

THE INFLUENCE OF TRUST IN SCHOOLS AND JOB SATISFACTION ON TEACHER RETENTION

May Zin Thant¹, Ei Thinzar Ko²

Abstract

The main purpose of the study was to investigate the influence of trust in schools and job satisfaction on teacher retention. A total sample of 630 in-service teachers (PAT, JAT, SAT) was randomly selected from the Ayeyarwady Region, Yangon Region, and Mon State. To find out trust in schools, job satisfaction, and teacher retention, the Omnibus T-Scale (OTS) developed by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2003), the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) developed by Lester (1987), the Intent to Stay Questionnaire (ISQ) developed by Olivier (2001) were used. There was no significant difference in trust in schools (overall), job satisfaction (overall), and teacher retention (overall) by gender. ANOVA results indicated a significant difference in trust in schools (overall) by age and designation at 0.01 level and location at 0.001 level. ANOVA results indicated a significant difference in job satisfaction (overall) by age and designation at 0.001 level and location at 0.01 level. There was a significant difference in teacher retention by age at 0.05 level, location at 0.01 level, and total teaching experience at 0.001 level. There was a significant positive correlation between trust in schools and teacher retention at 0.001 level and job satisfaction and teacher retention at 0.001 level. The faculty trust in colleagues subscale at 0.001 level and faculty trust in clients subscale at 0.001 level of trust in schools were significant positive predictors of teacher retention. Again, the colleagues subscale at 0.01 level and work itself subscale at 0.001 level of job satisfaction were significant positive predictors of teacher retention. The construct of trust in schools and job satisfaction of in-service teachers were considered to support teacher retention. This study will be useful for educators, principals, and educational stakeholders to maintain qualified teachers in the teaching profession and then help to improve professional knowledge and feel fulfilled as educators.

Keywords: Trust in Schools, Job Satisfaction, Teacher Retention.

Introduction

Trust is one of the most critical parts of a school. It is often unseen but generally felt by everyone in the school. When a school is successful, strong working relationships are built with trust between administrators, staff, students, and the community. According to Goddard et al. (2007), trust makes schools better places for students to learn, teachers to teach, and administrators to manage. Teacher trust affects schools' effectiveness (Van Maele & Houtte, 2012). Building trust among everyone in the school was a central component of its success.

Teacher job satisfaction is strongly tied to teacher retention, which helps solve the problem of teacher shortage (Klecker, 1996; Garrett, 1999; Meng, 2004). Teacher retention is a significant challenge facing educators today. This challenge has become a persistent concern for both general education and special education programs in public and private schools.

Significance of the Study

Trust is viewed as a vital element in organizations that are well-functioning (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). Without trust, communication may break down, and teamwork may suffer,

¹ Department of Educational Studies, Bogalay Education Degree College

² Department of Educational Psychology, Yangon University of Education

leading to an environment where individuals are less likely to share ideas, support one another, or work toward common goals. Building trust within the school community is essential for creating a positive and cohesive educational environment that promotes student success and overall school improvement. A healthy school culture must be built upon trusting, collegial relationships among teachers, the principal, colleagues, students, and parents (Tarter & Hoy, 2004).

Teacher retention is a persistent issue that has significant implications for student achievement and school improvement. When experiencing a high rate of teacher loss, educational systems may encounter problems offering high-quality education to all their students. There has been an even higher percentage of beginning teachers who leave the teaching profession within the first five years. Teachers are reaching a breaking point where they are choosing to transfer to other schools or to seek other employment. As the nation struggles with a high teacher turnover rate, teacher retention must be addressed to adequately fill classrooms with suitable teachers (Ellis & Bernhardt, 1992).

The trust in schools and teacher job satisfaction were reviewed to determine their influence on teacher retention. Therefore, this study is to explore the influence of trust in schools and job satisfaction on teacher retention.

Purposes of the Study

The main purpose of the study is to investigate the influence of trust in schools and job satisfaction on teacher retention among in-service teachers. The specific objectives are

- To observe the differences in trust in schools, job satisfaction, and teacher retention among in-service teachers based on gender, age, total teaching experience, designation, and location
- To investigate a relationship among trust in schools, job satisfaction, and teacher retention of in-service teachers
- To examine the influence of trust in schools on teacher retention among in-service teachers
- To explore the influence of job satisfaction on teacher retention among in-service teachers

Definitions of Key Terms

Trust. Trust occurs when one person is vulnerable to another person and believes that the other person is compassionate, dependable, competent, genuine, and honest (Hoy, 2013).

Job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is the general attitude of an individual's current job and organization that encompasses the feelings, beliefs, and thoughts about that job (Cranny et al., 1992).

Teacher retention. The ability to attract teachers to the job means mitigating teacher attrition and teacher turnover (Ingersoll, 2001).

Methodology

Sample of the Study

The participants were about 630 in-service teachers chosen by stratified random sampling technique from forty schools in the Ayeyarwady Region, Yangon Region, and Mon State.

Research Method

The design and method used in this study were a quantitative research design and a descriptive survey method.

Research Instrumentation

The demographic characteristics of the participants are gender, age, designation, total teaching experience, and location. The Omnibus T-Scale (OTS) was used to explore the trust in schools among in-service teachers. It was developed by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2003). It consists of 26 items of a six-point Likert scale questionnaire. This instrument contained three subscales namely; faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in colleagues, and faculty trust in clients (students and teachers). The internal consistency for the overall scale of OTS was 0.87.

The questionnaire was used to examine job satisfaction adopted by in-service teachers. Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) was adapted to measure four of the subscales: supervision, colleagues, working conditions, and work itself. It consists of 36 items of a four-point Likert scale questionnaire. This instrument was developed by Lester (1987). The internal consistency for the overall scale of TJSQ was 0.95.

The Intent to Stay Questionnaire (ISQ) was developed by Olivier (2001) which measures a teacher's intent to remain in the teaching profession. It is an unidimensional measure. It consists of 9 items of a four-point Likert scale questionnaire. The internal for the overall scale of ISQ was 0.83.

Data Analysis and Research Findings

Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Trust in Schools

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Trust in Schools

Variable	No. of Teachers	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Trust in Schools	630	118.27	13.989

According to the descriptive statistics in Table 1, the mean value of trust in schools was above average (118.27). This result pointed out that teachers' social interaction are good and they are active and trust each other in their schools. Cohen-Vogel and Herrington (2005) indicated that trust encourages teachers to be more open, to share their ideas, and to express their concerns freely.

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics for Trust in Schools in Different Subscales

Variables	No. of Items	<i>M</i>	Mean (%)	<i>SD</i>
Faculty Trust in the Principal	8	39.84	83	5.780
Faculty Trust in Colleagues	8	38.20	79.58	5.655
Faculty Trust in Clients	10	40.23	67.05	6.638

The results shown in Table 2, indicated that the mean percentage of in-service teachers' faculty trust in the principal subscale was the highest at 83, that of faculty trust in colleagues subscale was the second-highest at 79.58, and that of faculty trust in clients subscale was the lowest at 67.05. In this study, it can be interpreted that most in-service teachers trust their principal. And most in-service teachers generally have less trust in students and parents in their workplace. Teacher's trust in the principal is essential and basis of trust in schools (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003).

Comparison of Trust in Schools by Gender

To find out whether the differences in teachers' trust in schools concerning gender was significant or not, an independent samples *t*-test was used and reported in Table 3.

Table 3 Results of Independent Samples *t*-test of Trust in Schools by Gender

Variables	Gender	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Faculty Trust in the Principal	Male	43	40.44	5.539	.704	.482
	Female	587	39.80	5.799		
Faculty Trust in Colleagues	Male	43	39.70	5.414	1.806	.071
	Female	587	38.09	5.661		
Faculty Trust in Clients	Male	43	40.49	6.988	.262	.793
	Female	587	40.21	6.618		
Trust in Schools (overall)	Male	43	120.63	13.918	1.145	.253
	Female	587	118.10	13.990		

Based on the results in Table 3, the mean scores of male teachers' trust in schools (overall) and all subscales were slightly higher than that of female teachers and insignificant. By this study, the results point out that male teachers and female teachers in their workplace had trust in schools and gender difference was not an important factor for school effectiveness and success.

Comparison of Trust in Schools by Age

To find out whether there was a significant difference in teachers' trust in schools by age. Descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were computed.

According to results, teachers with the age between 20-35 years had the highest mean score in faculty trust in the principal subscale, faculty trust in clients subscale, and trust in schools (overall). Teachers with the age between 36-50 years had the highest mean score in faculty trust in colleagues subscale. The mean score of teachers with the age 51 years and above was the lowest in all subscales and trust in schools (overall).

Based on the result of ANOVA, a significant difference was found in trust in schools (overall) ($F(2,627) = 5.541, p < .01$), in faculty trust in the principal ($F(2,627) = 9.325, p < .001$) by age.

Table 4 Post-hoc Analysis of Trust in Schools by Age

Variables	(I) Age	(J)Age	Mean Difference(I-J)	<i>p</i>
Faculty Trust in the Principal	20-35 years	51 and above	2.483***	.000
	36-50 years		1.417*	.024
Trust in Schools (overall)	20-35years	51 and above	4.336**	.006
	36-50 years		3.464*	.023

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

According to the results shown in Table 4, the mean scores of teachers with the age between 20-35 years and teachers with the age between 36-50 years were significantly higher than that of teachers with the age 51 and above in faculty trust in the principal subscale and trust in schools (overall).

In this study, it can be interpreted that younger teachers are more likely to be active, open, adaptable, and collaborative than older teachers. Younger teachers have new ideas in their teaching activities. They can create effective learning environment and are more energetic. In 2019, World Teachers' Day celebrates the teachers with the theme "Young Teachers: The Future of the Profession" (UNESCO, 2019). Older adults may learn to trust differently than younger adults (Seaman et al., 2023).

Comparison of Trust in Schools by Total Teaching Experience

To find out whether there was a significant difference in teachers' trust in schools by total teaching experience. Descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were computed.

Table 5 Descriptive Statistics of Trust in Schools by Total Teaching Experience

Variables	Grade	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Faculty Trust in the Principal	≤ 5 years	49	39.90	5.084	3.389*	.034
	6-10 years	114	41.10	4.741		
	11 and above	467	39.53	6.041		

Variables	Grade	N	M	SD	F	p
Faculty Trust in Colleagues	≤ 5 years	49	37.43	6.185	.808	.446
	6-10 years	114	38.64	5.328		
	11 and above	467	38.17	5.678		
Faculty Trust in Clients	≤ 5 years	49	40.67	5.336	.270	.763
	6-10 years	114	39.89	6.491		
	11 and above	467	40.27	6.803		
Trust in Schools (overall)	≤ 5 years	49	118.00	11.788	.649	.523
	6-10 years	114	119.62	12.323		
	11 and above	467	117.97	14.576		

* $p < .05$.

According to Table 5, the mean score of teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience was the highest in trust in schools (overall), faculty trust in the principal subscale, and faculty trust in colleagues subscale. Then the mean score of teachers with 5 years and less of teaching experience was the highest in faculty trust in clients subscale. The mean score of teachers with 5 years and less of teaching experience was the lowest mean score in faculty trust in colleagues subscale. Teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience had the lowest mean score in faculty trust in clients subscale. Teachers with 11 years and above teaching experience had the lowest mean score in faculty trust in the principal subscale and trust in schools (overall). The observation that the mean score of teachers' trust in schools was not significantly different among various teaching experience groups.

Based on the result of ANOVA, a significant difference was found in trust in schools (overall) ($F(2,627) = 3.389$, $p < .05$) by total teaching experience.

Table 6 Post-hoc Analysis of Teachers' Faculty Trust in the Principal by Total Teaching Experience

Variable	(I) Total Teaching Experience	(J) Total Teaching Experience	Mean Difference (I-J)	p
Faculty Trust in the Principal	6-10 years	11 and above	1.565*	.026

* $p < .05$.

According to the results shown in Table 6, the mean score of the teaching experience group of 6-10 years teachers was significantly higher than those of 11 and above in faculty trust in the principal subscale. It can be interpreted that the teaching experience group of 6-10 years

teachers can build positive relationships with their principal. Teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience have more trust than 11 and above in trust in the principal.

Comparison of Trust in Schools by Designation

To find out whether there was a significant difference in teachers' trust in schools by designation. Descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were computed.

Table 7 Descriptive Statistics of Trust in Schools by Designation

Variables	Designation	N	M	SD	F	p
Faculty Trust in the Principal	PAT	210	40.24	5.659	2.333	.098
	JAT	210	39.14	6.327		
	SAT	210	40.15	5.267		
Faculty Trust in Colleagues	PAT	210	38.53	5.470	.992	.372
	JAT	210	37.77	5.282		
	SAT	210	38.29	6.175		
Faculty Trust in Clients	PAT	210	41.10	6.483	7.313**	.001
	JAT	210	38.83	6.484		
	SAT	210	40.77	6.748		
Trust in Schools (overall)	PAT	210	119.87	12.751	5.339**	.005
	JAT	210	115.74	14.299		
	SAT	210	119.20	14.561		

** $p < .01$.

According to Table 7, the Primary Assistant Teachers (PAT) had the highest mean scores in faculty trust in the principal subscale, faculty trust in colleagues subscale, faculty trust in clients subscale, and trust in schools (overall). The Senior Assistant Teachers (SAT) had the second-highest mean scores in all subscales and trust in schools (overall). Then Junior Assistant Teachers (JAT) had the lowest mean scores in all subscales and trust in schools (overall).

Based on the result of ANOVA, significant differences were found in trust in schools (overall) ($F(2,627) = 5.339, p < .01$), in faculty trust in the clients ($F(2,627) = 7.313, p < .01$) by designation.

Table 8 Post-hoc Analysis of Trust in Schools by Designation

Variables	(I) Designation	(J) Designation	Mean Difference (I-J)	p
Faculty Trust in Clients	PAT	JAT	2.271**	.001
	SAT		1.938**	.007

Variables	(I) Designation	(J) Designation	Mean Difference (I-J)	<i>p</i>
Trust in Schools (overall)	PAT	JAT	4.129**	.007
	SAT		3.457*	.030

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

According to the results shown in Table 8, the mean scores of Primary Assistant Teachers (PAT) and Senior Assistant Teachers (SAT) were significantly higher than Junior Assistant Teachers (JAT) in faculty trust in clients subscale and trust in schools (overall).

Comparison of Trust in Schools by Location

To find out whether there was a significant difference in teachers' trust in schools by location. Descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were computed.

According to results, teachers from Region 2 had the highest mean score in all subscales and trust in schools (overall). Teachers from Region 3 had the lowest mean score in faculty trust in the principal subscale, faculty trust in colleagues subscale, and trust in schools (overall). Teachers from Region 1 had the lowest mean score in faculty trust in clients subscale.

Based on the result of ANOVA, significant differences were found in trust in schools (overall) ($F(2,627) = 14.121, p < .001$), in faculty trust in the principal ($F(2,627) = 12.669, p < .001$), in faculty trust in colleagues ($F(2,627) = 21.588, p < .001$), in faculty trust in clients ($F(2,627) = 3.706, p < .05$) by location.

Table 9 Post-hoc Analysis of Trust in Schools by Location

Variables	(I) Location	(J) Location	Mean Difference (I-J)	<i>p</i>
Faculty Trust in the Principal	Region 1	Region 3	2.395***	.000
	Region 2		2.433***	.000
Faculty Trust in Colleagues	Region 1	Region 3	2.829***	.000
	Region 2		3.219***	.000
Faculty Trust in Clients	Region 2	Region 1	1.681*	.025
Trust in Schools (overall)	Region 1	Region 3	4.824**	.001
	Region 2		6.933***	.000

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

According to the results shown in Table 9, the mean scores of teachers from Region 1 and Region 2 were significantly higher than that of teachers from Region 3 in faculty trust in the principal subscale, faculty trust in colleagues subscale, and trust in schools (overall). The mean

scores of teachers from Region 2 were significantly higher than that of teachers from Region 1 in faculty trust in clients subscale.

Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Job Satisfaction

Table 10 Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Job Satisfaction

Variable	No. of Teachers	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Job Satisfaction	630	111.54	12.084

According to the descriptive statistics in Table 10, the mean value of teachers' job satisfaction was above average (111.54). This result indicated that teachers' job satisfaction and positive attitudes toward their profession are good. Moreover, teachers feel fulfilled and happy in their workplace. Teachers with high job satisfaction provided higher quality teaching and their students were more successful (Demirtas, 2010).

Table 11 Descriptive Statistics for Job Satisfaction in Different Subscales

Variables	No. of Items	<i>M</i>	Mean (%)	<i>SD</i>
Supervision	13	39.92	76.77	5.508
Colleagues	10	30.84	77.10	3.913
Working Conditions	4	12.55	78.44	1.695
Work Itself	9	28.23	78.42	3.267

According to Table 11, the mean percentage of working conditions subscale (78.44) was the highest and that of supervision subscale (76.77) was the lowest in teachers' job satisfaction. This result pointed out that teachers had good working conditions and were satisfied in their schools. However, they were less satisfied with supervision. They may require good administration, adequate support, appreciation, and appropriateness and timing of feedback that influence teachers' job satisfaction. The level of support an administrator provides a teacher impacts a teacher's effectiveness and job satisfaction (Ingersoll, 2001).

Comparison of Job Satisfaction by Gender

To find out whether the differences in teachers' job satisfaction concerning gender were significant or not, independent samples *t*-test was used.

Based on the results, the mean scores of male teachers' job satisfaction (overall) and all subscales are slightly higher than that of female teachers. The mean value of job satisfaction (overall) was not significantly different by gender. However, a significant difference was found in colleagues subscale by gender (2.090, $p < .05$). Yin Nwe Aung (2017) stated that the mean score of females was slightly higher than that of males on job satisfaction.

Comparison of Job Satisfaction by Age

To find out whether there was a significant difference in teachers' job satisfaction by age. Descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were computed.

According to results, teachers with the age between 20-35 years had the highest mean score in supervision subscale, colleagues subscale, working conditions subscale and job satisfaction (overall). Teachers with the age between 36-50 years had the highest mean score in work itself subscale. The mean score of teachers with the age 51 years and above had the lowest in all subscales and job satisfaction (overall).

Based on the result of ANOVA, a significant difference was found in job satisfaction (overall) ($F(2,627) = 8.556, p < .001$), in supervision ($F(2,627) = 11.957, p < .001$), in colleagues ($F(2,627) = 6.043, p < .01$), in working conditions ($F(2,627) = 3.270, p < .05$) by age.

According to the results, the mean scores of teachers with the age between 20-35 years and 36-50 years were significantly higher than that of teachers with age 51 and above in supervision subscale, and job satisfaction (overall). Then, the mean scores of teachers with the age between 20-35 years were significantly higher than that of teachers with age 51 and above in colleagues subscale, and working conditions subscale.

Comparison of Job Satisfaction by Total Teaching Experience

To find out whether there was a significant difference in teachers' job satisfaction by total teaching experience. Descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were computed.

The mean score of teachers' job satisfaction (overall), supervision subscale, colleagues subscale, working conditions subscales, and work itself subscale from 6-10 years of teaching experience were higher than that of other teaching experience groups. Then the teachers with 5 years and less of teaching experience had the lowest mean scores in supervision subscale, work itself subscale, and job satisfaction (overall). Teachers with 11 years and above teaching experience had the lowest mean score in colleagues subscale and working conditions subscale.

Based on the result of ANOVA, a significant difference was found in supervision ($F(2,627) = 3.506, p < .05$), in colleagues ($F(2,627) = 3.081, p < .05$) by total teaching experience.

According to the results, the mean scores of the teaching experience group of 6-10 years teachers were significantly higher than those of 11 years and above in supervision subscale, colleagues subscale, and job satisfaction (overall).

Comparison of Job Satisfaction by Designation

To find out whether there was a significant difference in teachers' job satisfaction by designation. Descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were computed.

The Primary Assistant Teachers (PAT) had the highest mean scores in supervision subscale, colleagues subscale, working conditions subscale, and job satisfaction (overall). The Senior Assistant Teachers (SAT) had the highest mean scores in work itself subscale. Then the Junior Assistant Teachers (JAT) had the lowest mean scores in supervision subscale, colleagues subscale, working conditions subscale, work itself subscale and job satisfaction (overall).

Based on the result of ANOVA, a significant difference was found in job satisfaction (overall) ($F(2,627) = 9.235, p < .001$), in supervision ($F(2,627) = 7.817, p < .001$), in colleagues

($F(2,627) = 5.439, p < .01$), in working conditions ($F(2,627) = 3.948, p < .05$), in work itself ($F(2,627) = 8.815, p < .001$) by designation.

Table 12 Post-hoc Analysis of Job Satisfaction by Designation

Variables	(I) Designation	(J) Designation	Mean Difference (I-J)	<i>p</i>
Supervision	PAT	JAT	2.090***	.000
Colleagues	PAT	JAT	1.219**	.004
Working Conditions	PAT	JAT	0.457*	.016
Work Itself	PAT	JAT	1.038**	.003
	SAT		1.229***	.000
Job Satisfaction (Overall)	PAT	JAT	4.805***	.000
	SAT		3.610**	.006

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

According to the results shown in Table 12, the mean scores of Primary Assistant Teachers (PAT) were significantly higher than Junior Assistant Teachers (JAT) in supervision subscale, colleagues subscale, and working conditions subscale. The mean scores of Primary Assistant Teachers (PAT) and Senior Assistant Teachers (SAT) were significantly higher than Junior Assistant Teachers (JAT) in the work itself subscale and job satisfaction (overall).

Comparison of Job Satisfaction by Location

To find out whether there was a significant difference in teachers' job satisfaction by location. Descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were computed.

According to results, teachers from Region 2 had the highest mean score in supervision subscale and colleagues subscale. Teachers from Region 1 had the highest mean score in working conditions subscale, work itself subscale and job satisfaction (overall). Teachers from Region 3 had the lowest mean score in all subscales, and job satisfaction (overall).

Based on the result of ANOVA, a significant difference was found in job satisfaction (overall) ($F(2,627) = 7.239, p < .01$), in supervision ($F(2,627) = 5.425, p < .01$), in colleagues ($F(2,627) = 5.318, p < .01$), in working conditions ($F(2,627) = 13.185, p < .001$), in work itself ($F(2,627) = 3.446, p < .05$) by location.

According to the results, the mean scores of teachers from Region 1 and Region 2 were significantly higher than that of teachers from Region 3 in supervision subscale, colleagues subscale, working conditions subscale, and job satisfaction (overall). The mean score of teachers from Region 1 was significantly higher than that of teachers from Region 3 in work itself subscale.

Descriptive Statistics of Teacher Retention

Table 13 Descriptive Statistics of Teacher Retention

Variable	No. of Teachers	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Teacher Retention	630	27.86	4.763

According to Table 13, descriptive analysis revealed that the mean and standard deviation of teacher retention for all respondents were 27.86 and 4.763. It could be interpreted that retaining qualified teachers is a critical issue for educational development. Ingersoll (2001) points out that the crisis in the education field today is not really about the recruitment of teachers but rather about the retention of teachers.

Comparison of Teacher Retention by Gender

To find out whether the teachers were different in teacher retention for gender, descriptive statistics were conducted. The results are reported in Table 14.

Table 14 Results of Independent *t*-test of Teacher Retention by Gender

Variable	Gender	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Teacher Retention	Male	43	27.14	5.445	- 0.907	.309
	Female	587	27.91	4.710		

The mean score of female teachers was slightly higher than that of male teachers in teacher retention and not significant. The results show that female teachers are more attached than male teachers in school and profession.

Comparison of Teacher Retention by Age

To determine whether there was a significant difference in teacher retention by age. Descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were computed.

Table 15 Descriptive Statistics of Teacher Retention by Age

Variable	Age	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Teacher Retention	20-35 years	179	27.09	5.344	3.517*	.030
	36-50 years	241	28.30	4.383		
	51 and above	210	28.01	4.597		

* $p < .05$.

Teachers with the age between 36-50 years had the highest mean score in teacher retention. Teachers with the age 51 years and above had the second-highest mean score in teacher retention. Teachers with the age between 20-35 years had the lowest mean score in teacher retention. Ingersoll (2001; 2003) estimated that young teachers (under the age of 30) are 17.1% more likely to leave teaching than middle-aged teachers (between 30-50 years of age).

Table 16 Post-hoc Analysis of Teacher Retention by Age

Variable	(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	<i>p</i>
Teacher Retention	36-50 years	20-35 years	1.214*	.026

* $p < .05$

According to the results shown in Table 16, the mean score of teachers with the age between 36-50 years was significantly higher than that of teachers with age between 20-35 years in teacher retention. It can be seen that middle adulthood teachers have stability, maturity, good health, and satisfaction. So, middle adulthood teachers remain in their schools.

Comparison of Teacher Retention by Total Teaching Experience

To determine whether there was a significant difference in teacher retention by total teaching experience, Descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were computed.

Table 17 Descriptive Statistics of Teacher Retention by Total Teaching Experience

Variable	Total Teaching Experience	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Teacher Retention	≤ 5 years	49	25.57	6.840	8.367***	.000
	6-10 years	114	27.25	4.326		
	11 and above	467	28.25	4.524		

*** $p < .001$.

Teachers with 11 years and above of total teaching experience had the highest mean score in teacher retention. Teachers with 6-10 years of total teaching experience had the second-highest mean score. Teachers with 5 years and under of total teaching experience had the lowest mean score in teacher retention.

Based on the result of ANOVA, a significant difference was found in teacher retention ($F(2,627) = 8.367$, $p < .001$) by total teaching experience.

Table 18 Post-hoc Analysis of Teacher Retention by Total Teaching Experience

Variable	(I) Total Teaching Experience	(J) Total Teaching Experience	Mean Difference (I-J)	<i>p</i>
Teacher Retention	11 and above	≤ 5 years	2.679***	.000

*** $p < .001$.

According to the results shown in Table 18, the teachers' mean score of the teaching experience group of 11 years and above was significantly higher than those of 5 years and under in teacher retention.

Comparison of Teacher Retention by Designation

To determine whether there was a significant difference in teacher retention by designation, Descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were computed.

Table 19 Descriptive Statistics of Teacher Retention by Designation

Variable	Designation	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Teacher Retention	PAT	210	27.95	4.788	.072	.931
	JAT	210	27.77	4.390		
	SAT	210	27.86	5.105		

The mean score of Primary Assistant teachers (PAT) was slightly higher than that of Junior Assistant Teachers (JAT) and Senior Assistant Teachers (SAT) in teacher retention. Then Junior Assistant Teachers (JAT) had the lowest mean scores in teacher retention.

Based on the result of ANOVA, a significant difference was not found in teacher retention by designation.

Comparison of Teacher Retention by Location

To determine whether there was a significant difference in teacher retention by location, Descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were computed.

Table 20 Descriptive Statistics of Teacher Retention by Location

Variable	Location	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Teacher Retention	Region 1	210	28.82	4.782	6.918**	.001
	Region 2	210	27.57	4.978		
	Region 3	210	27.19	4.376		

** $p < .01$.

According to Table 20, teachers from Region 1 had the highest mean score 28.82, teachers from Region 2 had the second-highest mean score 27.57, and teachers from Region 3 had the lowest mean score 27.19 in teacher retention.

Based on the result of ANOVA, a significant difference was found in teacher retention ($F(2,627) = 6.918, p < .01$) by location.

Table 21 Post-hoc Analysis of Teacher Retention by Location

Variable	(I) Location	(J) Location	Mean Difference (I-J)	<i>p</i>
Teacher Retention	Region 1	Region 2	1.252*	.018
		Region 3	1.638**	.001

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

According to the results shown in Table 21, the mean score of teachers from Region 1 was significantly higher than that of teachers from Region 2 and Region 3 in teacher retention.

The Relationship Between Teacher Retention and Trust in Schools

To examine the relationship among teacher retention, faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in colleagues, faculty trust in clients. Pearson's correlation was conducted in Table 22.

Table 22 Correlation Between Trust in Schools and Teacher Retention

Variables	Faculty Trust in the Principal	Faculty Trust in Colleagues	Faculty Trust in Clients	Teacher Retention
Faculty Trust in the Principal	1			
Faculty Trust in Colleagues	0.535***	1		
Faculty Trust in Clients	0.294***	0.382***	1	
Teacher Retention	0.263***	0.424***	0.287***	1

*** $p < .001$.

According to Table 22, teacher retention is positively and significantly correlated to faculty trust in the principal ($r = .263$, $p < .001$). Teacher retention is positively and significantly correlated to faculty trust in colleagues ($r = .424$, $p < .001$). Teacher retention is positively and significantly correlated to faculty trust in clients ($r = .287$, $p < .001$). It could be interpreted that teacher retention in their schools is boosted if the trusting relationship among the principal, colleagues, students, and parents increases. Maintaining quality teachers for the success and efficiency of schools depends mostly on the trust between and among principals, colleagues, students, and parents.

Regression Analysis for Prediction of Teacher Retention from Faculty Trust in the Principal, Faculty Trust in Colleagues and Faculty Trust in Clients

To evaluate the prediction of teacher retention from faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in colleagues and faculty trust in clients, simultaneous multiple regression was conducted. The results are shown in Table 23.

Table 23 Regression Analysis for Prediction of Trust in Schools and Teacher Retention

Variables	<i>B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>R</i>	R^2	Adj R^2	<i>F</i>
Constant	11.334		7.793***	.446	.199	.195	51.746***
Predictor Variables							
Faculty Trust in the Principal	.028	.034	.789				
Faculty Trust in Colleagues	.296	.351	7.964***				
Faculty Trust in Clients	.103	.143	3.670***				

*** $p < .001$ (one-tailed).

Multiple regression analysis from Table 23, pointed out that the results were statistically significant $R^2 = .199$, $F(3,626) = 51.746$, $p < .001$. The adjusted R^2 was .195. This indicated that 19.5 % of the variance in teacher retention was explained by faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in colleagues and faculty trust in clients. Faculty trust in colleagues had the highest positive effect ($\beta = .351$, $p < .001$) on teacher retention and this is statistically significant. Faculty trust in clients had a positive effect ($\beta = .143$, $p < .001$) on teacher retention and this is statistically significant. The faculty trust in principle had a positive effect ($\beta = .034$, $p > 0.05$) on teacher retention, but this is not statistically significant.

The model could be explained in the following equation:

$$TR = 11.334 + 0.296 \text{ FTCo} + 0.103 \text{ FTCl}$$

TR = Teacher Retention, FTCo = Faculty Trust in Colleagues, FTCl = Faculty Trust in Clients

The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Teacher Retention

To examine the relationship among teacher retention, supervision, colleagues, working conditions and work itself, Pearson's correlation was conducted in Table 24.

Table 24 Correlation Between Job Satisfaction and Teacher Retention

Variables	Supervision	Colleagues	Working Conditions	Work Itself	Teacher Retention
Supervision	1				
Colleagues	0.649***	1			
Working Conditions	0.672***	0.638***	1		
Work Itself	0.503***	0.534***	0.554***	1	
Teacher Retention	0.379***	0.428***	0.384***	0.581***	1

*** $p < .001$.

According to Table 24, the correlation analysis of teacher retention and supervision results indicated that teacher retention is positively and significantly correlated to supervision. Teacher retention had a moderately strong but significant correlation to supervision ($r = .379$, $p < .001$).

The results of the correlation analysis of teacher retention and colleagues indicated that teacher retention is positively and significantly correlated to colleagues. Teacher retention had a moderately strong but significant correlation to colleagues ($r = .428$, $p < .001$).

The results of the correlation analysis of teacher retention and working conditions indicated that teacher retention is positively and significantly correlated to working conditions. Teacher retention had a moderately strong but significant correlation to working conditions ($r = .384$, $p < .001$).

The results of the correlation analysis of teacher retention and work itself indicated that teacher retention is positively and significantly correlated to work itself. Teacher retention had a moderately strong but significant correlation to work itself ($r = .581$, $p < .001$).

Regression Analysis for Prediction of Teacher Retention from Supervision, Colleagues, Working Conditions and Work Itself

In order to evaluate the prediction of teacher retention from supervision, colleagues, working conditions and work itself, simultaneous multiple regression was conducted. The results are shown in Table 25.

Table 25 Regression Analysis for Prediction of Job Satisfaction and Teacher Retention

Variables	<i>B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>R</i>	R^2	Adj R^2	<i>F</i>
Constant	1.170		.790	.598	.358	.354	87.019***
Predictor Variables							
Supervision	.041	.047	.997				
Colleagues	.175	.143	3.099**				
Working Conditions	-.019	-.007	-.141				
Work Itself	.706	.484	11.981***				

** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed).

Multiple regression analysis from Table 35, pointed out that the results were statistically significant $R^2 = .358$, $F(4,625) = 87.019$, $p < .001$. The adjusted R^2 was .354. This indicated that 35.4 % of the variance in teacher retention was explained by supervision, colleagues, working conditions and work itself. Work itself had the highest positive effect ($\beta = .484$, $p < .001$) on teacher retention, and this is statistical significant. Colleagues also had a positive effect ($\beta = .143$, $p < .01$) on teacher retention, and this is statistical significant. Supervision had a positive effect ($\beta = .047$, $p > 0.05$) on teacher retention, but this is not statistically significant. Working

conditions had a negative effect ($\beta = -.007, p > 0.05$) on teacher retention, but this is not statistically significant.

The model could be explained in the following equation:

$$TR = 1.170 + 0.175 C + 0.706 WI$$

TR = Teacher Retention, C = Colleagues, WI = Work Itself

Conclusion

Educational systems and schools worldwide constantly face the concern of teachers deciding to leave their school or even the profession. When experiencing a high rate of teacher loss, educational systems may encounter problems with offering high-quality education to all their students. If teachers possess trust in schools and job satisfaction, can maintain quality teachers and create an effective and successful school environment. Teachers who are satisfied and trust in schools will assist the future generation's education in terms of their intellectual and social abilities.

Limitations of the Study

Forty schools from four Townships of Ayeyarwady Region, Yangon Region, and Mon State were selected as samples of this study. The proportion of male teachers and female teachers involved in this study was not equal because male teachers are very rare in Myanmar. Moreover, it is also hard to obtain the same population in age group, and total teaching experience group among Ayeyarwady Region, Yangon Region, and Mon State. To examine the gender, age, and total teaching experience-related differences, an equal sample size was more participation.

Acknowledgements

We would like to express respectful thanks to Dr. Kay Thwe Hlaing (Rector, Yangon University of Education), Dr. May Myat Thu (Pro-Rector, Yangon University of Education), Dr. Khin Khin Oo (Pro-Rector, Yangon University of Education), Dr. Nyo Nyo Lwin (Pro-Rector, Yangon University of Education) and Dr. Tin Myo Myo Swe (Pro-Rector, Yangon University of Education) for their valuable administrative supports, official permission, encouragement and effective guidance during this study. We would like to offer my sincere and hearty gratitude to my professor, Dr. Khin Hnin Nwe (Professor and Head of Department, Department of Educational Psychology, Yangon University of Education) for her expert guidance, valuable pieces of advice, timely suggestions, unending patience, critical reviews, excellent judgment, continuous encouragement and great support to me throughout my study.

References

- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Cohen-Vogel, L., & Herrington, C. (2005). Teacher and leadership preparation and development: No stranger to politics. *Educational Policy*, 19(1), 5-17.
- Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. F. (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. Lexington.
- Ellis, N., & Bernhardt, R. (1992). Prescription for teacher satisfaction: Recognition and responsibility. *The Clearing House*, 65(1), 179-186.

- Garrett, R. M. (1999). Teacher job satisfaction in developing countries. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management*. (ERIC Digest, No. ED 459 150).
- Hughes, G. D. (2012). Teacher Retention: Teacher Characteristics, School Characteristics, Organizational Characteristics, and Teacher Efficacy. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 105(4), 245-255. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26586936>
- Hoy, W. K., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools: The Omnibus T-Scale. In W.K. Hoy & C. G. Miskel (Eds.), *Studies in leading and organizing schools* (pp. 181-208). Information Age.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2002). The teacher shortage: A case of wrong diagnosis and wrong prescription. *National Association of SSP Bulletin*, 86(631), 16-31.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2003). Is there really a teacher shortage? Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Ingersoll, R., & Smith, T. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 30-33.
- Klecker, B. M. (1996). A study of teacher empowerment in Ohio's venture capital schools / [Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University].
- Lester, P. E. (1987). Development and factor analysis of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 47(1), 223-233.
- Marinell, W., & Coca, V. (2013). *Who stays and who leaves? Findings from a three-part study of teacher turnover in NYC middle schools* [Paper presentation]. Research Alliance for New York City Schools, New York University.
- Olivier, D. F. (2001). *Teacher personal and school culture characteristics in effective schools: Toward a model of a professional learning community* [Unpublished dissertation]. Louisiana State University.
- Ronfeldt, M., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2013). How teacher turnover harms student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(1), 4-36. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23319706>
- Seaman, K. L., Christensen, A. P., Senn, K. D., Cooper, J. A., & Cassidy, B. S. (2023). Age-related differences in the social associative learning of trust information. *Neurobiology of Aging*, 125, 32-40.
- Tarter, C. J., & Hoy, W. K. (2004). A systems approach to quality in elementary schools: A theoretical and empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(5), 539-554.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Trust in schools: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36(4), 334-352.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (n.d.). Theme for World Teachers' Day 2019.
- Van Houtte, M. (2006). Tracking and Teacher Satisfaction: Role of Study Culture and Trust. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99(4), 247-254
- Van Maele, D., & Van Houtte, M. (2012). The role of teacher and faculty trust in forming teachers' job satisfaction: Do years of experience make a difference? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(6), 879-889.
- Yin Nwe Aung. (2017). *An Exploratory Study of Teacher Educators' Sources of Stress and Job Satisfaction* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Yangon University of Education.