

Article

Exploring the Multifaceted Challenges of Educators: Analysis of Personal, Institutional, and Psychological Factors Affecting Teacher Turnover

Karl Altubar*, Gaynillyne Jungco, Rufa Canadilla, Alma Belocura, Stephanie Berame, Mutya Cabrera, Rona Quilaton, Ann Mae Pason, Angelica Ramos

Corresponding Author: karlaltubar@gmail.com

Abstract: This study provides a comprehensive analysis of the challenges faced by educators, segmented into Personal, Institutional, and Psychological Factors, to understand their impact on teachers' professional lives and well-being. Personal Factors reveal moderate concerns related to health, commuting, and career aspirations, while Institutional Factors uncover significant issues with class size, workload, and policy implementation, indicating a commonality in institutional challenges. Psychological Factors, however, emerge as the most pressing, with high levels of demoralization, motivation issues, and concerns regarding support from family and colleagues. Through statistical analysis, the study highlights the complex interplay of these factors, with Psychological Factors showing the greatest impact on teacher satisfaction and performance. The findings underscore the need for comprehensive support systems that address the multifaceted challenges educators face, emphasizing the importance of psychological well-being alongside professional and personal concerns to enhance the educational environment and teacher retention.

Keywords: Teacher turnover, personal, institutional and psychological factors

Introduction

Teacher turnover has garnered considerable attention in the past few years. Peck (2023) emphasized that high rates of turnover can lead to disruptions in the learning environment, a lack of continuity in educational programs, and challenges in maintaining a seasoned and skilled teaching workforce. For instance, several factors contribute to teacher turnover, including but not limited to, inadequate support and resources, insufficient professional development opportunities, challenging working conditions, and non-competitive salaries (Mahmood et al., 2022; Thaba et al., 2022; Boamah, 2022). The effects



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors.
Submitted for possible open access
publication under the terms and conditions
of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY)
license(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Altubar et al. (2024). Exploring the Multifaceted Challenges of Educators: Analysis of Personal, Institutional, and Psychological Factors Affecting Teacher Turnover.

Copyright (c) 2024. Author (s). This is an open term of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). www.wjehr.com

of high turnover are multifaceted, affecting not just the educational outcomes for students but also the morale and cohesion of teaching staff (Pietsch et al., 2020). Addressing teacher turnover requires comprehensive strategies that encompass improving working conditions, offering competitive compensation, and providing robust professional growth opportunities, aiming to create a more stable and supportive environment that encourages teachers to remain in their positions long-term (Nguyen & Springer, 2023; Sachau, 2007).

The teaching profession has been facing increasing turnover rates, a trend that shows no signs of abating (Sethi & Scales, 2020; Han, 2023; Mourtgos et al., 2022). This issue is recognized globally as a complex challenge, often attributed to issues in workforce planning or seen as a reflection of declining teacher morale and motivation (Ingersoll, 2020). A variety of factors contribute to this trend each year, including workload demands, administrative pressures, the allure of better pay in other industries such as call centers, and the pursuit of licensure in education (Sorensen & Ladd, 2018; Han, 2023; Adams et al., 2023). Furthermore, adverse working conditions, limited opportunities for career progression, and low pay have driven many seasoned teachers to seek opportunities elsewhere (See et al., 2020; Suthcer et al., 2019).

It is well-established that teachers play a crucial role in shaping students' educational outcomes, with strong evidence indicating that high teacher turnover rates adversely affect student achievement (Bardach et al., 2022). Schools with high numbers of minority or socio-economically disadvantaged students are especially hard-hit by teacher turnover, exacerbating existing educational disparities (McGee, 2021; Suson et al., 2020). Data over the years show that nearly half of all new teachers exit the profession within five years, with an annual turnover rate stabilizing alarmingly at 16% (Sutcher et al., 2019). This turnover not only hinders student learning but also strains educational budgets with increased costs for recruitment, hiring, and training.

Recent studies further highlight the link between rising teacher turnover and declining student performance in core subjects, noting that turnover is especially prevalent in underperforming and high-poverty schools (Zilanawala et al., 2018). The ripple effects of persistent turnover undermine school culture, fuel disciplinary issues, increase principal turnover, and erode the sense of community, thereby triggering further turnover. Defined as the year-to-year fluctuation of teaching staff within schools (Sorenson & Ladd, 2018), teacher turnover exacerbates shortages, disproportionately affects the distribution of qualified teachers, and compromises the quality of education for students most in need (Goldhaber et al., 2015). It poses significant obstacles to collaboration and instructional improvement, with studies showing a direct correlation between high turnover rates and lower student achievement across various school environments (Guin, 2004; Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2013).

Teacher turnover in the Philippines is a significant issue, mirroring global concerns within the education sector. The reasons behind teacher turnover in the country can be multifaceted, encompassing socio-economic, institutional, and policy-driven factors. Key issues often cited include the search for better opportunities abroad, locally competitive salaries that fail to meet the rising cost of living, challenging working conditions, and the quest for professional growth and development. The phenomenon not only disrupts the continuity of learning for students but also poses a challenge to the educational system's efforts to maintain a stable and experienced workforce. Future research should aim to address these gaps by adopting longitudinal and comparative approaches, examining the multifaceted reasons behind teacher turnover, and evaluating the long-term effectiveness of retention strategies. This direction of research is crucial for developing targeted interventions that can enhance teacher retention, thereby ensuring a stable and high-quality educational system in the Philippines.

Methodology

The research was conducted utilizing a descriptive method, which served to meticulously detail the characteristics of the population under scrutiny and elucidate the various data points concerning teacher turnover. This methodological approach was chosen to comprehensively address inquiries pertaining to the who, what, where, when, and how aspects of the study, aiming to provide a thorough understanding of the prevailing conditions. Specifically, the study delved into the current state of support provided to teachers and identified the concerns they faced in the context of identified school in Lapu-Lapu City. Furthermore, the research framework embraced an INPUT-PROCESS-OUTPUT approach, delineating the flow of information from data collection through analysis to the ultimate outcomes. The main instrument of the study was adopted from the study of Santiago et al., 2022 which study focused determined the possible factors that cause the high teachers' turnover. Utilizing a 4-point Likert scale, the study sought to quantitatively assess the degree of teacher's turnover.

Results and Discussion

Table 1. Age

Age	f	%
51-60	4	10.81
41-50	9	24.32
31-40	13	35.14
21-30	11	29.73
Total	37	100.00

The table presents a distribution of a sample population based on age, with a total of 37 individuals categorized into four distinct age

groups. The age group of 31-40 years comprises the largest segment of the population, accounting for 35.14% (13 individuals), indicating a predominance of middle-aged adults in the sample. Following this, the 21-30 age group represents the second-largest portion, with 29.73% (11 individuals), showcasing a significant representation of young adults. The 41-50 age group includes 9 individuals, making up 24.32% of the population, which suggests a noticeable but smaller fraction of middle-aged adults. The smallest group is the 51-60 age category, consisting of only 4 individuals or 10.81% of the sample, indicating the least representation among the older adult demographic. Overall, the data highlights a sample skewed towards younger and middle-aged adults, with the majority being under the age of 50.

Table 2. Highest Educational Attainment

Highest Educational Attainment	f	%
Full pledge Doctorate	1	2.70
With units in doctor	1	2.70
Full Pledge Master	7	18.92
With units in master	16	43.24
Bachelor degree holder	12	32.43
Total	37	100

Table 2 outlines the distribution of highest educational attainment among a sample of 37 individuals, providing insight into the educational background of the group. The data reveal that the largest proportion of the sample, 43.24% (16 individuals), has completed some units towards a master's degree, indicating a significant inclination towards postgraduate education but without full completion of the program. Following this, individuals holding a bachelor's degree constitute 32.43% (12 individuals) of the sample, showcasing a substantial foundation in higher education. Those with a full-fledged master's degree represent 18.92% (7 individuals), further highlighting the prevalence of advanced education within the group. The categories of 'Full pledge Doctorate' and 'With units in a doctorate' each account for 2.70% (1 individual each), indicating a minimal representation of doctoral level education in the sample.

Table 3. Years of Service

Years of Service	f	%
21 above	5	13.51
16-20	0	0.00
11-15	0	0.00
6-10	5	13.51
1-5	27	72.97
Total	37	100

Table 3 presents the distribution of years of service among a group of 37 individuals, delineating their tenure within an organization or field. The data notably highlight that the majority of the sample, 72.97% (27

individuals), have 1-5 years of service, indicating a predominantly early-career stage demographic. This suggests either a relatively young workforce or a scenario where individuals have recently transitioned to their current roles. Interestingly, the segments for 6-10 years of service and those with 21 years or above each account for 13.51% (5 individuals) of the sample, showcasing smaller yet equal representation of mid-career and long-tenured individuals. Notably, there are no individuals within the 11-15 and 16-20 years of service brackets, indicating a gap in mid to late career stages among the sampled population.

Table 4. Designation

Designation	f	%
Special Science Teacher	4	10.81
Master Teacher	1	2.70
Teacher 3	7	18.92
Teacher 2	9	24.32
Teacher 1	14	37.84
Total	37	100

Table 4 outlines the distribution of designations among a sample of 37 individuals within an educational setting, offering insights into the professional hierarchy and roles within the group. The largest segment of the sample is comprised of Teacher 1 positions, representing 37.84% (14 individuals) of the group. This indicates a strong base of entry-level or early-career teachers, highlighting the foundational level of teaching staff within the institution. Following this, Teacher 2 roles account for 24.32% (9 individuals), suggesting a moderate presence of individuals with a slightly more advanced level of experience or responsibility. Teacher 3 positions, representing 18.92% (7 individuals), further denote the progression within the teaching hierarchy, albeit with fewer individuals than the preceding levels. Overall, the data demonstrate a clear stratification within the teaching staff, with a substantial emphasis on early-career positions. The progression from Teacher 1 through to Master Teacher reflects a pathway of professional development and responsibility within the educational setting, with a pronounced lean towards the foundational levels of the hierarchy.

Table 5. Personal Factors

Indicators	Mean	VD
I need to address my health problem	1.46	D
My residence is far from school.	2.72	A
My residence is far from school.	3.26	A
I changed my residence.	3.20	A
I cannot cope with the demands of my work	2.27	MA
I want to seek greener pasture	1.72	D
I want a change of environment.	1.52	D
I want a challenging job	2.90	A
I was encouraged by my family to transfer to another job	2.51	A

Table 5 delves into personal factors affecting individuals' professional decisions. A primary observation is the relatively low mean score (1.46) for health problems as a factor, labeled with a variance of Disagree (D), indicating that health concerns are not a major factor influencing most individuals' decisions related to their jobs. Similarly, the desire for greener pastures and a change of environment, with mean scores of 1.72 and 1.52 respectively, also fall under the Disagree category, suggesting these are not significant motivators for the majority. Conversely, indicators related to the physical location of work and personal circumstances, such as the distance of residence from school (mean scores of 2.72 and 3.26), and changing one's residence (3.20), all categorized under Agree (A), highlight that logistical and environmental factors play a considerable role in job-related decisions. These factors suggest a considerable number of individuals are affected by the practicalities of their living situations in relation to their workplaces. The mean score for coping with work demands (2.27) falls under Moderately Agree (MA), revealing a nuanced perspective where a portion of the individuals find the demands of their work challenging but not overwhelmingly so. Furthermore, seeking a challenging job (mean score of 2.90) and family encouragement to pursue other job opportunities (2.51), both under the Agree category, suggest a positive inclination towards growth and familial influence in professional decisions. Overall, the data point towards a complex interplay of personal satisfaction, logistical concerns, and the pursuit of professional growth and challenges as factors influencing individuals' career decisions. Practical concerns like commuting distances and living arrangements seem to weigh heavily, alongside a moderate but notable concern for job satisfaction and professional development.

Table 6. Institutional Factors

Indicators	Mean	VD
The class size is big, hence, so difficult to manage	1.62	D
I am overloaded with work	1.80	MA
The opportunities for training are limited	1.43	D
Seldom receive recognition in the form of incentives	1.60	D
The school policies are not well-implemented	1.84	MA
The present residence is not conducive to facilitate my teaching.	1.72	D
The school climate is not healthy.	2.05	MA
I find it difficult and tiring to discipline my students	2.54	A

The results presented in Table 6 highlight various institutional factors that impact educators, revealing a complex interplay of challenges and constraints within their working environment. The findings indicate that a significant number of teachers perceive their class sizes as large and difficult to manage, with a mean response of 1.62, suggesting a notable difficulty in classroom management due to size. Work overload is another critical issue, with a mean score of 1.80, categorized under 'Moderately Agree', pointing towards a substantial perception of

excessive responsibilities among educators. Training opportunities are viewed as limited, scoring a mean of 1.43, which, along with seldom receiving recognition through incentives (mean of 1.60) and perceived ineffective implementation of school policies (mean of 1.84), underscores a sense of inadequacy in professional development and support. Furthermore, issues related to the teaching environment, such as non-conducive residences (mean of 1.72) and an unhealthy school climate (mean of 2.05), reflect additional external challenges that educators face, potentially affecting their overall job satisfaction and effectiveness. Interestingly, the discipline of students stands out as the most challenging aspect, with a mean of 2.54, falling under 'Agree', indicating that managing student behavior is a significant source of stress and exhaustion for teachers. Collectively, these results underscore the multifaceted institutional challenges that educators encounter, highlighting the need for systemic improvements to address these concerns effectively.

Table 7. Psychological Factors

Indicators	Mean	VD
I feel demoralized	2.95	A
I am no longer motivated to work harder	2.16	MA
I feel I do not get support from my family	2.84	A
I feel insecure about my colleagues	3.04	A

Table 7 delves into the psychological factors affecting educators, providing a clear picture of the mental and emotional challenges they face. The data indicates that a considerable number of educators feel demoralized, with a mean score of 2.95, falling within the 'Agree' category. This suggests that a majority of the respondents experience feelings of being disheartened and demotivated, which can significantly impact their enthusiasm and commitment to their work. Moreover, the motivation to work harder is notably diminished, as evidenced by a mean score of 2.16, categorized under 'Moderately Agree'. This decrease in motivation is a concerning indicator of the potential for reduced productivity and engagement in educational activities. Family support, or the perceived lack thereof, is another critical psychological factor, with a mean score of 2.84 also in the 'Agree' category. This indicates that a significant number of educators feel they do not receive adequate support from their families, which could exacerbate feelings of isolation and stress, further diminishing their professional drive and emotional well-being. Feelings of insecurity about colleagues are highlighted as the highest concern, with a mean score of 3.04, also under 'Agree'. This reveals that issues related to workplace relationships and trust among peers are prevalent, potentially leading to a competitive or hostile work environment that can further affect educators' sense of security and belonging.

Table 8. Analysis of teacher profiles based on Personal Factors, Institutional Factors, and Psychological Factors

Factor	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min	25%	50% (Median)	75%	Max
Personal Factors	2.512	0.704	2.0	2.0	2.6	2.6	3.0
Institutional Factors	1.854	0.458	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.0	2.0
Psychological Factors	2.680	0.704	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	4.0

The analysis of teacher profiles based on Personal Factors, Institutional Factors, and Psychological Factors provides a quantitative insight into the multifaceted challenges and experiences of educators. The Personal Factors have an average (mean) score of 2.512 with a standard deviation of 0.704, indicating a moderate level of personal challenges among teachers, with a relatively wide spread of responses suggesting varying degrees of personal issues affecting different individuals. The minimum score for Personal Factors is 2.0, with both the 25th percentile and the median (50%) at 2.6, and the maximum score reaching 3.0, suggesting that while some educators face significant personal challenges, the majority have moderate concerns.

Institutional Factors have a lower average score of 1.854 with a standard deviation of 0.458, reflecting less variability and a tighter clustering of responses around the mean. This suggests a more consistent perception of institutional challenges among educators, with scores ranging from 1.0 to 2.0. The median score of 2.0 for Institutional Factors indicates that half of the educators perceive their institutional challenges to be of moderate concern, with a significant proportion experiencing issues that are relatively more manageable compared to personal and psychological factors.

Psychological Factors have the highest mean score of 2.680, along with a standard deviation of 0.704, matching the spread of Personal Factors. This indicates a substantial level of psychological stress among teachers, with a broad range of experiences. The scores for Psychological Factors stretch from 2.0 to 4.0, with both the 50% (median) and the 75th percentile at 3.0, highlighting that a significant number of educators are experiencing high levels of psychological distress. This is further emphasized by the maximum score of 4.0, indicating that some educators are experiencing severe psychological challenges.

The analysis underscores the significant impact of psychological factors on educators, with high levels of stress and emotional challenges being prevalent. While institutional factors are perceived with less variability and to a slightly lesser extent, they still contribute to the overall challenges faced by educators. Personal factors, though moderate on average, show a significant spread indicating that personal issues can greatly affect some educators. Addressing these varied challenges requires a comprehensive approach that

encompasses personal support, institutional changes, and mental health resources to support educators effectively.

Conclusion

The analysis of teacher profiles based on Personal, Institutional, and Psychological Factors offers a detailed insight into the multifaceted challenges educators face in their professional lives. Personal Factors indicate a moderate level of concern, pointing to issues such as health, commuting difficulties, and aspirations for career advancement. Institutional Factors highlight concerns related to the management of large class sizes, work overload, and the implementation of school policies, with a relatively lower variability among responses, suggesting commonality in institutional challenges across educators. The highest concern arises from Psychological Factors, where issues of demoralization, motivation, and perceived support from family and colleagues significantly impact teachers' well-being and professional engagement. The variance in scores across these categories underscores the complexity of challenges in the teaching profession, emphasizing the need for holistic support systems that address not only the practical aspects of teaching but also the emotional and psychological well-being of educators to foster a more supportive and effective educational environment.

References

- Adams, I. T., Mourtgos, S. M., & Nix, J. (2023). Turnover in large US policing agencies following the George Floyd protests. *Journal of criminal justice*, 88, 102105.
- Bardach, L., Klassen, R. M., & Perry, N. E. (2022). Teachers' psychological characteristics: Do they matter for teacher effectiveness, teachers' well-being, retention, and interpersonal relations? An integrative review. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34(1), 259-300.
- Boamah, S. A. (2022). Investigating the work–life experiences of nursing faculty in Canadian academic settings and the factors that influence their retention: Protocol for a mixed-method study. *BMJ open*, 12(1), e056655.
- Han, E. (2023). The gendered effects of teachers' unions on teacher attrition: evidence from district–teacher matched data in the US. *Feminist Economics*, 29(1), 141-173.

Peck, T. (2023). Elementary School Principals' Perceptions on How They Maintained a Positive School Climate During Teacher Turnover (Doctoral dissertation, Shippensburg University).

Mahmood, K., Ghaffar, A., Ullah, M. I., & Zaman, A. (2022). Job Stress and Turnover Intentions among School Teachers of Punjab Pakistan. *Multicultural Education*, 8(9), 78-89.

Mourtgos, S. M., Adams, I. T., & Nix, J. (2022). Elevated police turnover following the summer of George Floyd protests: A synthetic control study. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 21(1), 9-33.

Nguyen, T. D., & Springer, M. G. (2023). A conceptual framework of teacher turnover: a systematic review of the empirical international literature and insights from the employee turnover literature. *Educational Review*, 75(5), 993-1028.

Pietsch, M., Tulowitzki, P., & Hartig, J. (2020). Examining the effect of principal turnover on teaching quality: a study on organizational change with repeated classroom observations. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 31(3), 333-355.

See, B. H., Morris, R., Gorard, S., Kokotsaki, D., & Abdi, S. (2020). Teacher recruitment and retention: A critical review of international evidence of most promising interventions. *Education Sciences*, 10(10), 262.

Sachau, D. A. (2007). Resurrecting the motivation-hygiene theory: Herzberg and the positive psychology movement. *Human resource development review*, 6(4), 377- 393.

Sethi, J., & Scales, P. C. (2020). Developmental relationships and school success: How teachers, parents, and friends affect educational outcomes and what actions students say matter most. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 63, 101904.

Sorensen, L. C., & Ladd, H. F. (2018). The hidden costs of teacher turnover. Working Paper No. 203-0918-1. Washington, DC: National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research (CALDER)

Sutcher, L., Darling-Hammond, L., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2019). Understanding teacher shortages: An analysis of teacher supply and

demand in the United States. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 27(35).

Thaba-Nkadimene, K., Mzindle, D., Nkadimeng, M. P., Mesuwini, J., Mashitoa, L. J., & Makwara, C. (2022). Editorial note: Career Pathing and the Challenges Faced by Teachers in Rural Public Schools. *Journal of African Education*, 3(2), 5-14.