international school teachers have taught at only one school (Gardner-McTaggart, 2018b). One might connect that school leaders mention being “global [minded]/global [citizens] as being the most important to their leadership” (Gardner-McTaggart, 2018b), with teachers commonly choosing to be globetrotters.

Gardner-McTaggart (2018b) noted that transient teachers would most often seek out a leader they feel supports them. Without this support, teachers will move on to the next school, contributing to the 89% of international school teachers that have taught at more than one school. Just as in studies in American schools, teachers in international schools commonly list support from the administration as an important aspect of their decision to stay at the school (Dos Santos, 2019; Gardner-McTaggart, 2018a, 2018b; Mancuso et al., 2010). Evidence of this support included behaviors such as accepting teacher requests for classroom improvement (Dos Santos, 2019) and being service-oriented (Gardner-McTaggart, 2018a). Mancuso et al. (2010) found that the support of one’s leader is the “most important correlate of turnover” (p. 306).

Studies also showed that teachers in international schools desire leaders who are strong communicators and encourage diversity (Gardner-McTaggart, 2018a, 2018b; Roberts & Mancuso, 2014). In a study of qualities mentioned in job advertisements for international school leadership, Roberts and Mancuso (2014) found that strong communication skills and a desire for diversity were, by 26%, the most commonly mentioned traits. As these traits are integral to

transformational leadership, this leadership style might be an effective type to lead to decreased teacher turnover in international schools (Gardner-McTaggart, 2018b; Roberts & Mancuso, 2014).

Summary

While turnover is a natural event in any line of work, nonretirement turnover remains costly for all involved. This impact includes the financial cost, as well as academic, social, leadership, and community costs. Research clearly shows while several factors will affect teacher turnover, the perception of principals and school administrators is one of, if not the most, impactful. While research in the international school context has increased in recent years, the predominance of literature has been based on U.S. schools. While these studies are useful, the new context of international schools in South Korea will provide a new avenue that has been vacant in previous literature. Chapter 3 will discuss the research methodology and design for this study

Chapter 3: Research Method

The purpose of this qualitative study was to understand teachers' perceptions of their schools' leadership and the impact on teacher retention in international schools in South Korea. This research focused on international schools in South Korea; a context overlooked in previous studies. This chapter starts by explaining the strengths and reasons for choosing a qualitative methodology, followed by an explanation of the population and setting, establishing the limitations, delimitations, and assumptions of this study. Finally, data collection, analysis, and ethical considerations are discussed.

Design and Method

To best capture the perceptions of leadership from teachers at international schools in South Korea, this study used a qualitative approach. Qualitative research involves “the study of social phenomena and is based essentially on a constructivist and/or critical perspective” (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012). Somewhat more broadly, Polkinghorne (2005) described qualitative research as that which is based on “language data” rather than numbers.

While several approaches to qualitative research exist, this study followed an approach known as basic qualitative research. Basic qualitative research is an appropriate approach in this study, as many research questions do not fit squarely into more specific approaches or methodologies (Kahlke, 2014). This research approach appears particularly useful in studies, such as this one, that “attempt to uncover the participants' experiences, the meaning the participant ascribes to those experiences, or a process” (Worthington, n.d., para. 8). Merriam (2009) says that, essentially, basic qualitative research's “purpose is to understand how people make sense of their lives and experiences” (p. 23). Bloomberg and Volpe (2012) stated that qualitative research “[attempts] to achieve a holistic rather than a reductionist understanding” of

the perspectives of participants (p. 82). In a broad manner speaking, qualitative research discovers, describes, extracts, and interprets participants' experiences (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012). As this study sought to describe how teachers at international schools describe leadership and what influences these teachers' employment decisions, basic qualitative research served as a fitting format.

This qualitative study, with the general inductive analysis, made use of an initial survey sent to the full group of potential teacher participants, interviews with leaders from international schools in South Korea, and interviews with a group of volunteers from those that took the survey. A purposive strategy for finding participants discussed further below fits most effectively. Due to the current pandemic, Zoom was the mode of recording all interviews. With permission via the consent form (see Appendix A), I made an audio recording of the interviews and transcribed said recording to allow later analysis. Subsequent sections contain more details on recording, transcribing, and analysis.

Setting

South Korea is home to nearly 21,000 schools from kindergarten to high school (Total number of schools, 2020). While most of these are public schools or private schools still following the Korean national curriculum, the Korean government classifies a small but crucial number of schools as, officially, international schools. Korea applies this designation to 23 schools (Listings in MOE, n.d.), 14 of which are located in Seoul, with the remainder spread throughout the country (Seoul Metropolitan Government, n.d.). While the Korean government must accredit schools as international schools, an unknown but not insignificant number of unaccredited schools advertising themselves as international schools exist. The government made an effort to shut these schools down (Kim, 2017). For the purposes of this study, the

Korean government must have officially recognized a school as being an international school rather than a simple self-designation. These schools mainly operate in the English language using primarily American, International Baccalaureate, and British curriculums (Seoul Metropolitan Government, n.d.).

Population and Participants

Potential participants came from teachers at Korean government-accredited international schools. Most of the country's international schools are located in Seoul, and most teachers live in this city. Teachers at international schools in South Korea must meet strict requirements to gain a teaching visa. These requirements include a valid foreign teaching license, a degree in a relevant subject, and a minimum of two years of teaching in a setting similar to that of an international school (Careers & Employment, n.d.; Employment, n.d.; Employment*, n.d.). These requirements are not merely those of the international schools in South Korea; rather, the Korean government sets these requirements for a teacher to receive the necessary visa (Seoul Metropolitan Government, n.d.). As such, every participant in this study met those minimum requirements.

While quantitative studies seek generalizability and thus need many participants, qualitative studies need far fewer participants (Leavy, 2017). Qualitative studies performed by a professional researcher can include a vast range of participants depending on the goals and methods for a given study (Baker & Edwards, 2012; Leavy, 2017; Saldaña & Omasta, 2018). Given the research goals and constraints of this study, the questionnaire portion sought 30 participants, while the leadership and teacher interviews aimed for five participants of each type.

As I currently work at an international school in Seoul, a purposive strategy of convenience sampling fit best. Purposive sampling is a strategy in which the selection of

participants follows “preselected criteria relevant to a particular research question” (Mack et al., 2005, p. 5). After gaining approval from ACU’s Institutional Review Board (see Appendix E), I contacted three international schools in South Korea. Two schools allowed the study to use their teachers as potential participants, with one school not replying. Bloomberg and Volpe (2012) note that qualitative studies do not intend to make broad generalizations about entire populations. Rather, qualitative research seeks to “describe a particular context in depth, not to generalize” (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012, p. 69). Rather than seeking applicability to another context in terms of the results, this study informs future research possibilities in other contexts.

Assumptions

Several ideas are presumed to be the true preface of this study. First, the most basic assumption is that teachers at international schools can offer a point of view that is valuable to the general research on leadership in international schools. Patton (1990) stated that “qualitative interviewing begins with the assumption that the perspectives of others are meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit.” A second and similar assumption is that of the participant’s truthfulness. All studies would, essentially, assume that participants are truthful in their statements, recollections, and clarifications. Without the full truthfulness and candor of participants, this study’s results, findings, and conclusions will lack validity.

Limitations

Based on interviews with participants, this study inherently relies on self-reported information. Polkinghorne (2005) explains that, while a participant might give their own perception of an event, situation, or memory, their ability to recall experiences precisely as they occurred “is intrinsically limited” (p. 139). Denzin and Lincoln (1998) went further to say that one’s recall of events is “filtered through the lens of language, gender, social class, race, and

ethnicity” (p. 12). A second limitation of this study rests in being qualitative. Qualitative research, by its own nature, cannot generalize to an entire population or context (Anderson, 2017; Flick, 2007; Polkinghorne, 2005). While this is an accepted component of qualitative research, others state it as a criticism of the approach (Anderson, 2017). Further, Polkinghorne (2005) notes that, in transcribing recorded interviews, the written form can lose by not including “the pacing, the intonation, and the emphasis in the talk” (p. 142). Researchers can limit this negative impact of transcription somewhat by including notes about pauses, facial movements, and other similar observations (Flick, 2007).

Limitations that appear specific to this study could include a lack of response from potential participants or principals. While getting all participants from a single school does not necessarily taint the results, participants answering questions regarding the same leadership structure will make for a narrower set of findings. Additionally, time and distance could limit the ability of some volunteers to participate. While flexibility will help, it must still be a consideration.

Delimitations

To keep a study from expanding too far from the purpose and research questions, researchers must “clarify the boundaries” (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012). This approach will keep researchers focused on what they truly want to study and not simply follow a trail that might lead away from the original intention. The delimitations for this study will relate to the participants, location of the study, data collection method, and research questions.

As this study revolved firmly around the perceptions of leadership held by teachers in international schools, it makes sense that participants would, at the time of their participation, teach in international schools. In South Korea, a number of other visas allow a person to be a

teacher, such as in public schools, private academies, or universities. However, as these individuals teach largely for Korean companies with Korean leadership, their inclusion would detract, not help, in researching the research question at hand. Thus, this study included only teachers in Korean-accredited international schools. The primary reason for South Korea's selection as the location for this study results from the location is where I currently live, have connections, and am employed at an international school. Thus, this location provides the most convenience and the deepest connections, which will allow for greater ease in meeting with participants.

Four different methods possible in qualitative research include interviews, observations, examining documents, and examining artifacts (Polkinghorne, 2005). To answer the research question most easily, examining documents and artifacts appeared less than ideal. While one could read diaries or other personal writings of participants to ascertain their perceptions of leadership, other methods provided greater ease of participation. Additionally, observations would become very time-consuming, not ideal for completing while otherwise employed, while the presence of a researcher could easily disrupt the communications of those involved. Thus, interviews served as the most sensible approach and gave the best opportunity to gather the necessary data to answer the research question.

Researcher Role

From 2013 to early 2020, I worked as an administrator in a small international school in South Korea. Before that, I taught English in a Korean academy to students in grades 2-9. As part of my administrative duties, I kept a partial teaching schedule in my licensed areas of Chemistry and Social Studies. In early 2020, I moved to a large international school in South Korea into a full-time teaching role in Chemistry. The topic of leaders' perceptions and their

connection to retention is very deep, as much of my role in the last 9 years was to ascertain similar information on a smaller and more informal scale and use that information to become a better leader.

In this study, I collected data using an approved interview protocol (Saldaña & Omasta, 2018). These questions stimulated the minds of participants to give robust answers full of usable data. While qualitative research naturally includes some amount of subjectivity due to its inherent reliance on “emotion-laden and meaningful interpretations about the social world” (Saldaña & Omasta, 2018, p. 35), a researcher must balance those interpretations with facts to “ensure a trustworthy account of the investigation (Saldaña & Omasta, 2018, p. 35). As I was intricately involved in data collection, the process and I must remain trustworthy, ethical, and sensitive to the needs of both the participants and the research. Due to not being in a supervisory capacity at the time the study occurred, bias or potential untruthfulness from participants is not a consideration. It remained imperative that I follow the guidelines of ACU and the protocols as approved by the institutional review board.

Data Collection

As previously described, the selection of participants occurred through convenience sampling. I contacted leadership from the three Korean-accredited international schools in the Seoul metropolitan area to obtain permission to use the schools’ teachers as potential participants. This included my current workplace at an accredited international school in South Korea. While unsuccessful in the goal of three participating schools, two participating schools provided enough participants for the necessary data gathering.

Data collection proceeded in three stages. First, participants received a questionnaire through email along with the request for participation (see Appendix D), with the goal being

approximately 30-40 respondents. By the completion of the study, 26 teachers had completed the questionnaire. The questionnaire (see Appendix B) asked open-ended questions based on, but different from, the LBDQ, a leadership questionnaire developed at The Ohio State University in the 1950s and 1960s. While the full LBDQ includes 12 factors of leadership, studies found that two factors, initiation of structure and consideration, are sufficient to accurately describe one's leader (Fleishman, 1957; Halpin & Winer, 1957). SurveyMonkey provided the means to create the survey for this study, which teachers received via email. Teachers had two weeks from the date of the original request to complete the questionnaire. At that time, I closed the questionnaire. SurveyMonkey's standards for security made it a secure choice for use in this study. According to SurveyMonkey, data storage involves "world-class, SOC 2 accredited data centers" with "24x7 monitoring, cameras, visitor logs, entry requirements, and dedicated cages for SurveyMonkey hardware" (SurveyMonkey, 2020). In short, safe and secure data storage with strict protocols ensure confidential data.

Second, administrators at participating schools received an invitation to participate in an interview session. The purpose of the leadership interviews includes checking if the themes are similar from different perspectives. Last, the final question of the questionnaire asked teachers to indicate their interest in participating in an interview to explore the topic in more depth. Those that answered in the affirmative had a separate survey to sign up to keep their original responses confidential. With an original goal of five teachers and five administrators taking part in the interviews, seven teachers and six administrators volunteered and participated in the interview stage.

Questions in the interview asked teachers to respond further to the issues considered in the questionnaire. This process included discussing their experiences in Korean international

schools, their perceptions of past and current leaders, and their insights regarding what teachers see as helpful and hurtful to their experiences and decisions to turnover or stay at their school. Additionally, questions included those that arose naturally from teachers' responses to the predetermined list of questions for the semistructured interview. In getting data through three different data collection methods, triangulation can occur, which will give more validity to the study (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, an audio recording of all interviews occurred via Zoom. In agreeing to the consent form (see Appendix A), participants gave permission for interviews to be audio recorded. A recording allows for transcription and data analysis. Additionally, during the interview, I took field notes to make notes of observations, such as facial expressions, body language, disruptions to the interview, or any other item that, at the time, seemed important.

Semistructured interviews included detailed questions and possible follow-up questions allowing for leeway to adjust course during the interview (Saldaña & Omasta, 2018). In order "to improve questions, format, and instructions" (Creswell & Creswell, p. 154) and to check for questionnaire and interview length to prevent "participant fatigue (Creswell & Creswell, p. 154), the interview protocol was initially field-tested by interviewing two volunteers at similar institutions that were not included in the study. These field study participants closely resembled teachers that eventually took part in the study. The questionnaire received minor changes after field testing, though the changes did not change the substance of the questions.

Interviews lasted 30-60 minutes, while questionnaires took teachers 20-30 minutes to complete. With a total of 26 questionnaires, seven teacher interviews, and six administrator interviews completed, the total time for the completion of data collection was three weeks.

Following completion of each interview, transcription of audio recordings will occur through the professional transcription service Trint to allow for further analysis.

Analysis

Developed in the early 2000s, the general inductive approach (GIA) is an approach to analyzing qualitative data that does not fit into the previously developed qualitative approaches. Thomas (2006) described the inductive analysis as “[using] detailed readings of raw data to derive concepts, themes, or a model through interpretations made from the raw data” (p. 238). This process contrasts with deductive analysis. A researcher looks at data through the lens of its agreement with “prior assumptions, theories, or hypotheses” (Thomas, 2006, p. 238). GIA allows themes to arise from the raw data, rather than only checking whether a theory or other preconceived idea, such as a hypothesis, is true.

According to Thomas (2006), three possible purposes arise in creating GIA. First, GIA will take a large amount of data, often gathered from interviews, and reduce it into much smaller segments. Second, GIA will allow a researcher “to establish clear links between the research objectives and the summary findings” (Thomas, 2006, p. 238). Last, analysis of qualitative data can create a new “model or theory about the underlying structure of experiences or processes” (Thomas, 2006, p. 238).

While other approaches encourage researchers to examine data and gather findings through a model or theory, GIA says that “findings arise directly from the analysis of the raw data” (Thomas, 2006, p. 239). In GIA, coding data to create categories is most common. The coding process will take large amounts of data and condense it into smaller chunks of important information. By highlighting words, phrases, sentences, and sections of relevant information, one

can “show the richness, complexities, and contradictions” (Center for Evaluation, 2018) of interviewees and their perceptions.

While reading and highlighting, similarities in information began to appear or seem to appear. Notation of these similarities occurred through the highlighting of various colors, underlining, or making comments in the transcript margins. For coding, I used “in vivo” and “descriptive” techniques. “In vivo” coding involves using the exact words of interviewees in highlighting, while “descriptive” coding summarizes the words of interviewees (Leavy, 2017).

To determine that coding occurred appropriately, I and my dissertation chair each coded the same teacher interview. We compared the identified codes and themes to ensure that the themes identified by both were in agreement. Determining this to be so, I alone read, coded, and analyzed the remaining interviews.

After the completion of interview coding, a search for commonalities in the coding of each interview commenced. As GIA is based on the idea that the findings will come from examining the data, predetermined codes were unnecessary. Rather, I used codes that were evident in the transcripts. Thomas (2006) notes that the categories created from coding include five parts: category label, category description, examples of information coded in each category, connections between categories, and models, theories, or frameworks that are evident after having coded. The most common categories formed the basis for the findings of the study (Thomas, 2006), though the number of these was unknown until coding completion.

Trustworthiness

The work of Lincoln and Guba found trustworthiness encompassed in the four areas of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The use of high-quality procedures and high-quality participants are the basis for credibility in a qualitative

study (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012). This focus on credibility makes following protocols, getting proper permission, and seeking out the right type of participants extremely important.

Essentially, credibility increases with a high degree of confirmability. This occurs with research that is, as much as possible, objective, with biases mitigated, proper procedures and protocols followed, and through transparency, such as the use of an audit trail (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012).

As stated previously, qualitative research, by its nature, does not seek to have findings that are generalizable to an entire population. Rather, qualitative research seeks transferability, or how well the research processes work in other contexts (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012). This transferability occurs through a high degree of dependability using detailed and honest methodologies, data collection procedures, and findings (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012). Additionally, the results of this study will inform future research possibilities in this area of currently limited literature.

Additionally, Saldaña and Omasta (2018) noted that the use of triangulation gives a researcher the opportunity to “make warranted assertions about the research question if the participants’ responses harmonized” (p. 99) using multiple sources of data. Further, Bloomberg and Volpe (2012) described triangulation as “a process of using multiple perceptions to clarify meaning” (p. 75). In the current study, triangulation occurred by using three sources of data: a questionnaire for the full group of teacher participants, semistructured interviews with a smaller group of teacher participants, and semistructured interviews with a small group of administrators.

Audit Trail

In a qualitative study, credibility occurs through basic high-quality research techniques and transparent honesty in presenting results (Saldaña & Omasta, 2018). The authors further suggest that credibility in such a study increases by including information that will “permit the

reader to informally audit the work” (Saldaña & Omasta, 2018, p. 272). Such a trail gives readers confidence in the results, analysis, and conclusions of a study. In the current study, an audit trail (see Appendix C) shows the steps of the study and what occurred (i.e., semistructured interview, questionnaire, etc.).

Ethical Considerations

As qualitative research involves participants sharing more information than quantitative research, a researcher’s ability to keep the data and participant’s participation confidential remains important (Flick, 2007). During recruiting, interviewing, transcribing, coding, analyzing, and presenting findings, participants must have confidence that their participation and what they have shared will remain confidential and unidentifiable. Flick (2007) identifies seven “basic principles of ethically sound research” (p. 69). These include informed consent (see Appendix A), avoiding deception of participants, guarding participants’ participation, ensuring accurate data and interpretation, respecting participants as humans, beneficence, and justice.

Informed consent supports the idea that participants know they are participating and have the opportunity to not participate if they choose. Part of this informed consent involves a researcher being honest with participants about the study's goal, the utilization of the collected information, participants' safeguards, and finally, presenting the findings honestly, accurately portraying the data. To get the best data, participants and their data must remain confidential. Beyond protecting their identity to safeguard against workplace consequences, researchers must see participants are more than data generators. Participants must be viewed as humans. Part of viewing them as humans is thinking about the “well-being of the participants” (Flick, 2007, p. 69) and ensuring that the difficulties encountered by participants are not beyond acceptable nor beyond what participants agreed to. A researcher must ensure all of these items and take steps to

do so. This process happens, among other things, through following protocols, getting approval from the institutional review board, and maintaining open communication with participants

I kept all data related to the study on a dedicated external hard drive stored in my personal office. Data did not include participants' real names or identifying information, with only pseudonyms used when necessary (Mack et al., 2005). Doing so allowed the study to “[maintain] confidentiality” (Mack et al., 2005, p. 53). While transcripts could inherently hold identifiable information based on the words of participants, the information included in the study will seek to remove all information that identifies a specific person. Additionally, by using two schools, teacher quotes are less likely to connect back to a specific teacher. Lastly, as interviews were audio-recorded, the identity of teachers could be known by listening to the audio. Only I can access the audio recordings, saved only on an external hard drive. Upon completing this study, I will delete the files from the hard drive, with the recycle bin/trash emptied. At that point, I will ensure the physical destruction of the hard drive to eliminate the possibility of file retrieval. The informed consent form (see Appendix A), signed by participants to participate in this study, includes specific confidentiality assurances (Mack et al., 2005).

Summary

This chapter presented the methodology used in this qualitative study using a general inductive approach. To best answer the research question and stay in line with the purpose of this study, the methods described above allowed for the most robust data collection while at the same time protecting participants and the integrity of the research. This chapter included not only the methodological choices but also literature to support each choice. It also included ethical considerations and an explanation of how to establish and maintain trustworthiness in this study.

Chapter 4: Results

This research study focused on perceptions of leadership from the perspective of teachers in international schools in South Korea. To study these perceptions, I used a questionnaire, semistructured interviews with teachers, and semistructured interviews with administrators to achieve triangulation. This chapter provides the results in the form of themes that emerged within each research question, in addition to aggregate demographic to better understand the teachers who took part in the study.

Research Questions

One guiding research question drove this study, while two subquestions guided the questionnaire and semistructured interviews.

Q1. What perceptions do teachers hold regarding the impact of principal leadership styles on teacher retention in an international school in South Korea?

Q1a. What characteristics and behaviors of principal leadership do teachers perceive to impact their decision to leave or stay at an international school in South Korea?

Q1b. What characteristics and behaviors of principal leadership do teachers perceive to impact a positive or negative professional experience at an international school in South Korea?

Demographics

To better analyze responses, the initial questionnaire collected demographic data from teacher participants. I invited three international schools in South Korea to participate, with two responding affirmatively and granting permission for teacher contact to occur. The study did not collect data on particular schools in which teachers work.

Table 1*Years at Current School*

Years	Number of participants	% of total
0–2	12	46.2%
3–5	9	34.6%
6–10	5	19.2%
11+	0	0%

Table 2*Years in International Schools*

Years	Number of participants	% of total
0–2	5	19.2%
3–5	8	30.8%
6–10	7	26.9%
11+	6	23.1%

Table 3*Total Years of Teaching Experience*

Total years	Number of participants	% of total
0–2	0	0%
3–5	8	30.8%
6–10	10	38.5%
11+	8	30.8%

Table 4*Frequency of Job Changes*

Frequency	Number of participants	% of total
~2 years or fewer	10	38.4%
~4 years	3	11.5%
~5 years	4	15.4%
Other	9	34.6%

The tables outline a total of 26 respondents to the questionnaire with a wide range of total years of experience and time spent in international education. Teachers' years at their current schools show a cluster in the two brackets relating to fewer than 5 years of service (see Tables 1 and 2), with nearly 81% of teachers in the lower two brackets.

Data Collection

The process of data collection occurred in two ways for teachers and one way for administrators. After schools granted permission, teachers received an email invitation to participate in the questionnaire portion of the study. The email invitation included a link to an online questionnaire, whose final question pertained to teachers' interest in participating in a semistructured interview. Teachers who answered affirmatively to this interest provided contact information and potential interview times. Interviews lasted 30 minutes to one hour and occurred via Zoom with audio-only recordings made. Triangulation occurred through the invitation of administrators from the same schools to participate in their own interviews, also recorded via Zoom. Transcripts of all audio recordings occurred using the transcription service Trint, which uses AI to turn audio recordings into usable transcripts. I then checked all transcripts to compare them against the recording for accuracy, with any incorrect transcripts adjusted.

Analysis

After the transcription of all semistructured interviews, coding began. In vivo and descriptive coding formed the basis of the analysis. In vivo coding involves using the exact words of interviewees, while descriptive coding summarizes the words of interviewees (Leavy, 2017). This process entailed my reading through all questionnaires and transcripts, while individually highlighting keywords and summarizing sections. After completing the coding of all questionnaires and interviews, I created a compilation of the results with lists based on the question asked and the format of data collection. With this list of keywords from the responses of each participant for each question, an assessment of emergent themes could begin. Thematic searching initially occurred within teacher and administrator responses as their own groups, after which time, a comparison of responses between the groups and a search for larger themes began.

Audit Trail

An audit trail supported transparency in this qualitative study (see Appendix C). This serves the primary purpose of keeping track of the research study and who was involved in each step (Saldaña & Omasta, 2018). The audit trail (see Appendix C) increases the study's trustworthiness giving further confidence to the findings. Within the study, specifically in the results, the audit trail tracks the data collection process. In doing this, readers can see the timeline for data collection, as well as the steps taken in data collection.

Results

To understand the perceptions that teachers have of their leaders, one must first understand the reasons that teachers leave their schools. The most-cited reasons among these 26 teachers included personal or family reasons unrelated to the job, a lack of growth opportunities, leadership issues, and a desire for a new location. Personal/family reasons dominated other

reasons, as cited by 11 teachers. School leadership issues arose as the third most common reason for leaving one's school with five teachers out of 26, giving this reason. Spoken in a straightforward fashion, Teacher 7 wrote, "A change in leadership caused me to feel less supported than previously" [1, 24]. Teacher 5 responded similarly by saying, "I didn't feel I had the most support or a leader who I trusted to respond in an appropriate manner. I also felt very overworked and had little balance between my personal and professional life" [1, 22]. In the same vein, Teacher 23 commented, "A change in administration at my previous school which led to broken promises regarding development of my own position as well as an extremely toxic work environment school-wide" [1, 40]. Other related comments included a lack of support, poor school culture, and a lack of trust, as cited by 4, 4, and 2 teachers, respectively.

Behaviors

Among the three data streams, multiple questions focused on the behaviors of principals. These behaviors fell into topics including support of teachers, staff treatment, specific actions to retain teachers, things to positively impact all teachers, and behaviors that teachers do and do not want in a leader. Responses supported contentions by Stogdill (1963), Halpin and Winer (1957), and Fleishman (1957) that the full Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire, as described previously, was useful, while only using two of the 12 factors described. These two factors, initiation of structure behaviors and consideration behaviors, were sufficient to differentiate between leaders, according to research (Fleishman, 1957; Halpin & Winer, 1957; Stogdill, 1963).

Support of Teachers

While there have only been a small number of studies on international schools, a number of them suggested that administrative support was key to decreasing teacher turnover (Dos

Santos, 2019; Gardner-McTaggart, 2018a, 2018b; Kartika & Purba, 2018; Mancuso et al., 2010). Carver-Thomas and Darling-Hammond (2017) found that 21% of teachers stated an absence of support as a push factor for leaving the profession while also finding that rated their administrators as supportive were nearly 50% more likely to stay at their school than those who rated their administrators as unsupportive.

Administrator Point of View. In this study, administrator responses read of intentionality and purposefulness of action. They spoke of a concerted effort to know teachers, both personally and professionally, and to offer an environment and support based on that. Of the six administrators interviewed, three administrators discussed the need for a positive work culture, four noted the importance of offering meaningful professional development, and five of showing care and respect for teachers.

Leader 2 stated:

I think, number one, it has to be a consistent attitude from the administrators that we want you here...But from a non-benefit standpoint, non-monetary, if you will, we have to give them opportunities for professional development and we have to give them a desirable work environment. We have to treat them with respect...We have to make sure they know how important and valuable they are on the team [3, 6].

Leader 3 said:

So, we have to look for opportunities to say “yes” to teachers, give opportunities to teachers, and create a work environment where the teachers feel safe and cared about. So, we’re intentional about finding those opportunities and creating that kind of culture [3, 7].

Leader 6 said:

So, maybe one of the things that's important for me to be able to do is to understand where each person is, to develop an understanding of where they're at, in their profession and in their growth to understand why, well, first, to understand maybe what their strengths and their weaknesses are and then why they wish to set particular goals. So I think that maybe the most important thing I can do is to understand them as an educator and where they're at in their profession. And then if I can understand that, if I can develop that understanding with them, then I can support them in ways that are maybe more specific to them [3, 10].

While administrators spoke most often of keeping teachers, some also commented on the other side of turnover. It is the reality of schools. Studies have found that turnover produces adverse effects on professional development, teacher leadership, teacher relationship, and community within the school (Allensworth et al., 2009; Donitsa-Schmidt & Zuzovsky, 2016). Yet, turnover of those that do not fit well within an organization is part of a healthy turnover (Jackson, 2012).

Leader 1 said:

When we think about retention, retaining everyone on staff isn't necessarily the best thing. There are going to be some folks that you will want to work with, and if that doesn't work, you will eventually want to cancel out. [3, 5].

Leader 6 stated:

I want people to come here because they have a call...I also want people to feel the freedom to follow the Lord's call should he take them somewhere else, and I never want to be in the way of that. And so this idea of retaining teachers or trying to get people to stay is one that, I think, for me, there's a lot of tension there [3, 10].

Though Leader 1 brought up the reality of separation, they also stated a clear desire to make outstanding teachers feel as such.

Leader 1 said:

If there are a group of people that you want to retain, you treat that person as such. It doesn't mean that you go out of your way to shower him or her with all kinds of unfair in, you know, unequal favors or anything like that. But if there is truly a rock star of a faculty or staff, it's up to you to make sure that you continue to challenge appropriately, challenge him or her appropriately, give responsibility, things that you can do to make sure that he or she feels appreciated, validated and appropriately challenged [3, 5].

Teacher Point of View. While teachers' definition of what supportive means varies (Boyd et al., 2011), teachers in this study viewed their principal as supportive. The teacher's point of view of support includes three overarching themes: presence, proactivity, and backup. The most common form of support mentioned by five of seven teachers interviewed involves presence. Teachers describe this presence as including behaviors such as communication, check-ins, and getting to know teachers.

Teacher A said:

I feel like I expect, especially when it comes to my classes or my schedule, like anything that personally has to do with my course load, I would expect to know from the supervisors ahead of time. Like, three weeks in advance, this is something that we're kind of discussing right now. Not sure if it's going to get into play, but I'd like to let you know, and what are your thoughts on it? Yeah, I'd like to have a space to give my opinion and I want to feel valued [2, 11].

Teacher B said:

...regular check-ins with department heads to see what's needed and maybe trying to follow through on meeting those needs...I think it's good to just have a supervisor that is willing to listen and consider...their teachers before considering the students [2, 12].

Teacher D stated:

I think just like personal check ins, you know; it doesn't have to be grand or extravagant, you know, just like popping in a classroom and saying, 'Hey, how's it going?' I think face-to-face check-ins are much more valuable...but just making sure everyone's okay, that they have what they need to do their job [2, 14].

A second common theme in this area focused on proactivity, with three of seven teacher interviewees noting its importance. This theme also included communication on items like schedule changes, as mentioned by Teacher 1 above, professional development, goal accomplishment, wisdom, and confidence and fulfillment in their role as a leader.

Teacher A said:

So, support, to me, just looks like proactivity rather than a reactive reaction or reactivity to when I pry...support, to me, should be that they should have [expected] these things from the beginning...been proactive about it and then relay that information to me [2, 11].

Teacher C stated:

There's going to be professional development that is connected to the goals that the school has for itself and its growth. But I think by also having opportunities for professional development that may be cutting edge or best practice, it supports the teacher in the then and now... [2, 13]

Teacher E said:

...somebody who understands, like at different times different situations require that leader to step into different roles...I find it helpful when a leader is confident, like they are sure of what they would like to accomplish. So kind of taking their authoritative role and... teach the staff, this is why this is the best thing to do instead of just saying this is what we're doing and let's move on...They can help you feel heard, but they don't just listen and say, oh yeah, I agree with everything you say. Like, they're going to listen, but then still make a decision that they think, in their wisdom, is the best decision to make [2, 15].

A third emergent theme of support related to backup and dealing with issues that arise during the school day. Connected to the previous theme of presence, four of seven teachers commented on the need for a present administrator to be able to support teachers in the situations that inevitably arise during the day.

Teacher F said:

The first word that comes to mind is logistical. I just want them to handle all of that stuff, that kind of support, make the school run or make that division run smoothly and handle situations that are kinks that come up. And so that's one way I know I would want support. Uh, so, yeah, logistical, whether the scheduling or whatnot. Um. I guess. Some instructional, but. Instructional support, but not as I don't lean on that as much, I think I look for instructional support from colleagues or other teachers or PLCs or even online teaching communities. Or professional development opportunities, I don't look to my supervisors for that [2, 16].

Teacher G said:

If there's like a parent complaint or something like that or there's a disciplinary issue, do they have my back? Now, if I'm wrong, I'm wrong. And I can accept that. If they say you screwed that up, OK, that's [on] me. But the first thing is, when the proverbial stuff hits the fan, where are you...for or with [me], behind me, in front of me...So that is honestly the first thing that came to mind. The second thing that came to mind was, and this is more real to my experience, when I have run into an issue and I'm like, OK, I need help...Can I walk to my principal and...they say, yeah [Teacher G] have a seat. But like if I walk and you just can tell tacitly, by the way someone approaches, they say, hey, I need help. Do they provide that sort of help? That's when you see the value of what a person brings in that role [2, 17].

Staff Treatment

As Boyd et al. (2011) found in their study, each staff member's definition of support varies. Previous research rarely noted specific behaviors connected to turnover; rather, the research found that more general statements to describe a principal, such as positive perception or support, indicate a staff member's likelihood of turnover (Allensworth et al., 2009; Boyd et al., 2011; Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Hammonds, 2017; Hughes et al., 2015; Kini & Podolsky, 2016; Player et al., 2017; Sutchter et al., 2016). Responses to this study found similarly nonspecific needs of both teachers and administrators, with four of six administrators stating a need for relationships. From teachers, responses used different verbiage but largely spoke of mutual behaviors, such as professional respect, being known, and care.

Administrator Point of View. Though the current study's administrator interviews did not ask direct questions about staff treatment, other questions revealed applicable responses. The most common administrator responses in this area related to relationships, respect, and value.

Four out of six administrators centered on the need to forge relationships to understand teachers' points of view to better deal with conflict. For these four administrators, a focus on relationships echoed throughout their responses.

Leader 1 said:

What has really worked well is to ensure that I really build the relationships, the positive person-to-person relationships, because...when the relationship is there and it's good, you can usually work through a lot of things that come up, disagreements, conflicts, disagreements, or whatnot [3, 5].

Leader 5 said:

...building that relationship, so that when we have to enter more difficult situations, I can speak truthfully and honestly with them, and they know where my heart is. They know where I'm coming from and that I'm sincere in my motives [3, 9].

Leader 6 said:

[When] the relationship was strong...I think our commitment to working through conflict was also strong. And so, not that there wasn't any conflict...we were able to find resolution and I think that was probably, in part, because of the previous relationships that I had with them [3, 10].

Another common area around which administrator comments revolved includes intentional respect and care for teachers. One administrator related the treatment of teachers as being even more important at their school as administrators have little influence on teacher salaries.

Leader 3 said:

...we cannot control the salary, which is unfortunate...so we have to look for opportunities to say yes to teachers, give opportunities to teachers and create a work environment where teachers feel safe and cared about. So, we're intentional about finding those opportunities and creating that kind of culture. [3, 7]

A second administrator echoed these sentiments in that monetary influence was not the role of administrators.

Leader 2 stated:

...we have to give them opportunities for professional development and we have to give them a desirable work environment. We have to treat them with respect in front of their peers, in front of their students, in front of the parents. We have to offer support and in front of the students, in front of the parents especially, in front of the peers and the teams. We have to be willing to listen when they have comments or ideas about how things are being done or what should be done. We have to communicate that with them as well. We have to make sure they know how important and valuable they are on the team. [3, 6]

Teacher Point of View. In the treatment of teachers, teachers' responses trended towards those in which a mutual behavior occurred. Mutual behaviors include those such as professional respect, being known, and clear care for teachers. Out of the seven teachers interviewed, three spoke of relational needs, two of professional respect and trust, and two of care.

Teacher A said:

So, at the very least, I feel like supervisors should have empathy, especially in the international school setting. We are staffed away from our home, our hometowns. We do, we're not in the comforts of our home. We don't have family here. And so, in international schools, I feel like this is like a gift as well, but we become each other's

families. And so, although I don't expect the supervisor to babysit my kids or watch my dog or anything like that, I do expect them to have a higher level of empathy than, I would say, regular or other school [2, 11].

Teacher D said:

It comes down to really treating others the way you want to be treated. So, like, I think it's really important that leaders function with mutual respect for their people. And I think when you give respect, like, that models like the things that you want from people. So, I think that it's really important to value and appreciate your people. I know that most people just want to be seen. And just to feel like they're cared for, like it could be a total hot mess behind the scenes. Yeah, but like, if I know that, like, I feel valued and seen and heard, like, I mean, it doesn't look like it's all about perception and feeling for me, but I'm a feeler. So I think it's really important to model the kind of character of people that you want [2, 14].

Teacher E said:

I think staff should feel known. That's hard when you have a big staff. I think for, like, a headmaster to know all of his staff under [them] is, I don't think it's possible. I think, like you can know about that or know about them, but to know each person individually and in a deep world isn't realistic. But for your principal, for example, for them to, like I said, be available to talk is really helpful. I think an expectation I have of my admin is that. They care about me as a person, not just as a teacher in their school, because in the same way that I think I am treated by them, it can be easily shown to how I treat my students and my parents [2, 15].

Teacher B took this need for empathy to an actionable step by speaking of a previous noninternational school where they had a positive experience as a staff member. In this, Teacher B describes a culture in which administrators prioritize the teachers. This contrasts with a mentality in which administrators prioritize students.

Teacher B said:

The mentality the school had was actually that they prioritized the teachers. They said the teachers come first or staff comes first, because ultimately, they're the ones that are then helping the students. And so I think, like in their actions, they should show something that prioritizes the health, the health and the and the capability and the and the just the support of their of their staff, their teachers, because if they're doing that, if they're supporting primarily their staff of teachers, then that shows them, one, putting faith in their teachers that they're going to be the ones to help the students directly. And then two, it sets up the teachers to then have all the full support they need to then make sure the students get all the support they need [2, 12].

Following this same mentality but speaking more broadly, Teacher G spoke of a certain level of evident care pervading the actions of their leader. According to this teacher, while administrators are fallible, their care for teachers should be evident in their actions. Additionally, they noted the importance that this care might have on a teacher's willingness to follow a leader in spite of fallibility.

Teacher G said:

Ideally, anyone should walk away saying this [leader] actually, really cares for me. I can feel that by the way they treat me and that's not a data point. But most of my observations tell me this person actually cares...Even if they screw up...there's still this underlying

sense that someone in the conversation would say, yeah, but their heart is good. So, I guess I would want to be treated in a way that even when things are adverse, I have a deep-seated sense that this person is not out to get me. There's no malice, there are decisions I may not like/agree...but this person actually cares and cares for me. And I can feel that at the end of the day [2, 17].

Specific Principal Behaviors

As part of the questionnaire, teacher participants identified specific behaviors and traits of principals that were both desirable and undesirable. With no limits to the number or type of behaviors listed, respondents provided many responses. Included in the list below are all desired traits that had five or more mentions by teachers and undesired traits with three or more mentions. Boxes with multiple traits demonstrate a similarity of characteristics. Teachers did not have to provide any explanation or further reasoning for their responses to this question. In researching this study, previous studies' results rarely included specific behaviors listed by teachers. Within these previous studies, researchers largely described teachers as having a positive or negative perception of their principal (Allensworth et al., 2009; Boyd et al., 2011; Fuller et al., 2016; Hughes et al., 2015; Jackson, 2012; Kraft et al., 2016; Player et al., 2017; Ryan et al., 2017; Sutchter et al., 2016; Torres, 2016) or in describing their principal as supportive or unsupportive (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017). One could certainly generalize the responses into those categories, but due to the smaller participant pool in this study, I made the decision to keep teachers' responses in their original form.

Table 5*Desired Trait*

Desired trait [1]	Number of mentions (maximum: 26)
kind/warm/caring/friendly/down-to-earth	13
transparent/honesty/forthright	10
trustworthy	7
good listener	6
makes time for teachers/available/present	6
culturally aware	5
humble/humility	5

Table 6*Undesired Trait*

Undesired trait [1]	Number of mentions (maximum: 26)
not present/not available	8
selfish	5
doesn't listen	4
doesn't communicate	4
dishonest	3
pride	3
Uses people as stepping stones/power hungry	3

Things to Positively Impact Teachers

In a similar vein, administrators gave examples of actionable items with which they positively impact teachers. Most of the administrators stated the need for relationship-building to be a key part of their ability to do their job. Other items mentioned by administrators followed a similar path, though all responded uniquely. These responses included empathy, servanthood, validation of teachers, mutual trust, and encouragement. Despite a wide range of commentary, four of six administrators emphasized the importance of developing relationships with teachers.

Leader 1 stated:

When the relationship is there and it's good, you can usually work through a lot of things that come up: conflicts, disagreements or whatnot. So once that's there, it's of course easier to work collaboratively with them and to get their buy-in and to just believe that everyone has the best of intentions [3, 5].

Leader 5 said:

I feel like one of my strengths is connecting with people on a personal level and building that relationship, so that when we have to enter more difficult situations, I can speak truthfully and honestly with them, and they know where my heart is. They know where I'm coming from and that I'm sincere in my motives. Second to relationships is just having ground for what you're saying in education, in good education theory and research based practices so that, um, teachers know that you're coming from, but it's not personal at the same time, like you talked about the personal aspect, like at some point you have to bring in the professional knowledge, instructional knowledge, so that you have some gravitas to what you're saying, right, because if they if they only respect you personally for being a nice person like that only goes so far to show so being up on research, being

up on best practice, being able to anticipate conversations and questions that teachers have from their professional knowledge as well, I think it's very important [3, 9].

Professionalism

With the previous section delving into the behaviors of principals, this section discusses the perspectives of teachers related to a principal's job duties. This section breaks professionalism into three overarching aspects of a principal's job: communication, feedback, and approachability. Fitting squarely into two subscales found by Stogdill (1963) to be sufficient in differentiating leaders, these three topics solicited descriptive responses from teachers regarding a wide variety of expectations.

Communication

Administrator Point of View. In administrator interviews, interviewees all spoke uniquely of their perspectives and preferences, though a similar vein appeared in their responses. Two out of six administrators emphasized the need for regular face-to-face time. They mentioned the need for being together to have honest discussions that are not possible through email.

Leader 6 said:

I prefer face-to-face communication and so. I like to deliver information, news, make suggestions, ideas, I prefer to do that face to face, and that isn't always the most...I guess sometimes it can feel like it takes a lot of time, but that is my preference. I think that especially if it's anything a little bit challenging or different, I can get a better feel for people and what they actually think about it if we're talking about it face to face, I can measure, I can see facial expressions, they can see mine. And I think we can have a little bit more of a human conversation [3, 10].

An additional two administrators noted that email communication allowed for efficiency and time savings for teachers. This time saving, according to one leader, would give teachers more time to do what they needed. Leader 2 said, “I’d be shocked if the teachers gave you something else that is more important to them [than their time]” [3, 6].

In part, email communication gives both teachers and leaders information they can later refer to, especially in cases of reprimands or similar items.

Leader 2 stated:

I’ll be honest, any time there’s something that you think you might have to refer back to, you’ve got to follow up with an email for documentation. You’re going to follow a carbon copy or BCC, put it in a folder and just let it sit there...So sometimes you have to protect yourself and plan for future events by just documenting it. And again, it’s not to it’s not to be a ‘gotcha,’ but it’s meant to protect yourself if there’s ever a question of whether your recollection of the events is accurate or someone else’s is [3, 6].

Two leaders emphasized the importance of multiple forms of communication.

Leader 5 said:

It has to be communicated several times in many different ways, especially with working with a multi-generational staff of some millennials thrown in there with some older teachers and then some mid-range, like, you almost have to do it in several different formats [3, 9].

Leader 3 stated:

Everybody will hear things differently or prefer different forms of communication. Some prefer to hear it from a friend or from a [teacher leader], someone for email, some a text,

some video or a phone call or an in-person meeting or a staff meeting...So you just have to do it all [3, 7].

The latter administrator noted that different types of information could effectively be communicated in different ways, with a difference in ease of clarity and time.

Leader 3 stated:

When you do communicate, it has to be worthwhile. You don't want to waste anybody's time reading your email. You don't want to waste anybody's time going to your meeting. [When] it comes to interpersonally, it just takes time to listen and to help paint pictures, so people have the right perspective [3, 7].

Though the form of communication had some variation, themes emerge within these variations. Most administrator responses presented the need for clarity with honesty or transparency. Five of seven administrators discussed the desire to be clear in their communication with teachers, while three noted the hope to be as honest as possible.

Leader 1 said:

I think trying to be, striving to be as clear, as transparent, and as honest, and as humble as possible, I think is very important. The minute you try to throw on the authoritative tone and the finger-pointing, you can lose people very quickly. So have the tone of, hey, I'm coming alongside you, not necessarily on top of you, but really alongside and offering you support in any way I can. I think that is a tone that the teachers pick up on right away and can really buy into [3, 7].

Leader 3 said:

The most important part of communication as an administrator is listening. By far, the more you listen, the more questions you ask, the more the teachers feel cared about, the

more informed you're going to be, the better you are going to be in handling any given new situation [3, 7].

Teacher Point of View. Of the seven teacher interviewees, four spoke of the importance of transparency in communication. Though varying in their description of this transparency, all noted its importance. In one response, Teacher D tied together the ideas of transparency and being a stakeholder in the organization.

Teacher D said:

I'm all for radical transparency. I feel like if I am employed somewhere like I am, I should be considered a valued stakeholder. So, I think that being overly transparent is better than being not...consistency and transparency are two of my big expectations for communication [2, 14].

While transparency was an oft-cited desire, teachers also commented on the importance of conciseness and not oversharing. Teachers used oversharing in two similar but not identical ways. The first use of oversharing related to sharing private information of other departments or teachers, while the second stemmed from sharing ideas still in development. The former, according to one teacher, runs counter to what should be the goals of a school division.

Teacher A said:

You don't want to overshare and spill out secrets or weaknesses of other departments or teachers that blatantly, because you are trying to create a culture that is healthy, that is supportive and robust in positivity...I find that in my experience in international schools, the problem has been more the former in which there is undersharing [2, 11].

Teacher B said:

I think it's also good to not over communicate because there are some things that might be in development that if you share it with the masses, then it could be more problematic than waiting to see how those things develop and then communicating the result. So, I think that communication should be approached with a little bit of wisdom on that, a little bit of leveraging whether or not this needs to be known or not before sharing it [2, 12].

As to the format of communication, teachers, like administrators, showed a balance between their preferences. Three out of seven teacher interviewees stated directly that they desire in-person communication as opposed to email. For one teacher, the preference for in-person communication grew out of an inability to see the nonverbal cues and hear the tone of an email.

Teacher C said:

Too much formality or rigidity in communication can come off very impersonal, can be misconstrued, especially if it's in an email form and you don't hear that tone of voice. So, you don't see those facial expressions. People can interpret that message [in] very different ways. And, so, while face-to-face communication is definitely a lot more taxing on time, it can have a huge pay out with people in the long run [2, 13].

Three out of seven teacher interviewees stated a preference for email communication.

This connected, then, to the efficiency of time. For these teachers, the common thread of saving and valuing time predominated.

Teacher D stated:

E-mail is enough. Like I'm not for just meeting to meet. I mean, I'm all about efficient communication as well. So, if it can be put in a message or at least sent ahead of time to you know, if then we have a 10 minute...directly...bullet points...does anyone have questions? I just think that that's about valuing everyone's time involved as well [2, 14].

Teacher F said:

I prefer written communication. That's just my own personal style. I read every email, I read every newsletter, I read anything that's written. And so I don't mind for things to come in written form...because I take the responsibility to read and stay informed [2, 16].

Answering outside of the main two groups, one teacher related a preference, not for a specific mode of communication. Rather, Teacher A commented that the communication of a supervisor should show clear care for teachers. Additionally, the administrator's relatability and relational aptitude should come through in their communication with staff.

Teacher A said:

The way that you communicate really determines what type of relationship you have...At the end of the day, we're still all humans, you know, even though there is a hierarchical system. There should be more down-to-earth-ness, I guess, more of a relational like more of the compassionate and empathetic side when it comes to communication. I feel like supervisors that I've worked with are more just one-way direct, like I'm your leader, you're my subordinates...not in an unkind way, but just structurally. I wouldn't feel like I could trust them with my social-emotional well-being. The way [a leader] express [themselves] determines how I perceive [them]. [2, 11].

Approachability

Centered within the premises of initiating structure behaviors and consideration behaviors (Stogdill, 1963), approachability opens administrators up to their teachers. In one of the most uniform responses, six out of six administrators acknowledged the importance of teachers seeing them as approachable. Teachers spoke very similarly, with all seven teachers speaking of the desire for high levels of approachability.

Administrator Point of View. With uniformity, administrators spoke of the necessity of approachability. In addition, most administrators noted the limits of approachability and the importance of balancing approachability and boundaries. Most common among their responses were those relating to approachability being a necessary skill for administrators to have open and honest communication with their staff.

Leader 2 said:

I think it's an upper-level skill that the leader has to cultivate. I don't believe that you can be an effective leader if you are not approachable. So, I would say that it is a very high priority, and I think that as far as getting your own work done...just setting boundaries and communicating them openly and honestly [3, 6].

Leader 3 stated:

If staff don't feel like they can come talk to you, then you're not going to know what the issues are on the ground. You're not going to have the rapport or social capital to make changes or have harder discussions or harder decisions you have to make [3, 7].

Leader 5 said:

I think [teachers are] not going to be honest if you're not approachable...When I think of bosses that I've had that have been impactful and that I wanted to develop under or wanted to learn from them, they've always had a, like, collegial approachability [3, 9].

One leader added that proactivity on their part encourages teachers to feel comfortable in approaching the administrator. Proactivity, in this administrator's case, involves actively seeking opportunities to talk with teachers outside of class and to see them in class. According to them, approachability goes beyond personality traits and must include actions to create the desired perception.

Leader 3 said:

The best way for me to be approachable, besides being kind and hopefully decent to be around, is actually come to the teachers, go to them in their classrooms just to check on them during breaks, before and after school, and to be available by going to them instead of just waiting for them to come to me [3, 7].

While all administrators spoke of the need for approachability, several also commented on the need to set boundaries both to maintain professionalism and fulfill their professional responsibilities. For Leader 2, this meant “just setting boundaries and communicating them openly and honestly” [3, 6]. Leader 4 responded similarly by saying, “There's definitely times where my door is closed...and there are times when my door is open where a teacher could come in and ask a quick question” [3, 8]. In Leader 3’s response, one sees an emphasis on balancing approachability with vulnerability and the ability to be efficient in their work.

Leader 3 said:

If you reveal enough about your own thought process, your own experience, your own decisions, your own challenges, it can make you much more approachable with your staff. So, you have to be someone the staff knows they can depend on. And you have to be solid. You have to be predictable in terms of how you respond to it oftentimes. And so, I guess if you are so approachable, that anybody can talk to you about anything, you probably wouldn't be very efficient to get your job done. You know, there's a balance [3, 7].

From a different point of view, one administrator discussed their difficulty with approachability. Noting a tendency toward introversion, this leader makes a specific effort to

become more approachable. For them, this self-awareness helps to foster a behavior in themselves that they see as necessary to lead well.

Leader 6 stated:

I think that sometimes I'm afraid or I worry that that makes me seem unapproachable...I'm always really sad when I find out that someone was hesitant to tell me something or to bring something to my attention that always really, really bothers me. But I also have to recognize that. Then I need to work harder to be more approachable [3, 10].

Beyond making self-aware adjustments, this administrator commented on the importance of having a balanced administrative team, in which those on the team complement each other's strengths and weaknesses [3, 10].

Teacher Point of View. Of the seven teachers interviewed, five noted that, while they expect their administrators to be approachable and available, they also respect the fact that administrators are busy. Some teachers went on to say that, while they expect administrators to be busy, responses to inquiries should occur relatively quickly.

Teacher C said:

I would never expect that an administrator could just take me any time I feel like coming by. You know, technology has become our friend...all you have to do is make an appointment...I think it shows a level of respect because, if I show up to their door and they don't know I'm coming, it can be kind of sideswiping, can also put the supervisor in an awkward position because they have obligations. But yet you're standing right there, and it's hard to say, "I'm sorry I can't chat with you right now." So, by having [an appointment-making system], the teachers know that, hey, this is how my supervisor is

accessible to me. And I've used that kind of a system several times and the administrator knows exactly why I'm coming. And, you know, if I'm angry about something, it also gives me time to cool, you know, and maybe go to them in a bit more professional state of mind rather than just going off about some idea [2, 13].

Teacher E stated:

It's okay for my administrator to go and be in meetings or to have their door closed...they're [a] working person. They're not there to tend to my every need. My ideal is like within twenty-four hours, they're going to respond and we're going to set up a time to meet, like it doesn't have to be immediate. [However], I do not like to sit on a question. I like the question to be answered so that I can move on. And so that in case another question is going to compound that question, I already have one thing ready because I find during the day it's just so busy. So, to have a question lingering for me personally bothers me. And so, I like to know. I prefer to know right away [2, 15].

Teacher G said:

[It's] not that they can always see me at a given time, but relationally, there's an open-door policy if I need to drop in and say something... So basically, my view of them and their approachability are positively correlated or proportionally related [2, 17].

Feedback

In two of the few studies to include specific behaviors regarding principals' attempts to decrease turnover, Hughes et al. (2015) and Greenlee and Brown (2009) found that positive school culture stems in part from a culture of positive feedback, which was important to decreasing turnover. Three of six administrators noted the importance of giving feedback in as positive a light as possible, with one additional emphasizing the need to not judge while initially

giving feedback. A similar proportion of teachers, three out of seven, commented on their desire for positively-framed feedback.

Administrator Point of View. Beyond the desire for positivity, three administrators out of the six interviewed brought up the need for feedback to take place face-to-face.

Administrators noted the importance of face-to-face meetings, especially in cases where any type of criticism might take place. From those three administrators, the desire was to avoid any misunderstanding in tone and for teachers to see and know the intention of care of said feedback.

Leader 2 said:

If there is some constructive criticism, always face to face. I would not write that down. I would not send that in an email before talking to them about it, because they can't interpret my tone from an email, and I want them to hear that I care about them and about the students. And that's why we're having this conversation [3, 6].

Leader 3 said:

I would never write anything critical in [a] message unless it's absolutely necessary. If I had something critical to say, it should always come in a face-to-face meeting, never in a message writing to them, because you can't read the tone and you can't answer their questions [3, 7].

Leader 6 stated:

Definitely, I prefer to talk about it, if I can. Report card comments, though, I'm just going to send you an email, because most of the time it's pretty simple or it's written so I can write something. And sometimes it's just going to their classrooms, having conversations and talking with them about whatever it is, whether it's positive or whether there's something that needs to be changed [3, 10].

Despite the hope for positivity in feedback, two-thirds of administrators recognized the need for honesty. In describing their own style of giving feedback, these four administrators pointed out the need not to shy away from the truth. Though variations arose in how these four administrators gave feedback, the clear opinion was that critical feedback as part of their accepted role.

Leader 1 said:

When you call a meeting where you have to give not such, uh, positive feedback, start with that. Put it out on the table, name it and start with it. And then you explain it and then you end with a positive, knowing that this is a critical point. We believe in you. We want to help you [3, 5].

Leader 3 stated:

So, the general idea is give feedback as often and as positively as you can...If I had something critical to say, it should always come in a face-to-face meeting, never in a message writing to them, because you can't read the tone and you can't answer their questions, they might have curiosities. So, if I have to give feedback, which is a big part of my job, had to be frequent, try to be positive, try to encourage...But I think dignity has to be the underlying principle of any interaction, positive or negative or neutral. Because that person has invested their adulthood into what they do today. And if I kick you for what you do today, that's a pretty terrible thing to do. So, let's walk together. Let's figure this out together. And that allows us to hopefully have positive outcomes [3, 7].

Leader 4 said:

If there's an issue that comes up, I mean, I'm just honest, like a teacher will come in and because I feel like I have that relationship and that rapport with that teacher...We all have

feedback that needs to be given that can be of a critical nature. But I just make sure that I share it in a way where they understand that I care [3, 8].

Teacher Point of View. Teachers largely agreed that feedback from their administrators should be generally positive, validating, and based on presence and relationships. Teacher A's perspective of feedback related largely to the idea that feedback should include both positive aspects and constructive criticism, which will both validate a teacher and push them to improve. In a similar way, Teachers C and D spoke of the importance of having positive interactions with administrators to aid in feedback. In the longest teacher reply on feedback, Teacher G commented on the connection between positivity, critiques, and their perspective of their principal.

Teacher A said:

I, actually, am one of the rare ones that enjoy constructive criticism, because I feel like that's the way that I learn to grow as an educator...I do expect our supervisors to keep us accountable for professional growth...Teaching is already a profession in which it's hard to step up...it's not really a profession where you receive a lot of validation...so it's really important for me to feel like the work that I'm putting in is validated [2, 11].

Teacher C said:

Be genuine...notice what people are doing and be able to give that positive feedback to help establish that relationship. It's much harder to take criticism from somebody you don't know, because you don't know the heart behind it. You don't know the mindset from where that's coming from [2, 13].

Teacher D stated:

Coming in my room, seeing what we're doing, like, having a presence...I, personally, desire feedback about, like, what I could improve...I mean, obviously I like [feedback] to be wrapped in positivity because I don't want to be, like, torn down. But I think constructive positive feedback is really helpful [2, 14].

Teacher G stated:

It comes back to a similar feeling of, at the end of the day, does this person care about me? Not that I need to receive only good news...But like, give me that sense that you're building up. You see something good that I'm doing. It's not just a critical relationship...But I have, at least, the desire to have the sense that this person is glad they hired me, they're glad I'm under their supervision, and they verbalize that [2, 17].

Though teachers spoke primarily to the overall message of feedback, one teacher specifically noted the importance of principal feedback not encroaching on a teachers' ability to attempt new teaching methods. In doing so, this teacher said, an administrator will give teachers the ability to do their job at the highest level possible. Despite desiring the freedom to make professional judgments without interference, this teacher also spoke of a strong desire for feedback.

Teacher A said:

I actually am one of the rare ones that enjoy constructive criticism, because I feel like that's the way that I learned to grow as an educator...With that, I think it's important that they also give us the agency to experiment, to just give us room to breathe, not to micromanage but give us that room and space to try and fail while being guided alongside [2, 11].

Leadership Style

The final topic examined specific leadership style preferences of teachers and the leadership styles that administrators described themselves as having. Transformational leadership serves as a common and effective leadership style among school principals in the United States (Berkovich, 2016; Hauserman & Stick, 2013; Sun & Henderson, 2017). In one of few studies on international schools, Roberts and Mancuso (2014) found that traits common to transformational leaders were some of the most frequently mentioned in job advertisements for leaders in international schools. Teachers answered this topic in three questions on the questionnaire, while administrators directly described their leadership styles.

Administrator Point of View. While not running counter to the idea of transformational leadership, three out of six administrators in this study described their leadership style as servant-based. Additionally, two administrators spoke of leading by example. Despite a number of administrators previously emphasizing the relational aspects of leading, only one specifically included it in their description of their own leadership.

Leader 2 said:

I think them seeing that I'm willing to do those kinds of things to be a servant to them, as opposed to 'I'm the supervisor. Hey, you guys put your chairs up before you leave, please.' You know, that's how you treat kids, not professionals. And so I just try, I greet everyone by name. I try and know a little bit about them. I try and make some small talk occasionally when I have the opportunity to do little things like one of their duties or to get coverage for something. I try and do that. And again, I think when you do it with little things, they just ascribe those qualities to the big things too. So I think I probably have more trust than I have earned because of what I've done in the background [3, 6].

Leader 3 stated:

I'm a servant leader at heart and a situational leader in practice...and so my nature is to help and support however I can...But I know that each moment requires me to be a different kind of leader, but consistent in terms of the person [3, 7].

Leader 4 said:

The words that come out for me are probably servant, charismatic, inspirational. I like to be less transactional, although transactions have to be made. But yeah, I want to inspire the people that I lead. I want to lead by example [3, 7].

Leader 6 stated:

I want to be somebody who is able to take the problems that we face as a school or as a division or even just [teams or colleagues] and find solutions...or at least begin to resolve them....I want to be somebody who's willing to engage in that and work toward having an environment we work well together and where we support our students...I like to lead by example, I guess, is what I'm saying [3, 10].

While not tied to a specific characteristic, four administrators spoke of the balance between several characteristics. For Leader 1, the balance between the characteristics of intellect, energy, people skills, and integrity came to the forefront. For Leader 2, they spoke of a balance between giving teachers agency and holding them accountable. Leader 4 commented on the balance between transaction and inspiration. Leader 5 noted a balance between professional and relational.

Teacher Point of View. The questionnaire asked teachers to choose from among four common leadership styles in response to several prompts. The first prompt asked which leadership style, among the four similar yet distinct styles described, the teacher perceived as

being the best school leader. Out of 26 responses, 12 respondents chose Authentic Leadership as the type they perceived as the best school leader. A further eight chose Servant Leadership, while six chose Transformational Leadership. No respondents chose Charismatic Leadership.

A second question asked teachers which type of leadership style they preferred in a leader, as opposed to the first question, which asked which leadership style would make the best school leader. In this question, responses varied more widely, with three of the four choices having a similar number of selections. When asked which type of leadership they preferred, eight teachers chose Servant Leadership, seven teachers chose Authentic Leadership, and six teachers chose Transformational Leadership. A further four teachers opted for some combination of those three styles.

The third question focused on selecting which of the four leadership styles were most ill-suited to school leadership. In this, responses varied little, with 25 out of 26 saying that a charismatic leadership style did not fit their view of a good school leader. One teacher chose servant leadership as ill-suited to school leadership, while none chose transformational and authentic leadership.

Conclusion

Seeking to understand the perception of school leaders by teachers, this research study shows areas in which school leaders' and teachers' perceptions are similar and areas in which they are dissimilar. Research shows increased retention for those with a positive view of their principal (Allensworth et al., 2009; Boyd et al., 2011; Fuller et al., 2016; Jackson, 2012; Kraft et al., 2016; Mancuso et al., 2011; Player et al., 2017; Ryan et al., 2017; Sutchter et al., 2016; Torres, 2016), understanding the perspectives and needs of both sides allows teachers and administrators to make better decisions.

The current study found many areas in which administrators' and teachers' perspectives matched quite closely, yet other areas in which those perspectives differed. One recurring theme was that of relationships. While previous studies connected teacher relationships with turnover (Allensworth et al., 2009; Donitsa-Schmidt & Zuzovsky, 2016), no studies found in researching specifically discussed relationships between teachers and administrators. While an implied positive relationship could come from teachers' positive perception of their principal, studies never stated it specifically. In this study, from the perspective of both teachers and administrators, a positive relationship fosters the desired environment from both perspectives, mutual respect, honesty, proactivity, trust, frequent communication, approachability, and positive feedback help make this a reality.

While there were few ways in which the two perspectives were incompatible, the details of how each side viewed specific topics showed some potential areas in which administrators and teachers have differing points of view. In the area of support, teachers specifically noted a desire for administrator presence and back-up, while administrators focused on positive relationships. In the area of feedback, teachers and administrators showed agreement in general, yet teachers also wanted to have certain care for teachers evident in the feedback. While principals rated highly in collaboration, trust, and respect correlate to decreased turnover (Allensworth et al., 2009; Hauserman & Stick, 2013), Jones and Watson (2017) found that these behaviors had little to no effect on turnover. This research shows that the gap between the perspectives of teachers and administrators is a narrow one. Yet, any gap shows potential areas in which growth could occur. Chapter 5 will focus on a discussion of the results, conclusions, and recommendations for future action and research.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This study sought to better understand the perspectives of teachers in international schools in South Korea related to the way principals can influence turnover in schools. This qualitative research study used two data collection methods of questionnaires and semistructured interviews of both teachers and administrators. Data pointed to administrators emphasizing relationship building, honesty, boundaries, multiple forms of communication, and feedback. At the same time, teachers spoke of a desire for presence, support, positivity, transparency, trust, and care. While certainly not at odds with each other, the difference in responses speaks to the importance of differing perspectives of teachers and administrators. This chapter will delve more deeply into a discussion of the results, including the limitations, practical application, and future research.

Discussion of Research Question 1a

Research finds that positive teacher perceptions of their principal increase the likelihood of choosing to stay at their school (Allensworth et al., 2009; Boyd et al., 2011; Fuller et al., 2016; Hughes et al., 2015; Jackson, 2012; Kraft et al., 2016; Player et al., 2017; Ryan et al., 2017; Sutcher et al., 2016; Torres, 2016), one can conclude that any factor which affects that positive perception would impact teachers' turnover intention decisions. Among the results in this study, three teacher responses showed up in at least three different topics: presence, transparency, and relationships. As the most commonly cited factors, teachers think these are important behaviors or traits in their perception of an administrator.

Even among the few studies on international schools, research finds that support from administrators influences teachers to stay at their current school (Dos Santos, 2019; Gardner-McTaggart, 2018a, 2018b; Kartika & Purba, 2018; Mancuso et al., 2010). Teachers in the current

study cited presence as a key factor in their desire for support. Connected to this idea of support, both administrators and teachers described a desire for a high degree of approachability in administrators. In line with teacher responses, administrators described approachability and presence as factors they saw as important, as well.

Though transparency did not come up as a factor in previous research, teachers in this study considered transparency an important aspect of a leader. Teachers cited transparency as the second most common specific behavior desired by teachers in an administrator and in responses regarding communication. While wanting transparency, teachers also commented that administrators should be careful with what they share to avoid oversharing. Teachers also noted the importance of conciseness. Thus, while teachers want an administrator to be transparent, limits exist.

The final factor that arose most commonly for teachers was the need for a relationship between themselves and their administrators. Explicitly mentioned related to feedback, teachers shared that positive feedback had a role in building the relationship between themselves and their administrator. The two previous factors of transparency and presence feed into this idea of a relationship. Teachers that choose to stay at their school tend to have positive perceptions of their administrators (Allensworth et al., 2009; Boyd et al., 2011; Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Hammonds, 2017; Hughes et al., 2015; Kini & Podolsky, 2016; Player et al., 2017; Sutchter et al., 2016), though the research compiled for this study did not specifically study teachers' perceptions of their relationship with their administrators and its influence on turnover. However, with one's perception of the strength of that relationship inextricably linked with the positivity of perception, one could make a logical conclusion that teachers who perceive the relationship with their administrator as strong would be more likely to stay at their school.

Discussion of Research Question 1b

Intertwined with the previous research question, teachers described professional experience needs based on transparency, presence, backup, and professional courtesy. Player et al. (2017) and Watson (2018) found that increases in job satisfaction and job fit correlated to an increase in retention. With a clear relationship between these items and professional experience, administrators must understand the areas in which teachers see administrators most impacting their professional experience.

As stated above, presence and its related trait of approachability came to the forefront when teachers discussed the area of teacher support. While teachers might define support very differently from one another (Boyd et al., 2011), teachers in this study emphasized the need for administrators to simply be around them. In this opinion, teachers and administrators were in sync. From the administrator side, an emphasis on relationships came through frequently, which can only occur if an administrator is present. Additionally, as above, transparency in communication became an important factor for teachers. With the prospect of oversharing and limits to transparency mentioned by both teachers and administrators, there is a clear value placed on trust and discretion, as well.

When asked about undesired traits in an administrator, the most common response was that of being unavailable. Selfishness and a lack of communication and honesty came next down the list. While these responses predominantly reflected the negative perspective of teachers' responses when asked about desired traits, compared to the positively-phrased trait of availability/presence, two additional teachers mentioned unavailability as an undesirable trait.

With more than one-third of responses in this open-ended question mentioning the same undesired trait, even though this only amounted to eight out of 26 respondents, it was clear that this was an important factor for teachers' professional experience.

Discussion of Research Question 1

With an overarching research question related to teacher perceptions of principal leadership and those perceptions' impact on retention, the results showed general agreement between the perspectives of teachers and administrators. Though limited in number, research shows that support from administrators in international schools influences retention (Dos Santos, 2019; Gardner-McTaggart, 2018a, 2018b; Kartika & Purba, 2018; Mancuso et al., 2010); thus, the similarity in which teachers and administrators define support could prove to be a powerful predictor of retention. Within many responses, a focus on the relationship between teachers and administrators came to the forefront. In most areas, responses from both sides were similar, with one or two differences. Yet, those differences likely make a large impact on those responding in that way. For example, in support, both sides discussed the need for the purposefulness of action, yet teachers specifically mentioned the need for presence and back-up, while administrators noted respect, professional development, and relationship-building. While administrators may have intended presence and back-up from their responses, none specifically stated it. As well, these responses, while not running counter to one another, show differences in the perspectives of teachers and administrators.

As this study did not collect data related to the turnover decisions of teachers, these results cannot speak specifically to the efficacy of administrators in retaining staff. However, as the results showed parallel responses in many areas, school leaders should feel encouraged that administrators and teachers see eye-to-eye in what it takes to retain staff. With these similarities

in response, one could surmise a positive perception of leaders by teachers, which studies find to be a major factor in retention (Allensworth et al., 2009; Boyd et al., 2011; Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Hammonds, 2017; Hughes et al., 2015; Kini & Podolsky, 2016; Player et al., 2017; Sutchter et al., 2016). One primary area of difference is teachers' need to feel cared for, backed up, and prioritized. As administrators noted the need to focus on relationship building, these concerns of teachers should be kept in mind, and administrators' relationship-building efforts should address those needs specifically.

Conclusions

This qualitative study sought to better understand the perspectives of teachers in international schools on leadership. By using a questionnaire and semistructured interviews with teachers and administrators, this study echoed studies done in the United States and abroad. Echoing the work of Greenlee and Brown (2009) and Hughes et al. (2015), both teachers and administrators brought up the need for feedback to be positive. With that, echoing the results of Boyd et al. (2011), teachers and leaders brought up many ways in which support should appear. Yet, the overarching themes of proactivity, presence, positivity, and relationships emerged.

The work of Allensworth et al. (2009) connected the ideas of trust and respect to high teacher retention. While this study did not gather data on teacher turnover intention, teachers frequently identified trustworthiness as a desired trait. Teachers also discussed the need for a leader who can connect with them and communicate with them in an efficient way. Roberts and Mancuso (2014), in one of few studies in international schools, had similar results. Further supporting this result, Player et al. (2017) correlated teachers rating an administrator highly in communication with decreased turnover. Speaking to the bigger picture of communication,

Player et al. (2017) also commented that teachers desired a leader who was strong in “communicating a vision” (p. 338).

Without a significant number of studies done in the world of international schools, a true comparison of this study with others in its context is difficult. For those teaching and leading in international schools, this lack of research means relying on a body of knowledge formed in a different context, spending considerable resources to create a new body of knowledge or some combination of those. Yet similarities in the results of studies done in the United States and this study make it clear that careful comparison can be helpful and enlightening.

Limitations

Due to this study’s reliance on questionnaires and semistructured interviews, the perspectives of the participants form the basis of all responses. While respondents’ recall of specific situations or events could be limited (Polkinghorne, 2005), resulting in potentially untrue perspectives, triangulation was used, which helps to ascertain truth even among these perspectives. Additionally, one’s own “language, gender, social class, race, and ethnicity” (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998, p. 12) can influence perspectives for which this study cannot account. As this study did not collect data on the turnover intention of individuals or turnover figures of schools, it relies entirely on participants’ responses, which limits the study as described above.

Second, the nature of qualitative research limits the generalizability of the results (Anderson, 2017; Flick, 2007; Polkinghorne, 2005). Outside of methodological limitations, the number of participant schools, teachers, and administrators might limit the applicability of the results even further. While the number of respondents was within the desired range, additional responses could have given more data to draw conclusions.

To aid in controlling for the limitations, I kept the scope of research to the narrow topic of perceptions of leadership, utilized the dissertation advisor to ensure the accuracy of coding of transcripts, and required that all participants be currently licensed and practicing teachers or administrators in an international school in South Korea. This study used an audit trail (see Appendix C) to track data collection and further maintain the study's credibility (Saldaña & Omasta, 2018).

While impossible to quantify, the current COVID-19 pandemic could have influenced this study. As this pandemic has impacted the world in various ways, it stands to reason that COVID-19 has impacted this study as well. Had this research been conducted before or after COVID-19, the results could change.

Implications

Most of the relevant studies that I could find were based on schools in the United States, limiting the generalizability of said research to international schools in South Korea. A limited amount of research into international schools exists, with even fewer touching on the stated research question. Due to the low number of applied research studies, the current study adds to the literature and gives international schools, especially those in South Korea, something to examine. With the similarity of responses between administrators and teachers, one could expect turnover to be relatively low. However, if this were not the case, school leaders should look to other potential causes of turnover, which this study did not attempt to solicit.

As educational research in international schools is still developing, further research could add greatly to leaders' ability to effectively steward their institutions. While the dearth of American-based research can give a baseline understanding of many areas, the uniqueness of international schools necessitates accounting for other factors to aid in staff retention. The

current study begins to foster research into this new context; additional research would greatly increase academia's understanding of international schools.

Recommendations

Practical Application

As administrator and teacher perceptions showed relative similarity, administrators and teachers should feel encouraged that teacher perceptions of leaders largely match the perceptions of teachers' needs by leaders. If turnover in an institution stays at acceptable levels over an extended time period, school leaders likely work with faculty and administrators in sync with teacher needs and ways to meet those needs. However, for institutions seeking to decrease turnover, the results in this study yield several recommendations.

With so few studies on international schools (Gardner-McTaggart, 2018b; Mancuso et al., 2010; Odland & Ruzicka, 2009), individual schools should purposefully track their own data to find baselines for turnover. In doing so, administrators can have a better understanding of exactly what they can expect from year to year, as well as understand when there is cause for concern. Without a baseline of real data, administrators rely on anecdotal evidence to make decisions. However, by tracking turnover by division, subject, grade, and other specifications, administrators equip themselves with the tools to make decisions.

As part of gathering data to determine a turnover baseline, administrators should perform robust exit interviews and gather purposeful feedback throughout the year. Administrators can quickly know of items that need addressing by identifying incongruent perspectives among teachers and administrators. Along similar lines, international schools should adopt a proactive approach to gathering feedback from staff regarding administrators, from administrators regarding themselves, and the supervisors regarding administrators. This feedback should

provide opportunities to voice opinions related to a wide range of a leader's performance-related, specifically to the leader's job duties. Data should include open-ended response opportunities to gather valuable qualitative feedback. After going through a self-rating process on similar topics, administrators can reflect on the match or mismatch between their self-ratings and those of their staff.

As both teachers and administrators stated the importance of relationships to the success of a teacher-administrator relationship, one very important application of this research is for administrators to keep their avenues of communication open as much as possible (Boyd et al., 2011; Roberts & Mancuso, 2014; Sutchter et al., 2016). While teachers shared a dislike for oversharing, a proactive presence and affirmative communication frequently came to teachers' minds in their responses. Thus, school leaders must ensure that administrators have the ability, both in skill and time, to, literally and figuratively, be there.

Future Research

Stemming from this research study, several other opportunities for research come to mind. As the current study limited the scope to a small number of schools, expanding the research to include other international schools would increase understanding of the needs of teachers. This additional research could occur in South Korea and other countries with international schools. Further, a baseline of turnover rates in international schools would provide fruitful data. In doing so, one could compare the copious amounts of data from American schools regarding teacher turnover rates, reasons for turnover, and what teachers desire in an administrator.

The acquisition of data for this study occurred during the COVID-19 pandemic. Repeating this study once the pandemic has passed could confirm the results or provide new

data, which might shed further light on this area. A search of existing literature found very few studies on international schools or international school teachers. Any substantive research into this area would add to the body of knowledge.

Summary

With international schools growing rapidly (Hallgarten et al., 2015; ISC Research, 2019), more and more teachers find themselves moving abroad. Projections show that the number of teachers at these schools will grow nearly 50% in the 10-year period from 2015 to 2025 (ISC Research, 2019), nearly doubling the percentage growth of teachers in American schools (Walker, 2018). This qualitative study sought to understand the perceptions of principal leadership on retention in these schools, using South Korea as an example, through questionnaires answered by teachers and interviews of both teachers and administrators.

Teachers in international schools in South Korea described their desire for a present, transparent, positive, and approachable leader. Administrators, on the other hand, described their leadership as based on intentionality, approachability, relationships, positivity, communication, and serving. From a school leadership perspective, these results point to administrators and teachers being in sync with one another, encouraging leaders, teachers, and administrators.

Yet, with the “paucity of literature” (Gardner-McTaggart, 2018b) on international schools, readers should view these results cautiously. While the teacher perspective echoes the results of studies done in the United States, additional research could further support similarities of results or open up areas of contrast. Additionally, further research to find baselines on which leaders can compare their own schools’ turnover, retention, and reasons for turnover would greatly benefit their own decision-making process. Additionally, as the COVID-19 pandemic has

impacted the world during the entirety of this study, research done post-COVID could help confirm or reject these findings.

References

- Allensworth, E., Ponisciak, S., & Mazzeo, C. (2009). *The schools teachers leave: Teacher mobility in Chicago Public Schools*. Consortium on Chicago School Research.
- Anderson, V. (2017). Criteria for evaluating qualitative research. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 1–9.
https://pure.port.ac.uk/ws/files/6930813/ANDERSONv_2017_cright_HRDQ_Criteria_for_Evaluating_Qualitative_Research.pdf
- Aydin, I., Toptas, B., Demir, T., & Eremlı, Ö. (2019). Being an expatriate teacher in Turkish private schools: Opinions on education, teaching, and administrative processes. *Education and Science*, 44(200), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.15390/eb.2019.8105>
- Baker, S. E., & Edwards, R. (2012). *How many qualitative interviews is enough?* Review paper for National Centre for Research Methods.
http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/2273/4/how_many_interviews.pdf
- Barnes, J. M. (2019). Teachers' values: An international study of what sustains a fulfilling life in education. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 7(5), 1–18.
<https://doi.org/10.11114/jetsv7i5.4151>
- Berkovich, I. (2016). School leaders and transformational leadership theory: Time to part ways? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 54(5), 609–622. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-11-2015-0100>
- Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2012). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A road map from beginning to end* (2nd ed.). Sage.

- Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Ing, M., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2011). The influence of school administrators on teacher retention decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(2), 303–333. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831210380788>
- Bunnell, T., Fertig, M., & James, C. (2017). Establishing the legitimacy of a school’s claim to be “International”: The provision of an international curriculum as the institutional primary task. *Educational Review*, 69(3), 303–317. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2016.1213224>
- Careers & Employment. (n.d.). <https://www.yisseoul.org/about/careers>
- Carroll, T. G. (2007). Policy brief: The high cost of teacher turnover. *National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future*. <http://nieer.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/NCTAFCostofTeacherTurnoverpolicybrief.pdf>
- Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Teacher turnover: Why it matters and what we can do about it. *Learning Policy Institute*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED606805.pdf>
- Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2019). The trouble with teacher turnover: How teacher attrition affects students and schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 27(36), 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.27.3699>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1998). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues* (pp. 1–34). Sage.

- Department for Education, United Kingdom. (n.d.). *Education and training statistics for the United Kingdom: 2017*. <https://www.besa.org.uk/key-uk-education-statistics/>.
- Di Carlo, M. (2015, January 22). *Update on teacher turnover in the US*. Albert Shanker Institute. <http://www.shankerinstitute.org/blog/update-teacher-turnover-us>
- Donitsa-Schmidt, S., & Zuzovsky, R. (2016). Quantitative and qualitative teacher shortage and the turnover phenomenon. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 77, 83–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2016.03.005>
- Dos Santos, L. M. (2019). Recruitment and retention of international school teachers in remote archipelagic countries: The Fiji Experience. *Education Sciences*, 9(132), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci9020132>
- Employment. (n.d.). <https://www.seoulforeign.org/about/employment/>
- Employment*. (n.d.). <https://www.siskorea.org/join-us/employment>
- Fleishman, E. A. (1957). A leader behavior description for industry. In R.M. Stogdill & A.E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Flick, U. (2007). *Designing qualitative research*. Sage.
- Foreign schools. (n.d.). <http://english.seoul.go.kr/life-information/education-studying-in-seoul/education-for-foreign-residents/1-foreign-schools/>
- Fuller, B., Waite, A., & Irribarra, D. T. (2016). Explaining teacher turnover: School cohesion and intrinsic motivation in Los Angeles. *American Journal of Education*, 122(4), 537–567. <https://doi.org/10.1086/687272>

- Gardner-McTaggart, A. (2018a). Birds of a feather: Senior international baccalaureate international schools leadership in service. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 17(1), 67–83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240918768295>
- Gardner-McTaggart, A. (2018b). International schools: Leadership reviewed. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 17(2), 148–163. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240918793955>
- Gomba, C. (2015). Why do they stay: Factors influencing teacher retention in rural Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Instruction*, 8(2), 55–68. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1085319.pdf>
- Greenlee, B., & Brown, J. J. (2009). Retaining teachers in challenging schools. *Education*, 130(1), 96–109. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ871642.pdf>
- Grissom, J. A., Rodriguez, L. A., & Kern, E. C. (2017). Teacher and principal diversity and the representation of students of color in gifted programs: Evidence from national data. *The Elementary School Journal*, 117(3), 396–422. <https://doi.org/10.1086/690274>
- Hallgarten, J., Tabberer, R., & McCarthy, K. (2015). International schools as creative catalysts for a new global education system. *ECIS*. <https://www.ecis.org/research-media-publications/infocus/>
- Halpin, A. W., & Winer, B. J. (1957). A factorial study of the leader behavior descriptions. In R.M. Stogdill, & A.E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Hammonds, T. (2017). High teacher turnover: Strategies school leaders implement to retain teachers in urban elementary schools. *National Teacher Education Journal*, 10(2), 63–72. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&authtype>

[=crawler&jrnl=21570590&AN=128857596&h=okdT5eihiGI9oYd60pGhw2TYau%2Fy4WHVfh1YT%2Fwd9bOKwRjSYNSCvN12SDnjRS%2BB%2Fwr44mZsZTsi8aCRR7BX%2BQ%3D%3D&crl=c](https://www.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1057940.pdf)

Hauserman, C. P., & Stick, S. L. (2013). The leadership teachers want from principals:

Transformational. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 36(3), 184–203.

<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1057940.pdf>

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

<http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1203451.pdf>

Hughes, A. L., Matt, J. J., & O'Reilly, F. L. (2015). Principal support is imperative to the retention of teachers in hard-to-staff schools. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*,

3(1), 129–134. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1054905.pdf>

ISC Research. (2019). *Data and intel*. <https://www.iscresearch.com/data>

Jackson, K. K. (2012). Influence matters: The link between principal and teacher influence over school policy and teacher turnover. *Journal of School Leadership*, 22(5), 875–901.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/105268461202200503>

Jones, D., & Watson, S. B. (2017). The relationship between administrative leadership behaviors

and teacher retention in Christian schools. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*,

26(1), 44–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10656219.2017.1282903>

Kaden, U., Patterson, P. P., Healy, J., & Adams, B. L. (2016). Stemming the revolving door:

Teacher retention and attrition in Arctic Alaska schools. *Global Education Review*, 3(1),

129–147. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1090201.pdf>

- Kahlke, R. M. (2014). Generic qualitative approaches: Pitfalls and benefits of methodological mixology. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *13*, 37–52.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/160940691401300119>
- Kartika, G., & Purba, D. E. (2018). Job satisfaction and turnover intention: The mediating effect of affective commitment. *Psychological Research on Urban Society*, *1*(2), 100–106.
<https://doi.org/10.7454/proust.v1i2.34>
- Kim, B. E. (2017, May 3). British Columbia-authorized school in Seoul to shut down. *The Korean Times*. http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/nation/2017/12/181_228730.html
- Kim, K., Harris, C. J., & Pham, L. (2018). How character education impacts teachers. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Perspectives in Higher Education*, *3*(1), 45–67. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jimphe.v3i1.632>
- Kini, T., & Podolsky, A. (2016). Does teaching experience increase teacher effectiveness? A review of the research. Learning Policy Institute.
- Kraft, M. A., Marinell, W. H., & Yee, S. W. D. (2016). School organizational contexts, teacher turnover, and student achievement: Evidence from panel data. *American Educational Research Journal*, *53*(5), 1411–1449. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216667478>
- Leavy, P. (2017). *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, arts-based, and community-based participatory research approaches*. Guilford.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.
- Lindqvist, P., Nordanger, U. K., & Carlsson, R. (2014). Teacher attrition the first five years – A multifaceted image. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *40*, 94–103.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.02.005>

Listings in alternative university preparatory schools. (n.d.).

<https://expatschoolskorea.com/listing/alternative-university-preparatory-schools>

Listings in International Baccalaureate Schools. (n.d.).

<https://expatschoolskorea.com/listing/international-baccalaureate-schools-ib>

Listings in MOE (Ministry of Education) accredited schools. (n.d.).

<https://expatschoolskorea.com/listing/moe-ministry-of-education-accredited-schools>

Listings in WASC accredited international schools. (n.d.).

<https://expatschoolskorea.com/listing/wasc-accredited-international-schools>

Mack, N., Woodsong, C., MacQueen, K. M., Guest, G., & Namey, E. (2005). Qualitative research methods: A data collector's field guide. *Family Health International*, 1–137.

<https://www.fhi360.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/Qualitative%20Research%20Methods%20-%20A%20Data%20Collector's%20Field%20Guide.pdf>

Mancuso, S. V., Roberts, L., & White, G. P. (2010). Teacher retention in international schools: The key role of school leadership. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 9(3), 306–323. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240910388928>

Mancuso, S. V., Roberts, L., White, G. P., Yoshida, R. K., & Weston, D. (2011). Strategies to improve teacher retention in American overseas schools in the Near East South Asia region: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of School Leadership*, 21(6), 819–844.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/105268461102100604>

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Expatriate. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/expatriate>

Nagrath, C. (2011, August 26). What makes an international school? *The International Educator*.

<https://www.tieonline.com/article/87/what-makes-a-school-international->

National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). *Teacher turnover: Stayers, movers, and leavers*.

<https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicatorslc.asp>

Odland, G., & Ruzicka, M. (2009). An investigation into teacher turnover in international schools. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 8(1), 5–29.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240908100679>

O’Neil, J. (2019). Faculty famine. *ISC Research*.

https://www.iscresearch.com/uploaded/images/Publicity/Education_Investor_Global_-_Article_-_Faculty_famine.pdf

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Player, D., Youngs, P., Perrone, F., & Grogan, E. (2017). How principal leadership and person-job fit are associated with teacher mobility and attrition. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67, 330–339.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.06.017>

Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research.

Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52(2), 137–145. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.137>

Ring, H. R., & West, A. R. (2015). Teacher retention in refugee and emergency settings: The state of the literature. *International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives*, 14(3),

106–121. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1086716.pdf>

Roberts, L., & Mancuso, S. V. (2014). What kind of international school leaders are in demand around the world? A test of differences by region and stability over time. *Journal of*

Research in International Education, 13(2), 91–105.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240914532214>

Ryan, S. V., von der Embse, N. P., Pendergast, L. L., Saeki, E., Segool, N., & Schwing, S. (2017). Leaving the teaching profession: The role of teacher stress and educational accountability policies on turnover intent. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 66, 1–11.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.03.016>

Saldaña, J., & Omasta, M. (2018). *Qualitative research: Analyzing life*. Sage.

Seoul Metropolitan Government. (n.d.). *Education for foreign residents: Foreign schools*.

<http://english.seoul.go.kr/life-information/education-studying-in-seoul/education-for-foreign-residents/1-foreign-schools/>

Shartle, C. L. (1957). Introduction. In R.M. Stogdill & A.E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

Stogdill, R. M. (1963). *Manual for the leader behavior description questionnaire-Form XII: An experimental revision*. Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, Ohio State University.

Strauss, V., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017, September 19). Where have all the teachers gone?

The Washington Post. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2017/09/18/where-have-all-the-teachers-gone/>

Sun, R., & Henderson, A. C. (2017). Transformational leadership and organizational processes:

Influencing public performance. *Public Administration Review*, 77(4), 554–565.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12654>

SurveyMonkey. (2020, July 7). *Security statement*.

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/legal/privacy-policy/#security>

Sutcher, L., Darling-Hammond, L., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2016). A coming crisis in teaching? Teacher supply, demand, and shortages in the US. *Learning Policy Institute*.

<https://doi.org/10.54300/247.242>

Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27(2), 237–246.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214005283748>

Torres, A. C. (2016). Is this work sustainable? Teacher turnover and perceptions of workload in charter management organizations. *Urban Education*, 51(8), 891–914.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085914549367>

Total number of schools in South Korea in 2019, by type of school. (2020). Statista.

<https://www.statista.com/statistics/1034516/south-korea-number-of-schools-by-type-of-school/>

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2018). Characteristics of public school teachers. In *The Condition of Education 2019*.

https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_clr.asp

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2019a). Table 105.40 Number of teachers in elementary and secondary schools, and faculty in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by control of institution: Selected years, fall 1970 through fall 2028. In US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics: 2018*.

https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d18/tables/dt18_105.40.asp?referrer=report

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2019b). Table 105.30.

Enrollment in elementary, secondary, and degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by level and control of institution: Selected years, 1869-70 through fall 2028. In US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics: 2018*.

https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d18/tables/dt18_105.30.asp?referrer=report

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2019c). The condition of education 2019: At a glance. In US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics: 2018*.

https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2019/At_a_Glance_508C.pdf

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2020, February 11). *Job openings and labor turnover – December 2019*. <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/jolts.pdf>

Vera, C. P. (2013). *Career mobility patterns of public school teachers* (UMI No. 3565830) [Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Stony Brook]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Walker, T. (2018, June 8). *Who is the average US teacher?* National Education Association.

<http://neatoday.org/2018/06/08/who-is-the-average-u-s-teacher/#targetText=The%203.8%20million%20public%20school,were%20teaching%20in%201999%2D2000>

Watson, J. M. (2018). Job embeddedness may hold the key to the retention of novice talent in schools. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program*

Development, 29(1), 26–43. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1172221.pdf>

Worthington, M. (n.d.). *Differences between phenomenological research and a basic qualitative research design.*

<http://a1149861.sites.myregisteredsite.com/DifferencesBetweenPhenomenologicalResearchAndBasicQualitativeResearchDesign.pdf>

Appendix A: Informed Consent

You may be able to take part in a research study. This form provides important information about that study, including the risks and benefits to you as a potential participant. Please read this form carefully and ask the researcher any questions that you may have about the study. You can ask about research activities and any risks or benefits you may experience. You may also wish to discuss your participation with other people, such as your family doctor or a family member. Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary. You may refuse to participate or stop your participation at any time and for any reason without any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

1. Introduction and Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to understand teachers' perceptions of their schools' leadership and the impact, if any, on teacher retention. This study will be specifically looking at international schools in South Korea.

2. Description of Research

The study that teachers are volunteering to participate in will entail answering questions via an online questionnaire with the possibility of a follow-up face-to-face (or Zoom) interview. All questions will be regarding your view of leadership in the context of international schools and how that leadership might or might not impact your decision to stay at your place of work. For principals volunteering for the study, face-to-face interviews will be conducted with questions based on their view of leadership (both in theory and in practice) at their respective schools.

3. Subject Participation

Participants in this study must currently be a teacher or principal in an international school in South Korea. Principals must have been in their principal position in South Korea for at least one year. Teacher participants will take a questionnaire, which will take approximately 10-15 minutes. A randomly selected group of teachers will then be asked to participate in face-to-face interviews lasting approximately 45 minutes. Principal participants will be asked to sit for a face-to-face (or video chat) interview of approximately 45 minutes.

4. Potential Risks

There are no known or expected risks for participants in this study. If there is any change to this, all participants will be contacted with the relevant details.

5. Potential Benefits

While there is no immediate benefit for participants, their participation in this study will aid in understanding leadership in international schools in South Korea. As members of that community, this could have the long-term benefit of helping leaders to better understand how teachers want to be led leading to a better experience for teachers.

6. Confidentiality

All participants' participation in the study will be kept strictly confidential, with names and any identifying information removed from any published information. Names and identifying information will not be shared with principals or other participants. All records, including transcripts, notes, and recordings of interviews, will be kept on the researcher's private laptop and hard drive, with access to said items limited to the researcher and those directly part of the research process. All video and audio recordings will be destroyed after the dissertation has been completed.

For those completing an online survey, the primary risk with this study is breach of confidentiality. However, steps have been taken to minimize this risk. There will be no collecting of any personal identification data during the survey. However, Survey Monkey may collect information from your computer. You may read their privacy statements here: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/policy/privacy-policy/>.

7. Voluntary Participation

Participants are taking part in this study on a strictly voluntary basis. At any point before, during, or after the study, consent may be withdrawn with all records, videos, audio recordings, and transcriptions destroyed. Participants may choose to answer or not answer any question in the study. If you desire to change your mind as to participation in the study, please contact the research at the email below stating your wishes.

9. Contact

With any questions regarding the study, please contact the researcher, Caleb Coleman, at xxxxxxx@acu.edu. If desired, you may also contact the researcher's advisor, Dr. Mary Christopher at xxxxxxx@acu.edu.

10. Consent Signature (lines, for name, signature, and date of participant)

On the lines below, write your name and sign if you understand and agree to all of the items stated above.

Name of Participant

Signature of Participant

Date

Appendix B: Questionnaire, Teacher Interview Questions, and Leader Questions

Questionnaire

Instructions: Please answer the following questions. Questions 1-7 provide demographic information used in aggregate format only. The next 10 questions relate to impact of leadership on your decision to leave or stay at a particular school. Answer each question in phrases or complete sentences, providing examples where applicable. Review the consent form through the attached link. Completion of the survey implies consent to be involved in the study.

Demographics

1. Are you a licensed teacher at an international school in South Korea?
 - If no, this is the end.
 - If yes, continue.
2. Identify your gender?
 - Male
 - Female
3. How many years have you taught at your current school?
 - 0-2 years
 - 3-5 years
 - 6-10 years
 - More than 10 years
4. How many years have you taught in international schools?
 - 0-2 years
 - 3-5 years
 - 6-10 years
 - More than 10 years
5. How many total years have you taught?
 - 0-2 years
 - 3-5 years
 - 6-10 years
 - More than 10 years
6. How often have you changed schools?
 - Never
 - Approximately every 2 years
 - Approximately every 4 years
 - Approximately every 5 years
7. Explain the reason(s) for changing schools.

Questions

1. What kind of instructional guidance do you expect in a leader?
2. Describe your expectations regarding how school leaders relate to school personnel, parents, and the community.

3. A regular part of a school leader's job is to communicate with teachers, staff, students, parents, and the community. Describe your expectations regarding how school leaders communicate with teachers, staff, students, parents, and the community.
4. In education, individuals hold differing views on balancing tradition with innovation. Describe how your opinion on how an effective leader should balance those two ideas.

Answer questions 5-8 using the descriptions of common leadership styles below.

Transformational Leadership – "...transformational leadership is the process whereby a person engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower" (Northouse, 2016, p. 162).

Authentic Leadership – Authentic leaders exhibit five characteristics: purpose, strong values, trusting relationships, self-discipline, and passion (Northouse, 2016).

Charismatic Leadership – "...the personality characteristics of a charismatic leader include being dominant, having a strong desire to influence others, being self-confident, and having a strong sense of one's own moral values" (Northouse, 2016, p. 164).

Additionally, charismatic leaders strongly reflect the characteristics that they desire in followers and "appear competent" (Northouse, 2016, p. 164).

Servant Leadership – These types of leaders focus on the good of others over themselves, help subordinates to develop, and act in a morally right way toward others,

5. From the above descriptions of leadership styles, which style would you perceive as the best school leader and why?
6. From the above descriptions of leadership styles, which would you prefer in a school leader and why?
7. Which leadership style(s) do you perceive to be ill-suited to a school leader in an international school? Describe your rationale for this perception.
8. Which leadership style have you personally experienced in a school leader while teaching in an international school? How did you feel about working for that person?
9. Give several examples of behaviors or traits that you would like to see in a school leader in an international school.
10. Give several examples of behaviors or traits that you would NOT like to see in a school leader in an international school.
11. Are you interested in participating in a face-to-face interview to talk more in depth on these topics?
 - If yes, a new and separate survey will be generated, which will ask for your contact information to arrange an interview.
 - If no, this is the end of the questionnaire.

Teacher Interview Questions

Instructions: Answer each question, including your personal experiences, stories, and any other information that you feel would answer the question.

1. What do you expect from a school leader in terms of clarity of communication?

2. Describe what you expect from a school leader in terms of setting standards for professionalism.
3. What style of communication do you expect from a school leader?
4. Describe what you expect from a school leader in terms of approachability.
5. How do you expect a school leader to treat staff?
6. Describe what you expect from a school leader regarding giving both positive and negative feedback.
7. Describe what you expect from a school leader regarding caring for teachers' personal lives.
8. Describe what you expect from a school leader regarding supporting teachers (i.e., instructionally, emotionally, etc.).
9. How do you think a school leader should balance tradition and innovation? Describe your expectations of a school leader in terms of keeping tradition and innovation.
10. What specific principal behaviors would encourage you to stay at his/her school?

Leadership Interview Questions

1. In terms of your role as a divisional leader, what do you see as the most important things that you can do to positively impact teachers?
2. As a school leader, how important do you feel it is to consult with teachers before making major decisions?
3. As a school leader, how important do you see your approachability? How do you make yourself more or less approachable?
4. In a few sentences, how would you describe your leadership style?
5. What types of behaviors do you do with an eye towards teacher retention?
6. How do you think, as a leader, you should balance tradition and innovation (change)?
7. How do you approach giving feedback to teachers?
8. When you think about supporting teachers, what do you think is important?
9. How do you approach communication as it relates to your teachers?

Appendix C: Audit Trail

Reference Number	Action	Document	Date
[1]	Questionnaire sent to potential participants	Survey Monkey responses	March 5, 2021
[2]	Semistructured interview performed with teachers	Transcripts (listed below)	See below
[3]	Semistructured interview performed with administrators	Transcripts (listed below)	See below
[5]	Semistructured interview with Leader 1	Transcript	March 11, 2021
[6]	Semistructured interview with Leader 2	Transcript	March 11, 2021
[7]	Semistructured interview with Leader 3	Transcript	March 15, 2021
[8]	Semistructured interview with Leader 4	Transcript	March 20, 2021
[9]	Semistructured interview with Leader 5	Transcript	March 23, 2021
[10]	Semistructured interview with Leader 6	Transcript	March 26, 2021
[11]	Semistructured interview with Teacher A	Transcript	March 12, 2021
[12]	Semistructured interview with Teacher B	Transcript	March 16, 2021
[13]	Semistructured interview with Teacher C	Transcript	March 19, 2021
[14]	Semistructured interview with Teacher D	Transcript	March 19, 2021
[15]	Semistructured interview with Teacher E	Transcript	March 23, 2021
[16]	Semistructured interview with Teacher F	Transcript	March 24, 2021

[17]	Semistructured interview with Teacher G	Transcript	March 26, 2021
[18]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher Respondent 1	Survey Monkey Results	March 5, 2021
[19]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 2	Survey Monkey Results	March 5, 2021
[20]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 3	Survey Monkey Results	March 5, 2021
[21]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 4	Survey Monkey Results	March 5, 2021
[22]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 5	Survey Monkey Results	March 5, 2021
[23]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 6	Survey Monkey Results	March 5, 2021
[24]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 7	Survey Monkey Results	March 5, 2021
[25]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 8	Survey Monkey Results	March 5, 2021
[26]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 9	Survey Monkey Results	March 5, 2021
[27]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 10	Survey Monkey Results	March 5, 2021
[28]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 11	Survey Monkey Results	March 7, 2021
[29]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 12	Survey Monkey Results	March 8, 2021
[30]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 13	Survey Monkey Results	March 8, 2021
[31]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 14	Survey Monkey Results	March 9, 2021
[32]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 15	Survey Monkey Results	March 10, 2021
[33]	Questionnaire responses of	Survey Monkey	March 12, 2021

	Teacher 16	Results	
[34]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 17	Survey Monkey Results	March 13, 2021
[35]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 18	Survey Monkey Results	March 16, 2021
[36]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 19	Survey Monkey Results	March 17, 2021
[37]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 20	Survey Monkey Results	March 17, 2021
[38]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 21	Survey Monkey Results	March 17, 2021
[39]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 22	Survey Monkey Results	March 17, 2021
[40]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 23	Survey Monkey Results	March 17, 2021
[41]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 24	Survey Monkey Results	March 24, 2021
[42]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 25	Survey Monkey Results	March 25, 2021
[43]	Questionnaire responses of Teacher 26	Survey Monkey Results	March 25, 2021
[44]	Questionnaire from [1] closed	Survey Monkey	March 26, 2021

Appendix D: Email to Potential Participants

Request for Participation

Caleb Coleman
 To: Caleb Coleman
 Cc:
 Bcc:

Fri, Mar 5, 2021 at 1:00 PM

Hello Teachers -

As some of you know, I am working on a Doctor of Education degree. I am at the point now where I have to conduct a research study. [redacted] has given me permission to ask for volunteers from among the teachers here at [redacted]. The goal of my study is to understand more about teacher perceptions of leadership at international schools and how that might be tied to decisions to stay or leave a school.

The study will have two possible stages for teachers. The first is a questionnaire filled out on Survey Monkey, which will take approximately 10-15 minutes. Your risk in this is minimal, as participants remain anonymous and steps will be taken to protect the data. At the end of the questionnaire, you will be asked if you are interested in participating in a "face-to-face" interview to delve more deeply into the topic, which is the second stage. If the number of those interested in the interview stage exceeds five, five volunteers will be randomly chosen to participate. The interview stage will take approximately 30-45 minutes. See the attached consent form for additional information.

If you are interested in participating, please first read the attached consent form which details the precautions in place to safeguard your participation and responses. If you have any questions, please feel free to let me know. Please click the link below to begin the survey. Those interested in signing up for the interview portion should do so at the end of the survey in the link provided on the final question.

Thank you for your time and help!

Questionnaire Link: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/j/colemanResearch> (link will be closed in 2 weeks)

Dear Administrators,

My name is Caleb Coleman and I am completing a qualitative research study as part of my dissertation at Abilene Christian University. My goal is to learn more about how teachers at international schools in South Korea view leadership and how that might impact decisions to stay or leave.

Your participation in this study would involve an interview lasting approximately 30-45 minutes and delving into questions relating to your approach to leadership and leading in an international school in South Korea. Your participation in this study would have minimal risk as no identifiable information will be published and data will be safely scored. See the attached consent form for additional information.

If interested, please click on the link below where information will be collected to arrange an interview.

Thank you for your time and assistance in this meaningful research.

Caleb Coleman
 EdD Candidate
 Abilene Christian University

Appendix E: IRB Approval

ABILENE CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY

Educating Students for Christian Service and Leadership Throughout the World

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



February 10, 2021

Caleb Coleman
Department of Graduate and Professional Studies
Abilene Christian University

Dear Caleb,

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board, I am pleased to inform you that your project titled "Teachers' Perceptions of the Impact of Principal Leadership Style on Teacher Transfers in International Schools in South Korea",

(IRB# 20-208) is exempt from review under Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects.

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

I wish you well with your work.

Sincerely,

Megan Roth

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