

PAY FOR PERFORMANCE
AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION:
A MIXED-METHODS STUDY

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Doctor of Education with

a

Major in Educational Leadership in the

Department of Graduate Education

Northwest Nazarene University

by

Joel F. Wilson

April 2017

Major Professor: Heidi Curtis, PhD.

AUTHORIZATION TO SUBMIT
DISSERTATION

This dissertation of Joel Wilson, submitted for the degree of Doctor of Education with a major in Educational Leadership and titled PAY FOR PERFORMANCE AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION: A MIXED-METHODS STUDY has been reviewed in final form.

Permission, as indicated by the signatures and dates given below, is now granted to submit final copies.

Major Professor Heidi Curtis Date 4/11/17
Dr. Heidi Curtis

Committee Members Dr. Shalene French Date 4/11/17
Dr. Shalene French

Dr. Gary Brogan Date 4-18-17
Dr. Gary Brogan

Program Administrator Heidi Curtis Date 4/11/17
Dr. Heidi Curtis

Discipline's College Dean Paula D Kellerer Date 4/25/17
Dr. Paula Kellerer

© Copyright by Joel F. Wilson 2017

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There have been countless people who have given me guidance, inspiration, and support along this journey. I am deeply grateful for them all. Specifically, I would like to thank Dr. Heidi Curtis and the NNU faculty and staff who did not give up on me. Thank you to Region V Superintendents Dr. Ron Bolinger, Dr. Gary Brogan, Dr. Molly Stein, Dr. David Risenmay, Marvin Hansen, Jamie Holyoak, Mary Vagner, and Jane Ward. Thank you and appreciation to Joe Kren, Dr. Andy Grover, John Crocker, David and Kim Detwiler, Daryl and Wendy Nielson, and Kendal and Peggy Wilson. And thank you to my own elementary school teachers during the late 1970's. Go Perry Panthers! Mrs. Tucker, Mrs. Johnson, Mrs. Eskelsen, Mrs. Thorne, Mrs. Martin, Mrs. Burt, and Mr. Hyde.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated my parents Fred and Betty Wilson and to my children Jonah, Jacob, Jace, Jorja, and Jax. You guys are “jeniuses.” I love you. I would also like to dedicate this work to the noble educators with whom I have had the pleasure of working in the Silverton School District, the Murtaugh School District, the Jerome School District, the Aberdeen School District, the Preston School District, and the Butte County School District.

ABSTRACT

Proponents of teacher pay for performance suggest that it reflects American values by rewarding student achievement and encouraging hard work. Supporters also say that pay for performance helps to recruit and retain teachers by increasing their compensation. Critics counter that pay for performance erodes teacher collaboration, is difficult to monitor, cannot be reliably linked to student achievement, leads to dishonest reporting of test scores, and is not a long-term solution to low teacher pay. Some researchers have found that extrinsic reward systems, such as pay for performance, can cancel the benefits that intrinsic motivation provides. As policy makers consider different pay for performance models, the link to teacher job satisfaction warrants investigation. This study examined pay for performance using the theoretical framework of Self-Determination Theory. This theory suggests that employees find satisfaction when they have freedom in how they pursue organizational goals (autonomy), when they are given opportunities to improve job skills (mastery), and when employees feel they make a difference in the world (purpose). This study investigated pay for performance's effect on teacher job satisfaction in a small, rural school district. An evaluation of both quantitative data and qualitative data determined that pay for performance can contribute to teacher job satisfaction, but only under the right conditions. This study concludes with a list of suggestions for implementing a pay for performance program that is likely to contribute to teacher job satisfaction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | ii |
| DEDICATION | iii |
| ABSTRACT | iv |
| Chapter I Introduction..... | 1 |
| Statement of the Problem..... | 4 |
| Background to the Study..... | 5 |
| Research Questions | 8 |
| Description of Terms | 8 |
| Significance of the Study | 11 |
| Theoretical Framework..... | 12 |
| Overview of Research Methods..... | 14 |
| Chapter II The Literature Review | 16 |
| Introduction..... | 16 |
| The Importance of Job Satisfaction | 17 |
| Motivational Theory | 23 |
| History of Pay for Performance | 32 |
| Conclusion | 40 |
| Chapter III Design and Methodology | 43 |
| Introduction..... | 43 |
| Research Design..... | 44 |
| Participants..... | 45 |
| Data Collection | 48 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Analytical Methods..... | 51 |
| Role of the Researcher..... | 52 |
| Limitations..... | 54 |
| Chapter IV Results..... | 56 |
| Introduction..... | 56 |
| Data Collection..... | 57 |
| Survey Validity and Reliability..... | 58 |
| Frequency..... | 59 |
| Survey Distribution and Participation..... | 61 |
| Research Question #1..... | 62 |
| Research Question #2..... | 72 |
| Research Question #3..... | 79 |
| Qualitative Data..... | 83 |
| Emerging Themes from Qualitative Data..... | 84 |
| Conclusion..... | 84 |
| Chapter V Discussion..... | 86 |
| Introduction..... | 86 |
| Summary of Results..... | 89 |
| Research Questions: Autonomy, Mastery, Purpose, and District Goals..... | 90 |
| Mixed Methods Results..... | 94 |
| Emerging Themes from Research Question #1..... | 94 |
| Emerging Themes from Research Question #2..... | 98 |
| Emerging Themes from Research Question #3..... | 102 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Conclusions..... | 107 |
| Recommendation for Further Research | 113 |
| Implications for Professional Practice | 114 |
| Conclusion | 115 |
| References..... | 116 |
| Appendix A: HRRC Approval..... | 157 |
| Appendix B: NIH Certificate | 158 |
| Appendix C: Letter Requesting District Permission for Study..... | 159 |
| Appendix D: Study Overview..... | 160 |
| Appendix E: Informed Consent Form..... | 162 |
| Appendix F: Interview Questions | 164 |
| Appendix G: Survey Questions | 165 |
| Appendix H: Interview Coding Template..... | 168 |
| Appendix I: Deming’s 14 Points of Management | 170 |

List of Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1 <i>Data Collection for Research Study</i> | 51 |
| Table 2 <i>Reliability Using Cronbach's Alpha</i> | 59 |
| Table 3 <i>Survey Response Frequency Percentages</i> | 60 |
| Table 4 <i>Demographic Profile of Survey Participants</i> | 61 |
| Table 5 <i>Interview Comments Related to Pay for Performance and Autonomy</i> | 64 |
| Table 6 <i>Percentage of Staff Grouped by Years of Experience</i> | 65 |
| Table 7 <i>Staff Ownership of the Pay for Performance Program</i> | 66 |
| Table 8 <i>Other Pay for Performance Programs are Hurt by Being Top-down Mandates</i> | 67 |
| Table 9 <i>Compilation of Responses Regarding Pay for Performance and Autonomy</i> | 69 |
| Table 10 <i>Weighted Responses Related to Pay for Performance and Autonomy</i> | 70 |
| Table 11 <i>Kruskal-Wallis H Test for Research Question #1</i> | 70 |
| Table 12 <i>Does the District's Pay for Performance Program Influence My Colleague's Willingness to Our Improve Craft</i> | 74 |
| Table 13 <i>District Staff's Positive Attitudes About Our Profession is Influenced by the Performance Program</i> | 74 |
| Table 14 <i>My Attention to Lesson Planning is Affected by the District's Pay for Performance Program</i> | 75 |
| Table 15 <i>Kruskal-Wallis H Test for Research Question #2</i> | 76 |
| Table 16 <i>District Staff's Willingness to Implement Effective Teaching Strategies is Influenced by the Pay for Performance Program</i> | 77 |
| Table 17 <i>District Staff's Willingness to Collaborate is Influenced by the Pay for Performance Program</i> | 77 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 18 <i>My District's High Levels of Morale are Influenced by the Pay for Performance Program</i> | 81 |
| Table 19 <i>The District Staff's Willingness to Work Together to Increase Student Achievement is Influenced by the Pay for Performance Program</i> | 81 |
| Table 20 <i>The District Staff's Sense of Purpose as Educators is Affected by the Pay for Performance Program</i> | 82 |
| Table 21 <i>Kruskal-Wallis H Test for Research Question #3</i> | 83 |
| Table 22 <i>Percentages of Disagree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, and Agree Responses: Does Pay for Performance Affect Job Satisfaction?</i> | 89 |
| Table 23 <i>District Staff's Willingness to Collaborate is Influenced by the Pay for Performance Program</i> | 103 |

Chapter I

Introduction

Teacher job satisfaction is at the lowest point that it has been in over 30 years (Markow & Pieters 2012). Low job satisfaction has made it difficult for administrators to recruit and retain teachers, which has contributed to a nationwide teacher shortage (Bodkin, 2016; Grieve, 2012; Mohan, 2013; Richert, 2017, Ybarra, 2015). In Idaho, the number of teachers leaving the profession outpaces the number of new teachers entering the field. From 2011 to 2014, there were 945 more Idaho teachers leaving the profession than new teachers entering the classroom. (Idaho State Department of Education, 2016). A 2014 study found that only 10 of 65 reporting school districts were able to hire fully certified staff for their open teaching positions (Mortensen, 2014). Idaho State Superintendent of Schools Sherri Ybarra commented that it is not question of teacher training, but rather there are just not enough people in the pipeline (Oshrin, 2017). One key to keeping the teacher pipeline flowing with qualified applicants and retaining those teachers already hired is job satisfaction (Armstrong, 2012; Bozeman, Scogin, & Stussey, 2013; Tek, 2014).

Teacher job satisfaction becomes even more important because of the connection between a positive classroom environment and increased student achievement (Kahlenberg & Potter, 2014; Morgan & O'Leary, 2004; Ololube, 2006). Teacher morale is critical for a successful school system, and despite its importance, it is frequently neglected when policies and programs are introduced in schools (Rosales, 2012; The Wallace Foundation, 2013; Webb, 2014). The declining levels of teacher job satisfaction

should be a concern for legislators, administrators, parents, and students (Goldring, Riddles, & Taie, 2014; Johnson, Kraft, & Papay, 2011; Torres, 2012).

Low levels of teacher job satisfaction are important because of the impact that morale has on organizational success. Organizations that make employees feel like assets rather than liabilities tend to be more successful than those that do not (Drucker, 2010; Manzoor, 2011; Vorhauser-Smith, 2013). Motivation is not only positively linked to greater creativity, innovation, collaboration, and teamwork; but it also encourages commitment, loyalty, long-term thinking, and an attitude of continual professional improvement (Smallwood, Ulrich, & Zenger; 1999, Public Health Action Support Team, 2011; Vance, 2006). Motivation affects the success of organizations in both the private sector and the public sector (Ayeni, Popoola, & Tella, 2007; Dulay & Mohiuddin, 2015; Juma, 2013). In schools, for example, studies positively link motivated teachers to successful students (Dufour & Mattos, 2013; Ololube, 2006; Oregon School Boards Association, 2009). It should be noted, however, that not all approaches to motivating employees produce the same results (Chen, 2014; Nicholson, 2003).

Researchers have broken down job satisfaction factors into two groups: intrinsic motivation with extrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Pink, 2009). Pink (2009), in particular, suggested that extrinsic motivators, those external reward programs such as pay for performance, are not likely to succeed in motivating workers. Sometimes extrinsic rewards actually harm motivation. Extrinsic motivation works best in jobs that require repeated procedures and little creativity such as assembly line workers or grocery store baggers (Orey, 2010; Wilson, 2010). Employees working in jobs where creativity and collaboration are required are more likely to be motivated by intrinsic, rather than

extrinsic rewards. Research identifies autonomy, mastery, and a sense of purpose as the key components in this kind of intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Pink, 2009). A reward system motivates workers best when it fosters the workers' desire to direct their own lives, urges them to improve their job skills, and satisfies the yearning people have to find purpose in the service of something outside of themselves (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Uchtdorf, 2013; Weir, 2013). This is the basis for Self-Determination Theory and is the foundation of this study's theoretical framework.

Extrinsic motivation, on the other hand, focuses on external motivation and is sometimes referred to as a carrot and stick mentality (Freeman, 2009; Hakobyan, 2015; Hartwig, 2016). In school systems, pay for performance programs have been introduced with little regard for how intrinsic motivation affects teacher morale (Ciurczak & Mississippi, 2016; Mohamoud, 2016; Strauss, 2016). These pay for performance programs were intended to increase compensation while at the same time increasing teachers' accountability for student achievement, but they have not always been received positively by teachers (Barnum, 2016; Conner, 2013; Chiang, et al., 2014; Travis, 2014). Along with teacher skepticism, teacher pay for performance programs in the United States, Canada, and Great Britain have produced dubious outcomes (Delisio, 2016; Gratz, 2009; Rampell, 2009). No matter the country, where there has been little stakeholder involvement, pay for performance measures have been seen as top-down mandates and have produced inconclusive results (Goodman & Turner, 2013; Hussey, Schneider, & Schnyer, 2011). In later chapters, this study will further explore the effects that pay for performance has had on teacher job satisfaction.

Amid the climate of low teacher job satisfaction, one district appears to have found a way to implement a pay for performance program that is valued by teachers. By identifying key aspects of this district's pay for performance program, other districts can replicate the program with a reasonable expectation that they will see similar results. What follows is a mixed-methods study that examines pay for performance and how it affects teacher job satisfaction.

Statement of the Problem

Policy makers introduced pay for performance programs across the United States in an attempt to increase compensation and also to increase teacher accountability for improved student achievement (Chiang, et. al., 2014; Connor, 2013; Travis, 2014). Instead of being viewed as a positive incentive by teachers, pay for performance programs have been seen as heavy handed, top-down mandates that have produced mixed-results (Goodman & Turner, 2013; Hussey, Schneider, & Schnyer, 2011). In a climate of low teacher morale, pay for performance programs are seen as one more hoop that teachers must jump through in order to be compensated (Castle & Hess, 2007; Lewis, 2016).

Pay for performance offers financial incentives to teachers, but there is little research linking it to job satisfaction (Aknin, et al., 2013; Gerhart & Fang, 2013; Lee, 2015; Max, 2014; Podursky & Springer, 2006; Ritter, 2013). In fact, there is a body of research that suggests this type of extrinsic motivation will cancel out the benefits that intrinsic motivation provides (Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 1999; Judge, et al., 2010; Perry & Yoon, 2012). For example, teachers stop volunteering for certain committee work when they see their colleagues being compensated for their committee work, they are less

willing to work beyond their contract day, and less willing to take on extra duties (Cui, Yao, & Zhang, 2017; Doorey, 2013; Vance, 2006).

The dilemma that district leaders find themselves in is to find a way to link compensation to student achievement results without alienating teachers. Districts who choose to use pay for performance program sometimes do not realize that they can harm teachers' intrinsic motivation. The problem comes in finding the best way to organize pay for performance so that it meets district goals and at the same time is valued by teachers and staff.

Background to the Study

Across the United States, teachers are overwhelmed (Flannery, 2016; Dionne, 2015; Hupfeld, et al., 2008) . They do not feel their jobs are secure (Heitin, 2012; Kubacka, 2014; Owens, 2016). Teachers do not feel treated like professionals in their communities and they do not feel that they have adequate opportunities for professional development (Riggs, 2013; Strauss, 2015). Teachers do not have sufficient time for collaboration and report that their preparation time is not adequate. Teachers have less time than they have had in the past to engage parents effectively and they see fewer parents and schools collaborating to improve the learning and success of students (Cotterell, 2013; Markow & Pieters, 2012; Vollmer, 2010).

Teacher salaries, including teacher pay for performance, are under more scrutiny than they have been in in the past (Hendrickson, 2014; McGuire, 2012; Neumark, 2014). Since the 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk*, public education has seen calls for heightened accountability and transparency (Downing, 2016; Klein, 2016; Rothstein, 2009). Complicating the call for more accountability was an economic downturn that led

Idaho to cut education spending by 19%. During this period, from 2008-2012, the 19% cut to education was the fourth largest in the country (Ritter Saunders, 2012). Since 2008, money for teacher raises has been even more scarce (Albares, et al., 2016; Barth, et al., 2016). Modest salary increases have been tied to teacher accountability measures such as higher test scores and increased responsibilities (Ballotpedia, 2016; Cotterell, 2012). The competitive grants through Race to the Top initiative offered \$700 million to schools and tied teacher pay to teacher performance and student achievement (Leonardatos & Zahedi, 2014). Many states eventually opted out of the Race to the Top grant process because the strings attached to the money had alienated teachers (Bakeman, 2013; Cavenagh, 2011; Vander Hart, 2015).

Going from a national perspective to a focus on the state of Idaho, Idaho's political and economic climate has been blamed for low teacher job satisfaction (Bodkin, 2016; Popkey, 2013; Welner, 2012, Wootten, 2016). This adverse political climate coupled with low teacher compensation has caused a mass exodus of teachers (P. Stark, personal communication, April 28, 2015). Idaho's negative culture towards professional educators contributes to low teacher job satisfaction and is one of the main reasons for the state's teacher shortage (Ybarra, 2016).

A negative consequence of Idaho's teacher shortage is the increasing number of teaching positions that are left unfilled, which has resulted in higher class sizes (Mortensen, 2015; Richert, 2015). Research found that 40% of Idaho school districts that were surveyed had to cancel classes or programs in 2015 because of a lack of qualified teacher applicants. Almost 42% of districts surveyed started the year with a substitute teacher in a regular teaching position because no qualified applicant could be found.

Close to 53% of the districts surveyed were working with institutions of higher learning to hire student teachers while they were doing their student teaching (Richert, 2015). Idaho teaching certificates issued to teachers living outside of the state of Idaho have decreased from 898 in 2008 to just 68 in 2014 (Bodkin, 2016). This teacher shortage is evidence that something is wrong (Brenneman, 2015; Brown, 2015). The difficulty in attracting and retaining teachers is due in a large part to low job satisfaction among teachers (Craig, Hamilton, & Stauffer, 2013; Richert, 2015; Popkey, 2013; Ybarra, 2016).

Since 2007, policymakers in have tried make Idaho more attractive to teachers by increasing compensation through different iterations of pay for performance (Hill, 2013; Wooten, 2012). These pay for performance programs were linked to accountability for student achievement and transparency in budgets and programs. Groups of teachers were initially awarded bonuses based on their students' achievement scores. Teachers were also eligible for bonuses based extra duties such as teaching in hard to fill positions and mentoring new teachers (Idaho State Department of Education, 2015; Johnson 2016; Richert, 2014). Despite pay for performance incentives, Idaho teachers continue to leave their classrooms (Bonner, 2012; Robinson, 2015; P. Stark, personal communication, April 28, 2015).

This mixed-methods study explores a pay for performance program in a small, rural Idaho school district. Pay for performance and its effects on teacher job satisfaction are explored. Teachers and staff will be interviewed and surveyed. The data gathered will be used to determine what negative and positive consequences pay for performance has had in the district staff job satisfaction.

Research Questions

Financial rewards can undermine motivation and harm performance on complex and intrinsically rewarding work, such as teaching (Ariely & Woolhandler, 2015; Dahl, 2016). Positive effects of pay for performance on teachers' intrinsic motivation are not clear (Chamorro-Premuzic, 2013; Jensen, Tibbetts, & Yamashiro, 2010). To understand how pay for performance affects teacher job satisfaction, this study asked three questions. These questions are based on the Self-Determination Theory framework (Deci & Ryan, 2000, Deci & Ryan, 2011; Pink, 2009):

1. How does pay for performance affect teacher autonomy?
2. How does pay for performance affect teacher mastery?
3. How does pay for performance affect teachers' sense of purpose?

An additional question was also asked. This fourth question was requested by the superintendent from this study's target district:

4. How does pay for performance affect district goals?

Description of Terms

This study is based on the theoretical framework of Self-Determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000, Deci & Ryan, 2011). Self-Determination Theory emphasizes the natural tendencies people have to behave in effective and healthy ways (Deci & Ryan, 2000, Deci & Ryan, 2011). To aid in the understanding of how pay for performance, Self-Determination Theory, and job satisfaction are related, the following definitions will be used:

Autonomy. The freedom people have to organize their tasks, time, and the techniques they will use to accomplish their goals (Chimoriya, 2016; Elias, 2016; Domencio & Ryan, 2017).

Autotelic. Internal motivation that comes from doing a task for the sake of accomplishing the task (Csikszentmihalyi, 1998; Vermeer, 2013)

Demotivator. A factor that reduces the desire someone has to engage in a task (BaniAta & Yadav, 2012; Frith, 2016).

Expectancy. An expectation that an action will produce a desired outcome (Bowman, 2016; Nemati & Redmond, 2016).

Extrinsic Motivation. Behavior that is driven by rewards that come from outside of an individual (Bainbridge, 2017; Cherry, 2016; Stecker & Tranquillo, 2016).

Flow. A mental state where a person is fully engaged in an activity to level that they are energized, focused, and have a high sense of enjoyment in the activity (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Desrosiers, 2016).

Hierarchy of Needs. A motivational theory that suggests that people base their decisions on fulfilling their physiological needs of safety needs, belonging and love needs, esteem needs, and self-actualization needs (Burton, 2012; Maslow, 1945; McLeod, 2007).

Hygiene Factors. Elements that are necessary for motivation, but do not drive motivation. If these elements are absent, people will not be motivated. Salary and working conditions are examples (Harrison, 2016; Jacquette, 2016; Morrell, 2011).

Intrinsic Motivation. Motivation that comes from within an individual, from the satisfaction a person gets in completing or working on a task (Bainbridge, 2014; Cherry, 2016; Stecker & Tranquillo, 2016).

Job Satisfaction. How satisfied someone is with the nature of their work, the supervision they receive, and the external and internal rewards they receive (Cox, et al., 2016; Weber, 2016; Weir, 2013).

Management. Controlling and making decisions about a business and its employees to meet organizational goals (Akrani, 2011; Gleeson, 2017; Shead, 2016).

Mastery. Comprehensive knowledge, skill, and ability in an area or subject (Fraser-Thill, 2016; Hsieh, 2011; Popova, 2016).

Merit Pay. A raise in pay based on someone's work performance. See also Pay for Performance (Heathfield, 2016; Kumar, 2016; Rosales, 2016).

Morale. The mental or emotional state someone has in regards to mood, attitude, and level of happiness (Fallon Taylor, 2016; Heathfield, 2016; Whitney, 2016).

Motivation. The reason someone has to behave in a certain way. A person's desire to do something (Babauta, 2016; Comaford, 2013).

Motivation Factors. Elements in a workplace that cause either job satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Heathfield, 2016; Llopis, 2012; Cohen, et al., 2016).

Motivational Theory. A model for explaining why people make the decisions they do. Often, these theories are an attempt to influence the decision making process in the work place to better meet organizational goals (Cherry, 2016; Morganroth, Peters, & Ryan, 2015; Reeve, 2016).

Pay for Performance. Financial rewards dedicated to improve quality and efficiency of a product. See Merit Pay. In this study, the term Pay for Performance is used in place of Merit Pay (Baird, 2016; Kahn, 2016; Miller, 2016).

Purpose. The need people have to find meaning in their lives. Finding meaning is a fundamental component of a fulfilling life (Bates, 2013; Sifferlin, 2014; Taylor, 2013).

Reverse Accountability. The responsibility supervisors have to provide resources, support, and direction to employees (Denning, 2011; Hamel, 2010; Perziosi, 2016).

Salary Grid. Also known as a Position Automatic Schedule, this method of determining a teacher's pay uses a grid that has the number of years of service on the x-axis and the amount of education on the y-axis. New teachers are placed on the upper, left-hand of the grid and are paid less than veteran teachers who are placed on the lower, right-hand portion of the grid (Luebke, 2016; Stoskopf, 2002).

Scientific Management. A theory of management that analyses and synthesizes workflow. Its main objective is to improve economic efficiency, especially in labor productivity. This was one of the earliest attempts of applying science to the engineering of process and management. Frederick Winslow Taylor developed Scientific Management between 1880 and 1890 within the manufacturing industries (Blake & Mosely, 2016; Eberle, 2016; Turan, 2015).

Self-Determination Theory. A motivational theory that suggests people seek to have freedom over how they approach job related tasks, wish to be effective in their job duties, and wish to be connected to a sense of purpose. These three elements of autonomy, mastery, and sense of purpose are the foundation of motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2012; Ryan, et. al. 2012).

Significance of the Study

Teacher pay for performance programs have existed for more than 150 years (Gratz, 2009; Ravitch, 2011). The success of these programs has often been subjective

and there is a lack of research linking pay for performance to job satisfaction (Ballou et al., 2010; Barnett, et al, 2014; Gerhart, Parks, & Rynes, 2005; Swidell, 2014; Viscardi, 2014). Pay for performance programs continue to be introduced, despite the lack of results. In 2006, Congress established the Teacher Incentive Fund to attract and retain effective teachers by providing grants pay for performance programs for teachers and principals (Chiang et al., 2015). These programs have produced underwhelming results (Chiang, et al., 2015). Since then, more states have introduced pay for performance programs, including Idaho, with no guarantee of results nor guarantee of increased teacher job satisfaction (Swidell, 2014; Vara-Orta, 2014; Wagner, 2014).

The significance of this study is that it examines pay for performance through an established framework for job satisfaction. This framework, Self-Determination Theory, highlights autonomy, mastery, and sense of purpose as cornerstones for job satisfaction (Deci & Ryan, 2006; Deci, Ryan, & Koestner, 1999; Pink 2009; Shiffbauer, 2013). The data for this study comes from surveys and interviews of teachers and administrators in the San Animado School District. The purpose of the surveys and interviews is to determine how pay for performance affects job satisfaction.

Theoretical Framework

Self-Determination Theory is the framework on which this study is based. Self-Determination Theory suggests that humans have three innate psychological needs: autonomy, mastery, and being connected to a broad sense of purpose. (Deci & Ryan, 2000). When these three needs are met, people are happy, motivated, and productive. Happiness, motivation, and productivity diminish when these needs are not satisfied. Deci and Ryan (2009) suggested that mental health, persistence at tasks, and performance

levels all decrease in jobs where there are low levels of job satisfaction. Autonomy, mastery, and sense of purpose are intrinsic in nature. The implication is for managers to find situations where employees can develop autonomy over their tasks, master how they perform their tasks, and connect to a sense of purpose. Deci and Ryan (2009, 2011) believe that meeting these conditions will lead to long-term motivation and job satisfaction. Extrinsic attempts to motivate employees will, at best, lead to short term gains, and, at worst, lead to diminished levels of motivation and performance. External rewards supplant intrinsic rewards, making intrinsic motivation less important to people than the outward compensation they are hoping to gain (Watson, 2014).

Extrinsic rewards can become de-motivators that harm performance and creativity (Marciano, 2010; Williams, 2013). Extrinsic motivators have been shown to encourage unethical behavior, create addictions, and foster short-term thinking. For repetitive tasks, carrot and stick motivators can be effective because such tasks require little creativity. For non-routine, creative tasks, however, research suggests that a focus on extrinsic rewards can negatively impact performance because it narrows focus and limits creativity (Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 1999; Fang, Gerhart & Ledford, 2013). Self-Determination Theory suggests that the business world adopt a new paradigm, one based on intrinsic motivation. The idea behind this theory is that intrinsic motivation would produce stronger performance, greater health, and higher overall well being because of its focus on internal rewards (Deci & Ryan, 2011; Pink, 2009; Schiffbauer, 2012). Self-Determination Theory outlines autonomy, mastery, and purpose as the building blocks of motivation (Blanchard, et al., 2009; Evans, 2015; Hui & Tsang, 2012). There is currently a disconnect in the business world between the case for a more intrinsically motivated

focus and the actual focus on extrinsic, carrot and stick motivators (Marciano, 2010; Pink, 2009; Williams, 2013).

Overview of Research Methods

This study followed a mixed-methods approach. In a mixed-methods study, qualitative data, such as opinions that cannot be easily measured, is blended with quantitative data, which can be easily measured and represented by numbers (Dowlan, 2014; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Matsiganis, 2016). This mixture of data types leads to greater validity, provides answers from multiple perspectives, and ensures there are no gaps in the information collected (Creswell, 2009; Hughes, 2016; Marshall & Rossman, 2011). For this study, quantitative data was collected via surveys and qualitative data was collected through open-ended and scripted interviews (Brown & Harris, 2010). The goal in combining the two types of data is a greater insight and understanding that could be overlooked if only one type of data is used (Creswell, 2009; Turner, 2010a). This corroboration of quantitative data and qualitative data should provide a clearer picture of the district's pay of performance program than either method could provide alone.

The sample group in this study consisted of 35 employees of the San Animado School District. These participants responded to online survey questions that asked them about the district's pay for performance model. In addition to the survey, a group of survey respondents were also interviewed. District administrators previewed the survey before it was distributed to staff and invited their staff to participate in the study. The survey took place during a two-week window in the winter of 2014.

Because of the ordinal nature of the survey's likert scale responses, the Kruskal-Wallis Test is able to determine if there is a statistical significant difference between the participants' responses (Tanner, 2012). Responses were organized into three groups to align with Self-Determination Theory tenets of autonomy, mastery, and connectedness (Deci & Ryan, 2006; Pink, 2009). Interviews were digitally recorded, transcribed, coded, and analyzed to determine themes related to Self-Determination Theory (Boyce & Neal, 2006; Campell, et al., 2013; Gorden, 1992). Quantitative data and qualitative data were then examined to determine what effect, if any, pay for performance efforts had on the autonomy, mastery, and sense of purpose for staff members.

Chapter II

The Literature Review

Introduction

Policy makers are in favor of pay for performance programs that increase compensation while also holding teachers accountable for student achievement (Chandler, 2011; Chiang et al., 2014; Connor, 2013; Hollingworth, 2011; Turner, 2010b). Former chancellor of Washington D.C. public schools, Michelle Rhee, has been an outspoken proponent of pay for performance insisting that it attracts the best teachers to the profession and encourages all teachers to improve their craft (Manno, 2012). Some researchers, however, are skeptical of pay for performance programs because of correlations they have found between extrinsic motivation and low levels of job satisfaction (Buck & Greene, 2011; Cavanaugh, 2011; Chandary & Kashyap, 2016; Hauer & Umhoefer, 2016). Some negative consequences of pay for performance are diminished performance, unethical behavior, limited creativity, narrow strategic planning, and short-term thinking, (Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 1999; Fang, Gerhart & Ledford, 2013; Marciano, 2010; Williams, 2013). Despite these negative consequences, districts continue to explore pay for performance for their teachers (Bluestein, 2015; Buck & Greene, 2011; Cavanaugh, 2011; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Delisio, 2016; Pink, 2009).

This literature review explores pay for performance, motivation, and how they are viewed under the framework of Self-Determination Theory. This chapter is organized into four sections. The first section reviews the importance of job satisfaction in the workplace. The second section describes motivational theory and traces how management has attempted to increase worker productivity from the time of the U.S.

Industrial Revolution (1820-1870) until the date of this study. The third section reports research findings regarding pay for performance programs. This section also includes rationale for supporting pay for performance programs and also presents arguments critical of such programs. The final section of this literature review examines the Self-Determination Theory framework and its role in successful organizational change.

The Importance of Job Satisfaction

Napoleon is credited with saying, “The effectiveness of the army depends upon its size, training, experience and morale, and morale is worth more than all the other factors together” (Fein, 2016). Research supports the importance of morale by finding a positive correlation between job satisfaction and organizational success (Ahmad, et al., 2013; Bakotic, 2015; Kaliannan & Nahr Adjovu, 2015; Manzoor, 2011; Proctor, 2014; Redmond, 2016). Job satisfaction provides a competitive edge for organizations in good and bad times and leads staff to support organizational strategies. Job satisfaction is strengthened by allowing employees a voice in decisions. Cogent to Idaho’s teacher shortage, job satisfaction also helps organizations attract and retain talented employees. Absenteeism decreases, customer satisfaction increases, engagement increases, and productivity increases with high levels of morale (Bowles & Cooper, 2009; Doshi & McGregor, 2015; Myers Giocometti, 2005).

Successful leaders consider how their decisions can affect worker motivation (Heathfield, 2016; Goodnow, 2016; Seppala, 2016). Motivation can be nurtured by unifying workers to organizational goals and by building their capacity (Heskett, 2007; Kouzes & Posner, 2012; Smallwood, et al., 2004). Part of building worker capacity is giving them opportunities to become autonomous in their areas of responsibility

(Marzano & Waters, 2006, Van Wart, 2004; Williams Richardson, 2014). Leaders build this kind of workplace autonomy by using shared leadership strategies to affect change and gather support for initiatives (Dawson, Lancefield, & Leitch, 2016; Fullan, 2014). This topic of autonomy will be discussed in greater detail, but for now it is evident that it is an important piece of job satisfaction (Baxter, et al., 2015; Marzano & Waters, 2006, Van Wart, 2004).

Innovations in the work place often fail when factors affecting job satisfaction are ignored (Aminoff, et al., 2009). Employee input should be encouraged, especially when new programs are in the planning stages (Green, 2011; Lavinsky, 2013; Randall, 2013). This type of employee engagement was an important part of Deming's 14 Points of Management (Deming, 1982). The 14 Points outlined in Deming's (1982) management philosophy incorporated a positive work environment and shared leadership. Deming has been recognized for his work in Japan's post-World War II manufacturing success and has been looked to for suggestions in building a positive culture in the workplace (Neave, 1987; Radziwell, 2012; Smith, 2011). Deming's 14 Points valued workers and empowered them to excel at their jobs (Berry, 2011; Van Ho, 2011). See Appendix A for the complete list Demings 14 Points of Management.

Self-Determination Theory, the framework for this study, is built upon the concepts of autonomy, efficacy, and purpose (Deci & Ryan, 2011). These ideas of autonomy, efficacy, and purpose are not explicit in Deming's management theory, but the concepts are imbedded in this philosophy. For example, under Deming's direction, manufacturing workers in post-World War II Japan were given decision-making authority to monitor quality. This autonomy increased their mastery of the tasks they faced.

Deming suggested that workers would be more effective and more motivated if management would break down barriers between departments (Alghamdi, 2016; Gopalan, 2014). Driving out fear and setting up effective teams allowed people to work together instead of in isolation. Teams were then better able to foresee problems and suggest solutions. Workers were empowered when they were allowed to make certain management decisions. This level of autonomy led to increased engagement and eventually to high levels of job satisfaction (Baker, Day & Salas, 2006; University of Birmingham, 2017).

Prevost (2014) shared comments about employee autonomy and freedom in regards to success in business. Empowering employees with freedom to make decisions can produce a fulfilling work environment that elevates productivity and job satisfaction. Prevost (2014) continues this line of thinking by offering five suggestions for allowing freedom in the workplace:

1. Give parameters, then offer choices. Choices offer opportunities for employees develop ownership in the tasks they are given and increases job satisfaction and productivity.
2. Reward top performers. Top performers are identified by customer satisfaction surveys. Employees are given freedom to decide how they can increase customer service.
3. Allow employees to customize their work schedule.
4. Unify the culture. Organizational rituals bond employees.
5. Provide training that instills organizational value.

(Prevost, 2014).

Drucker (2006) also offered suggestions on leadership and culture. An effective leader was defined as one who:

1. Asks what needs to be done.
2. Asks what is right for the organization.
3. Develops an action plan.
4. Took responsibility for communicating.
5. Focus on opportunities rather than problems.
6. Ran productive meetings.
7. Thought and said “we” rather than “I.”

(Drucker, 2006).

This type of leadership can foster a culture where employee freedom and autonomy can flourish.

DuFour, DuFour, and Eaker (2006) elaborate on this theme of culture in regards to job satisfaction. Collaboration is key in their definition of Professional Learning Communities. These authors contend that a professional learning community will have committed educators working together to improve student achievement through collective, job-embedded learning. Such a community will have six characteristics:

1. Shared mission (purpose), vision (direction), values (commitments), and goals (timelines and targets) focused on student achievement.
2. A collaborative culture focused on learning.
3. Collective inquiry into best practices.
4. Action orientation (learning by doing).
5. A commitment to continuous learning.

6. Results orientation.

(DuFour, DuFour, & Eaker; 2006).

An effective leader can foster a healthy organizational culture, such as DuFour, DuFour, & Eaker's Professional Learning Communities, when teachers have the right amount of autonomy to feel successful (2006).

Another example of this connection between autonomy, culture, and job satisfaction is when workers are involved in quality assurance decisions. By allowing workers to set goals regarding efficiency and effectiveness, managers can lead them to strengthen self-efficacy, job mastery, and attain higher levels of job satisfaction (Markos, 2010; Lunenberg, 2011; Proctor, 2014; Redmond, 2016). In a school setting, this idea of shared leadership and collaboration is part of Professional Learning Communities (Dufour, Dufour, & Eaker, 2008). Grade-level teams and subject area teams in Professional Learning Communities collaborate with each other as administrators delegate decision-making power over areas that affect teachers (Arroyo, Richter, & Wiseman, 2012; Dufour, Dufour, & Eaker, 2008). Staff collaboration and administrative support in the Professional Learning Community setting can enhance teacher job satisfaction (Ackerman, 2011; Trace 2016; Song, 2015).

Not all stakeholders see teacher autonomy as a positive idea. Parent groups have expressed support for teachers having control over what happens in their classrooms, but legislators have sought to restrict teacher autonomy (Bushaw & Lopez, 2013; Holloway & Park 2013). Some legislators have compared teachers to spoiled children, political thugs, and have sought to make teacher evaluations available to the public (Blackburn, 2011; Sawchuk, 2013; Wood, 2015). This adverse political environment has contributed

to a scarcity of teacher applicants and makes it difficult for teachers to support top-down initiatives from policy makers (Bodkin, 2016; Trillhaase, 2016, Ybarra, 2016). One such approach are plans to tie teacher pay to student achievement and performance evaluations in the hopes of motivating teachers to improve their craft (Lohman, 2011; Viscardi, 2014; Weldon, 2011). This type of carrot and stick mentality of teacher motivation is shortsighted (Barnum, 2016; Gratz, 2009; Store). Whether it is the inaccurate reporting of test scores or instances of being a poorly executed mandate, pay for performance has often been seen as a de-motivator (Fullan, 2014; Minkel, 2015; Paybarah, 2012; Richert, 2016b).

Teachers can be motivated by a pay for performance system when they have control over the parameters that drive the compensation (Deci & Ryan, 2004; Fullan, 2014, Pink, 2009). This idea of autonomy fits into Deming's suggestion of breaking down barriers between departments and sharing management decisions with employees (Deming, 1982). Employees should have the same opportunity to earn bonuses as the other employees doing their same job. Favoring one type of teacher over another will demotivate. Elementary teachers, core subject teachers, elective teachers, and special services teachers need to see a level playing field where bonuses are attainable by everyone on staff (Bluestein, 2015; Clotfelter, Ladd & Vigdor, 2010). The ideal pay for performance system, then, will incorporate Deming's ideas of collaboration and delegated authority and build upon Deci and Ryan's ideas of Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2011; Deming, 1982; Hassibi, 2013). Deming, Deci, and Ryan are just three examples business leaders who emphasized job satisfaction in the workplace. The following section of this literature review will explore other notable business leaders and

theories that have attempted to explain and capitalize on worker job satisfaction.

Motivational Theory

Frederick Taylor has been called the father of American Management (Giannantonio & Hurley-Hanson, 2011). Since his publication of *The Principles of Scientific Management* in 1911, business leaders and scholars have examined his work. Taylor introduced such concepts as task specialization, assembly line production practices, job analysis, work design, incentive schemes, person-job fit, and production quotas and control (Daruka, 2016; Helper, 2010; Lee & Young Shin, 2013; Rahman, 2012). Proponents of Scientific Management say that it increases productivity and efficiency (Dininni, 2017; Mohanty, 2016; Terry, 2011; Williyard, 2016). Critics contend that Taylor's ideas exploit workers, promote mistrust between management and employees, and demotivates by removing workers' creativity and thought processes from their actions in accomplishing tasks (Akrani, 2011; Chand, 2011; Perucci, 2014; Ralston, 2013). As teachers consider the implications of pay for performance rewards on their profession, concerns over control and mistrust of management become salient topics (Adams, 2016; Asmar, 2016; Bousted, 2015; Netolicky, 2016).

In contrast to Taylor's concept of scientific management, Maslow (1954) presented a Hierarchy of Needs model to explain motivation. Maslow (1954) offered an alternate motivational theory that suggested that the basic needs of all human beings could be placed into five categories: physiological needs, safety needs, the need to be loved, self-esteem needs, and self-actualization. These basic needs were related to each other and were arranged in a progressive order. The lowest levels monopolized a person's thoughts and efforts until they were met. Once a level of needs is met, people move up to the next level of need. For example, once the physiological need of food is met, a person

then seeks the safety need of shelter, and so forth through the stages of love, self-esteem, and self-actualization. Since gratified needs are not motivators, lower needs are forgotten while a person pursues the next higher need. The average person is most often partially satisfied or partially unsatisfied in all of his or her wants. Psychological damage occurs when the pursuit of the needs is threatened or thwarted. Such threats elicit emergency reactions in people (Burton, 2012; Fowler, 2014; Gunelius, 2014; Huitt, 2007; Kim, 2013).

Maslow (1954) looked at motivation from a holistic view that focused on intrinsic rewards. Frederick Taylor sought to motivate individual workers through extrinsic compensation (Chen, 2014; Grimsley, 2013; Ramlall, 2012; San, 2012; Suff, 2007; Van Vliet, 2015). In between these two viewpoints lie the Hawthorne studies (Gale, 2004; Hindle, 2008; Obrenovic, 2014; Shangchao, 2014). Researchers behind the Hawthorne Studies conducted a series of experiments in the 1920's and 1930's at Western Electric's factory in Illinois. These studies looked at groups of workers in a social context to see if group dynamics could be influenced to affect performance. By manipulating working conditions, researchers attempted to improve the productivity of the groups in the study.

Two groups were chosen for the Hawthorne study: a control group and an experimental group. Lighting, temperature, the number of rest breaks, working hours, and other environmental adjustments were made. Each time a change was introduced to the experiment group, productivity improved. Even when the change to the working environment did not seem to be positive, the effect was an increase in productivity. For example, improved lighting and decreased lighting both had similar effect on productivity. When the studies concluded and working conditions returned to match the

control group, the experiment group was performing at the highest rates of productivity in company history. Researchers concluded that workers thrive when they perceive they are seen in a positive light. Participants in the Hawthorne studies perceived a level of self-importance that warranted their involvement in the study. This social element of group validation outweighed the individual self-interest upon which previous management techniques were based (Allen, 2011; Gale, 2004; Hindle, 2008; Menon, 2016; Obrenovic, 2014; Paradis & Sutkin; 2016; Shangchao; 2014).

The Hawthorne studies present a unique case for this study. Workers reacted to the social elements of the work place in such a way that their individual self-interest was disregarded. Because of this, group dynamics and the human element of management became important pieces to consider in administrative decisions (Hindle, 2008; Obrenovic, 2014; Perry, 2011). Compensation structures such as pay for performance can be more effective if the culture of the work place is taken into account. Otherwise, isolation and individualization will likely diminish the value of pay for performance programs have to motivate employees. The work environment is a key piece to consider when looking at motivation (Gale, 2004; Hindle, 2008; Kompier, 2006; Shangchao, 2013). An unsupportive work environment is one of four factors causing a nationwide teacher shortage (Carver-Thomas, Darling Hammond, & Sutchter, 2016). According to these authors, of those teachers who choose to leave voluntarily, most list dissatisfaction with the workplace as an important or as an extremely important factor in their decision to leave the profession. A supportive environment is the factor that is most consistently associated with a teacher's decision to stay or leave a school (Carver-Thomas et al, 2016). An effective work environment can promote what has been called peak

performance (Drucker, 2010). Peak performance is when people function at the maximum of their abilities to such an extent that their confidence is high, their performance feels effortless, and they are focused on the task at hand (Livingston, 2008). People experience high levels of intrinsic motivation in such an environment and pride of workmanship becomes imbedded in the culture (Smith, 2012). Workers are then able to perform at high levels without constant oversight by management. Supervisors can gain enough confidence in their employees and allow autonomy in the tasks placed before them. Workers then have freedom to do their jobs without feeling scrutinized by management. Supervisors can be proactive in affording leadership opportunities that foster increased pride on the part of the workers. The self-confidence the workers will gain by accepting leadership roles will enhance motivation and improve efficiency in the organization (Bartol & Zhang, 2010; Ensley & Hmielesk, 2005; Hughes & Pickerall, 2013).

On a spectrum of management theory, between Taylor's (1909) authoritarian ideas of Scientific Management and Maslow's (1954) more humanistic Hierarchy of Needs lies Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene theory (Deshields & Kara, 2005; Fisher, 2009; Sachau, 2007). First introduced in 1968, this theory suggests that job satisfaction is affected by two kinds of needs. These needs were defined as hygiene factors and motivating factors. Hygiene factors are needed to avoid job dissatisfaction. These include salary, benefits, working conditions, and staff unity. They do not promote job satisfaction, but their absence will make job satisfaction decrease. Motivating factors include recognition, accomplishments, autonomy, and responsibility. If hygiene factors are missing, employees will have difficulty achieving long-term motivation (Baxamusa,

2012; Cleal & Nielsen, 2010; Northouse, 2010).

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory has been further explained by distinguishing between movement and motivation (Drake-Knight, 2007; Herzberg, 1968; Hyun, 2009). Movement was defined by someone doing something out of fear of punishment or as an attempt to gain an extrinsic reward. This kind of movement is used to train animals and in behavior modification efforts in humans. Motivation is deeper than movement. It comes from the growth associated with intrinsic rewards. Intrinsic rewards can be the result of interesting and challenging work. Extrinsic motivation has been called addictive because it requires repetitive reinforcement and focuses on short-term results. Movement must be continually enhanced to support a desired behavior. Intrinsic motivation, however, does not require the same incremental increases that extrinsic rewards do. (Chyung, 2005; Hogans, 2013; Zubova, 2014).

Gawell (1997) applied both Herzberg's Hygiene Theory and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs to schools. These theories fit the business world well, but each theory had at least one element that did not support teacher behavior. Teacher pay, while a low priority factor to Herzberg, was in fact a high priority to teachers. Self-esteem was a lower need for Maslow, but very important to teachers. Gawell (1997) suggested that these findings may explain why good teachers leave their profession for higher paying jobs elsewhere. Gawell (1997) also recommended that administrators should consider teacher self-esteem in order to motivate and retain staff (Gawell, 1997; Matoke, 2015).

Gawell, Hezberg, and Maslow all focused on internal drives. Another theory focusing on internal motivation is Expectancy Theory (Vroom, 1964). Vroom (1964) suggested that employees are rational individuals whose beliefs and perceptions drive

their behavior. Expectancy is based on anticipation, instrumentality, and valence. Employees are motivated to the degree that they believe that their efforts will lead to an acceptable level of performance (expectancy), that the performance will lead to a reward (instrumentality), and that reward will be positive (valence). Vroom (1964) also suggested that if managers feel that motivation is important, they should consider their employees' expectations for being rewarded. Motivation can be supported when employees are rewarded through a predictable and expected process (Gupta, Osterwalder, & Pigneur, 2014; Redmond, 2016).

Van Raaij and Wandwossen (1978) reviewed motivational theories to find correlations between motivation and consumer behavior. Among the theories they examined was McClelland's Need Achievement Theory. McClelland (1967) theorized that motivation comes from setting a goal to satisfy a certain need and then working towards that goal. There is a risk that this need may not be met. Motivation comes from the expectation that actions and behaviors will result in a positive consequence. The tendency to engage in the activity is strengthened or weakened by the perception that the activity will lead to success or failure. Managers may consider making the goals themselves desirable enough to stimulate motivation. Another strategy to increase motivation would be to reduce the risk of failure associated with the activity (Bhasin, 2016; Faber, May, & Xu, 2007; Koh, 2016; McClelland, 1967; Smith, 2016; Van Raaij & Wandwossen, 1978).

Moving from the business world to the school environment, research suggests that a poor school climate, weak administrative leadership, and a low quality of the school facilities have been associated with teacher dissatisfaction (Moore, 2012; Huicochea,

2014; Richmond, 2012). In some instances, the socioeconomic level of a school's student body has affected teacher motivation. Moore (2012) urged an increased scrutiny of the factors influencing teacher discontent in order to understand the pressures teachers face in light of increased accountability, decreased classroom support and resources, and the costs of teacher turnover. Part of the stress teachers experience is their heavy work load and low compensation levels (Beers, 2012; Johannsen, 2011; Partelow, 2016; Vaifanua, 2016). Carver-Thomas, et al. (2016), listed factors associated with a nationwide teacher shortage that included supportive school leadership, professional learning opportunities, instructional leadership, time for collaboration and planning, collegial relationships, and decision-making input.

Pink (2009) suggested paying employees at a high enough level so that salary is not a stumbling block to motivation. An adequate salary level becomes a hygiene factor and when it is not an issue in employees' minds, it is not an obstacle to motivation. A district can then go beyond salaries and reward teachers with teacher-valued incentives such as professional development and opportunities to advance (Harwell, 2003; Quattlebaum, 2014; Yoon, 2007). This will allow teachers the autonomy they need to improve their craft and their efficacy so that they perform high levels (Darling-Hammond & Rothman, 2011). Just as administrators can extend a level of autonomy to teachers, teachers can find success in giving students autonomy.

Teachers who gave students autonomy experienced an increase in student motivation and engagement (Assor, Kanat-Maymon, & Roth, 2007; Guvenc, 2015; Reeve, 2006). Highly motivated teachers can promote high levels of drive in students. Teachers who allowed students to have a voice in classroom objectives saw high levels of

engagement. Additionally, students experienced increased motivation by recognizing a sense of responsibility for their actions, decisions, and failures (McCombs, 2014). In the classroom, professional autonomy gives a teacher freedom. Teachers who use professional judgment and academic freedom to meet the needs of students can then share autonomy with students. Choice allows people to be both autonomous and productively interdependent with others (2009). Likewise, autonomous students take responsibility for their learning and are aware of their learning styles and strategies (Chu, Sakai & Takagi, 2010).

Successful teachers who inspire students can be motivated by the flow of their craft (Csikszentmihalyi, 2004). Activities that are intrinsically rewarding lend themselves to extraordinary voluntary efforts. Such intrinsically rewarding activities are seen as difficult but also worthwhile. Csikszentmihalyi (2004) uses the word *autotelic* to describe these optimal experiences. Optimal activities are those that are done without expectation of a future benefit. Deci, Pink, and Ryan's idea of being motivated by the purpose of task is reflected in Csikszentmihalyi's idea of flow. There is a difference between teachers who educate children for the sake of turning them into productive citizens versus teaching solely for the joyful interaction between students and teacher (Csikszentmihalyi, 2004). The activities may appear very similar, but they are not. When the experience is autotelic, a teacher pays attention to a lesson for the sake of the activity itself and is rewarded intrinsically in the moment (Belshaw, 2009). When the experience is not autotelic, a teacher pays attention a lesson for the sake of a future reward (Findlay, 2014). The intrinsic nature of an autotelic activities lead teachers to expend a great deal of energy and resources in teaching (Harley, 2003). The motivation to accomplish extrinsic goals

lacks this same staying power and does not have the same level of energy that flows from intrinsic motivation (Karageorghis & Terry, 2011). Autotelic people are internally driven. They get caught up in the sense of purpose and curiosity of the task before them (Ahmed, 2011). This internal determination is markedly different from being externally driven, where things such as comfort, money, power, or fame are the motivating force (Cherry, 2016; Csikszentmihalyi, 2009; Derosiers; 2016; McDermott; 2016).

This concept of internal motivation is imbedded in Csikszentmihalyi's (2004) work. It is also woven throughout Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Fang, Gerhart & Ledford, 2013; Pink, 2009; Sahrberg, 2014). This theory suggests that humans have three innate psychological needs: autonomy, mastery, and connectedness to a broad sense of purpose. (Deci & Ryan, 2000). When these three needs are satisfied, people are motivated, happy, and productive. When these factors are not present, motivation, productivity, and happiness diminish. Mental health, persistence at tasks, and performance levels all decrease when Self-Determination Theory needs are not met (Fang, Gerhart, & Ledford, 2013). Autonomy, mastery, and relatedness to a larger social context are intrinsic in nature. The implication is for managers to find situations where employees can develop autonomy, mastery, and a sense of purpose. Such situations will lead to long-term motivation and job satisfaction (Sahrberg, 2014). Extrinsic attempts to motivate employees will, at best, lead to short term gains, and, at worst, lead to diminished levels of motivation and performance (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Extrinsic rewards, such as pay for performance can become de-motivators that harm performance and creativity (Marciano, 2010; Williams, 2013). When this happens, the carrot and stick motivators of extrinsic motivation can encourage unethical behavior,

create addictions, and foster short-term thinking (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 1999). These undesirable aspects of extrinsic motivation will be explored in the next section of this literature review, but the view of extrinsic motivation is not completely negative. As for rote tasks such as assembly line work or grocery baggers, carrot and stick motivators can be effective and pay for performance may be appropriate. For non-routine, creative tasks such as teaching, however, research suggests extrinsic rewards can have negative effects (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 1999). When managers focus on intrinsic rewards, however, they will find stronger employee performance, greater organizational health, and higher overall well being from their staff. Internal reward systems are most likely to succeed when they incorporate autonomy, mastery, and purpose. These three elements are the building blocks of motivation and will be woven into the following section of this literature review that explores pay for performance (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 1999; Fang, Gerhart & Ledford, 2013; Sahrberg, 2014).

History of Pay for Performance

The history of U.S. teacher compensation begins with the room and board arrangements between teachers and parents throughout the 1800's (Gratz, 2009; McCallion & Stedman, 2001; Podursky & Springer, 2010; Wisconsin Education Association Council, 2011). From 1890 to 1920, there was a shift in how most teachers were paid. Salaries began to be tied to the grade levels teachers taught. It was during this time that a grade-based compensation model that paid more for teaching higher grades than lower grade levels was introduced. This system soon saw criticism because for the gender and racial inequalities it seemed to promote (Keister & Southgate, 2012; Subramanian, 2013).

The next phase of teacher compensation was the introduction of the salary grid. This single salary schedule, originally called the position-automatic schedule, was based on years of experience and level of education (Clowes, 2004; Hanushek, 2007). By 1950, 97% of teachers were paid on the single salary schedule. In contrast to the grade-based compensation model, the single salary schedule was viewed as being fair, objective, easy to administer, and promoting collegiality (Hanushek, 2007).

While traditional pay systems were being developed in the United States, pay for performance was being explored in England. Pay for performance can be traced back to a 30-year period, from 1870 to 1900, when British schools used pay for performance to reward teachers (Kershaw, 2000). Cheating scandals led the public to reject these measures in favor of a more uniform and objective system. Cheating also led to the downfall of pay for performance in Canada in the late 1800's (Gratz, 2009). Ironically, in 2013, pay for performance bonuses also played a role in the Atlanta Public Schools cheating scandal. In the Fulton County (Georgia) Supreme Court, teachers and administrators were convicted of racketeering for cheating on standardized tests. Cheating parties took place where students at struggling schools had their incorrect answers erased and replaced with correct answers by teachers and staff. These teachers and staff, along with their administrators, received performance bonuses for the improved test scores (Ellis & Lopez, 2015).

Teacher pay for performance began in 1918 in the United States (Gratz, 2009; Podursky & Springer, 2010; Stedman, 2001; Wisconsin Education Association Council, 2011). Pay for performance was slowly abandoned in light of the racial and gender inequalities it fostered (Gratz, 2009). Widespread adoption of a uniform teacher pay

system carried into the 1950's. By this time, less than 5% of U.S. school districts were paying teachers on a pay for performance model. Pay for performance saw new life in the late 1960's when President Nixon introduced performance contracting for the privatization of schools in Texas and Arkansas. Charges of corruption in these programs soon followed. Corruption coupled with a lack of results led to the program being abandoned (Heinzelman, 2013). Ten percent of districts reported using some form of pay for performance in the 1960s (Podursky & Springer, 2010). These numbers dwindled to 4% of districts using merit pay in 1978. Pay for performance again resurfaced in 1983 after the publication of *A Nation at Risk*, which blamed schools for the country's economic woes. In the 1980's and 1990's, incentive programs based on student achievement, career-ladders, teacher skills, and differentiated staffing were introduced. Few of these programs were successful (Gratz, 2009; Podursky & Springer, 2010; Stedman, 2001; Wisconsin Education Association Council, 2011). By 1986, administrators reported that pay for performance systems were unsustainable because of cost and ineffectiveness. Pay for performance systems were also introduced in the 1990's as part of outputs focused reform and value added movements (Podursky & Springer, 2010). As with previous iterations of pay for performance, these efforts were found to be ineffective and were abandoned. In 2008, the federal government provided funding for pay for performance incentives based on standardized test scores (Stedman, 2001). Several cities and states began programs to reward teachers based on performance. Some systems like those in Florida were based on test scores, some were based on career ladders like those in Arizona, and some were bargained for locally like those in Minnesota. Studies by RAND Corp. and another study in Tennessee found that student

achievement is unaffected by merit pay systems (Ballou, et al., 2010; Hermie, Schmidt, & Tirozzi, 2012).

Another concern about pay for performance is that teachers are often motivated to improve student achievement without merit pay (Dufour & Mattos, 2013). The idea that human behavior can be shaped by nominal rewards has been questioned. Teachers themselves have consistently reported that supportive working conditions and opportunities to succeed motivate more than nominal cash incentives (Adkins, 2004; Kelly & Odden, 2008; Lohman, 2011; Rosales, 2010; Strauss, 2010).

Part of the appeal of pay for performance comes from pressure from different federal entities that aggressively encourage improved effectiveness and efficiency (Adams et al., 2009). The idea of incentives based on increased productivity has been taken from the private sector and applied to public schools. Those who support using an incentive system for teachers claim that it is a common-sense model that will reward teachers for raising student achievement levels (Podursky & Solomon, 2001). However, pay for performance models differ greatly in performance, motivation, and unintended consequences. Productivity and employee behavior have not been positively linked to pay for performance models. (Chamorro-Premuzic, 2013; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Talamas, 2014; Vyasumesh, 2012).

Policy makers have consistently tried to link school improvement efforts to higher standards (Brown Cross, et al., 2011). They would like to hold teachers accountable for student achievement on standardized tests (Ballou, 2002; Darling-Hammond, 2015; Terry, 2015). These ideas do not support Ravitch (2011) and Stiggins' (2013) suggestions that assessments should be used to inform instruction, not to reward teachers.

Assessments for learning provide a constant flow of information not only to teachers, but also to students as well. Students should see a connection between their day-to-day classrooms activities and their assessments (Guskey, 2003; Tomlison, 2014). Under this paradigm, assessments will become more motivating for students and they will be more engaged in their school work. Students will gain confidence in their abilities to learn at productive levels as they continue working diligently in the face of difficult concepts and lessons presented in the classroom. Students will not give up due to frustration or hopelessness, but instead, this intrinsic motivation to succeed will lead to more productivity and creativity in the classroom and in the workplace (Stiggins, 2013; Supovitz, 2014).

Creativity is a highly sought after skill set in complex work environments (Ariely, et al., 2008). Increasing numbers of employers value employees who are able to display creativity and problem solving skills in their work (Kuther, 2013). An accepted notion is that increasing the incentive levels offered to employees will increase motivation and performance levels (Iberman, 1998; U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2010). But instead of increased creativity and productivity, the result of pay for performance has been decreased performance levels (Fang et al., 2013). When extrinsic motivators do produce high levels of productivity, increasing incentive levels are required to maintain that productivity. Raising incentives above a certain level can quickly become too costly for employers. Increasing incentives do not always translate into improved productivity (Heskett, 2007). A pay for performance reward system may work for some employees, but Chamarro-Premuzic (2013) cautioned that increasing rewards does not guarantee increased performance and motivation. Despite the numbers of school districts adopting

pay for performance measures, linking it to standardized test scores has been ineffective in improving student test scores (Ravitch, 2014; Stiggins, 2013; Supovitz, 2013). What has been effective, however, is pay for performance that is linked to professional development, classroom behavior, and specific learning outcomes for students (Heneman, Kimball, & Milanowski, 2007; Iberman, 1998).

In order for a pay for performance incentive to motivate teachers, teachers must first value the reward (Lee, Ijoo & Jung, 2008; Jensen, Tippetts & Yamashiro, 2011). Rewards must be sufficient for teachers to want to obtain as small bonuses have been ineffective and often bring unintended consequences into the work place (McPhie, 2007). Pay for performance is a complicated issue because any reward systems can contribute to either a positive or negative work environment depending upon its reception by staff (Varelas, 2013). This is important because an examination of teacher turnover and retention rates indicates that rewards and penalties are factors in teachers' decision to leave their profession (Morello, 2014; Riggs, 2013; Smallin, 2011). As previously mentioned in this study, teachers do value incentives beyond their salary. Such incentives include professional development, leadership opportunities, increased collaboration time, curriculum and support, effective student discipline, and a level of autonomy given to teachers. These incentives reinforce intrinsic values and can lead to long-term job satisfaction (Bottoms & Schmidt-Davis, 2010).

Pay for performance systems can be judged on the following factors to determine if teachers will view the rewards to be positive enough to seek and then to remain in the district (Eccles, 2009; Lunenberg, 2011; Scholl, 2002). Teachers must see a link between their performance and their pay. Teachers must understand the connection between their

effort, their performance, and the reward (Harvey-Beavis, 2003; Heskett, 2007; Jensen, 2010). Teachers should be able to expect that their performance will warrant a reward, but they are sometimes discouraged by difficult performance goals, unclear performance ratings, lack of instructional material, lack of administrative support, coaching and feedback, disconnected professional development, and unmotivated students (Doyle, 2009; Guajardo, 2011). Successful pay for performance plans should give teachers opportunities and resources to succeed (Eccles, 2009; Lunenberg, 2011; Scholl, 2002). Administrators should evaluate reverse accountability and the level of support their district offers teachers (Preziozi, 2016). Administrators would be responsible for supporting staff and giving them the tools such as curriculum, collaboration time, and professional development that will enable them to succeed (Preziozi, 2016).

One successful pay for performance program was implemented in Iowa's North Plains Community School District (Blazer, 2011; Shepard, 2012). School district leaders organized a pay for performance committee made of stakeholders. The committee was charged with constructing the pay for performance incentive plan and gathering staff input. The plan was designed not only to incentivize staff, but also to raise low scores on the state's standardized test. Under guidance from an intermediary organization, the committee evaluated the pay for performance programs in other districts and sought input to see if such a program could succeed in their district (Savage, 2012). This committee visited California's Poway Schools and modeled their pay for performance plan on what they saw there.

A plan was developed to support district goals of raising student achievement levels. The intermediary organization provided support to the district throughout the

process. The committee proactively sought to inform teachers and staff about the changes this plan would bring to the district. Teachers understood that the plan would focus on an individual student growth model, provide useful data for classroom instruction, and offer professional development. Through formal and informal communications, the district maintained transparency about the need to increase student learning. Teachers felt that they were included at each step of the process (Savage, 2012). Teachers expressed appreciation for the tools to track students and the professional development to improve their craft. Funding was initially provided for the program and it saw initial success its first year (Savage, 2012). As additional teachers were added from more buildings the subsequent year, there was less teacher buy-in. The program faltered and, with a cut in funding, was unsustainable. It appeared that the success of the program was based on teacher efficacy more than pay for performance incentives. The keys to the success of the program were the involvement of all stakeholders from the beginning, implementing fair and doable policies, acknowledging weakness in the program, adapting successful programs instead of trying to reinvent the wheel, and engaging formal and informal leaders in the system to garnish support (Savage, 2012).

Organizational change, successful and unsuccessful, frequently depends upon the vision of the organization's leadership (Bylsma & Shannon, 2007). In schools, leaders can be effective when they focus on school improvement efforts that are likely to improve student achievement (Bottoms, Schmidt-Davis, 2010).

If educational leaders fear a mass exodus of teachers, they should explore the causes and solutions to this issue (Corbin, 2016; Klein, 2013). Teachers are discouraged as they see their salaries remain stagnant, their efforts disparaged, and their contributions

to student success discounted (Corbin, 2016; Richert, 2015, Ybarra, 2016). Top-down mandates in Idaho that did not seek teacher input faced voter backlash (Corbin, 2013; Richert, 2013). An alternative to top-down management by mandate is a more humanistic leadership philosophy that seeks to support teachers and students. Strong education systems have leaders who motivate by unifying staff to organizational goals and who build staff capacity and expertise (Saz-Carranza, 2012). A critical piece to motivating staff is to delegate powers and give staff opportunities to become autonomous in their areas of responsibility. Pay for performance has not been typically applied by policymakers who have the intrinsic elements of motivation in mind, but when it has, it has been successful (Jensen, 2010). The key to successful implementation is to deliberately link pay for performance measures to motivational theory (Heng, San, Then, 2012).

Conclusion

Motivational Theory has evolved from Taylor's Scientific Management ideas where the focus was placed on outputs to the more humanistic approaches of Deci, Herzberg, Maslow, Pink, and Ryan that looked to intrinsic factors of motivation (Dierksmeier & Claus, 2016; Doh, Hodgetts, & Luthans, 2006). Taylor's carrot and stick approaches to management are effective in jobs that do not require creativity, are repetitive and rote, and have specific steps workers follow to accomplish tasks. In the classroom environment, where teachers are encouraged to be creative and to approach students with a mixture of caring support and high expectations humanistic approaches to motivation prove to be more effective (Muhammed, 2010), Self-Determination Theory is

one such approach that emphasizes intrinsic motivation. This approach can provide the kind of long-term job satisfaction that can transform organizational cultures.

Self-Determination Theory can be strategically implemented to increase employee autonomy, mastery, and sense of purpose. Top down approaches to organizational change often fail because the people most closely affected by the change are left out of the process. Programs are more likely to succeed when there is a deliberate collaboration in the planning process that involves employees. Leadership, motivation, and pay for performance can be combined to build employee autonomy, mastery, and sense of purpose. When decisions are collaborative, ownership in the process is shared by management and by employees at all levels. Under this paradigm, pay for performance models can be successful when they incorporate Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Deci & Ryan, 2011; Pink, 2009). This type of collaboration in the development and implementation of pay for performance in schools has been rare

Teacher pay for performance programs have existed since at least the late 1800's (Gratz, 2009; Podursky & Springer, 2010; Stedman, 2001; Wisconsin Education Association Council, 2011). Pay for performance developed in the U.S. during the Industrial Age at the same time as early motivational theory was being developed (Barba-Alvarez, 2010). Both pay for performance efforts and motivational theory have evolved over time. Motivational theory has become more humanistic, while pay for performance has struggled to be valued by employees. In its various configurations, pay for performance has had a history riddled with long-term failure and abandonment. Cheating scandals in pay for performance systems are as prevalent today as they were in the late 1800's. Despite the accepted notion that increased compensation will lead to increased

motivation and performance levels, there is a growing body of research that indicates increased incentives are likely to lead to decreased performance levels and unethical behavior (Gino, 2014; Pierce, 2013). It appears to be counterintuitive, but raising incentive levels does not always correspond to increased performance levels.

Policy makers and school administrators have employed a variety of management philosophies, including pay for performance, to motivate teachers. (Darling-Hammond, 2007; Leithwood, 2004). One recent attempt at pay for performance came from the federally funded, competitive grant process known as the Race to the Top. Several states abandoned the Race to the Top process because of the burdensome requirements on districts for the grant money (Downey, 2013; O'Connor, 2011; Springer & Gardner, 2010). Several states attempted to use pay for performance to motivate teachers to increase student achievement levels, but with little success (Holley, et al., 2008; Johnson, 2010; Wagner, 2009). Research into extrinsic rewards such as pay for performance is split. Proponents support pay for performance as a way to compensate teachers while holding them accountable for student achievement. Critics condemn pay for performance as a short sighted practice that is demotivating to staff (Goldhaber & Walch, 2011; Lavy, 2007; Pink, 2009; Deci & Ryan, 2000). When pay for performance is aligned to motivational theory, it is more likely to be valued by teachers and more likely to be successful (Jensen, 2010; Nemati & Redmond, 2016).

Chapter III

Design and Methodology

Introduction

A nation-wide teacher shortage has made recruiting and retaining talented educators a difficult task (Carver-Thomas, et al., 2016, Helm, 2016; Weingarten, 2016; Westervelt, 2016). Policy makers have looked to pay for performance programs to help bridge this gap between open positions and a dwindling pool of applicants. (Chiang, 2015; Carver-Thomas, et al., 2016; Douglas County School District, 2016). One piece of pay for performance that should not be overlooked is how it affects teacher job satisfaction (Brooks, 2017; Glazerman, 2016; Wellington, 2016). Pay for performance's effect on job satisfaction will either bolster staffing numbers or contribute to the teacher shortage (Barnum, 2016; Glasserman, 2011; Jensen, 2010; Smith 2009). If districts do not consider job satisfaction, they will have difficulty retaining their staff over time and they will be challenged to hire quality new teachers (Chamorro-Premuzic, 2013; Bland, 2014; Berry, 2013; Sundhiem, 2013; Voke, 2002).

One measure of pay for performance's link to job satisfaction is to gauge autonomy, mastery, and sense of purpose. These three elements are the foundation of Self-Determination Theory and form the basis of this study's theoretical framework (Ciau, Curren, Deci, Ryan & Waterman, 2014; Chiu, Deci, Ma, Marsden & Ryan; 2014; Deci & Gagné, 2005). When these three needs are satisfied, people are motivated, happy, and productive. Mental health, persistence at tasks, and performance levels all decrease when Self-Determination Theory needs are not met (Fang, Gerhart, & Ledford, 2013). This study examines pay for performance's effect on teacher job satisfaction in terms of

autonomy, job mastery, and sense of purpose.

Research Design

This study follows a mixed method design. The mixed method design combines quantitative and qualitative approaches to collecting and analyzing data (Creswell, 2009; Creswell & Wisdom, 2013). The rationale behind using a mixed method approach is to capture the strengths of both approaches in gathering and analyzing a study's results (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). The author, then, does not draw conclusions strictly from the human elements of a qualitative research design nor solely from the raw numbers of quantitative data. These approaches are blended together and the strengths of both are combined in order to identify relationships between quantitative and qualitative responses to determine if pay for performance has an effect on teacher job satisfaction (Creswell, 2009).

The district targeted for this study appears to have followed a systems approach in the development and implementation of their pay for performance program. A systems approach takes into consideration the components of an organization and how departments and personnel fit together to affect organizational goals (Arnold, 2015). The district's systems approach became a focus for this study and fit appropriately into the mixed-methods design (Bradley, Curry, & Nembald, 2009; Caruth, 2013).

Mixed methods studies incorporate prior knowledge and experience into the research process (Burke Johnson & Oweguebuzie, 2004). The first three research questions for this study were identified by the prior knowledge and experience of Self-Determination Theory researchers (Deci & Ryan, 2004). Their concepts of autonomy, mastery, and connectedness informed this study's theoretical framework and research

questions.

This study involved a relatively small sample size, $N = 35$, which was another reason the researcher selected the mixed methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2015). The study used surveys and interviews as tools to gather data. Analysis and interpretation of data was an ongoing process, as is allowed in a mixed methods study. The ongoing analysis of data informed the researcher at all stages of the research process (Creswell, 2009). The combination of quantitative data gathered from surveys and qualitative data gathered from interviews provided a richer, deeper understanding of pay for performance and job satisfaction than either approach could have provided alone (Marshall & Rossman, 2016).

Participants

The participants in this study were the administrators, teachers, and staff in the small, rural, K-12 public school district of San Animado. The San Animado School District is located in a micropolitan statistical area that was incorporated in the late 1800's. A year after incorporation, classes began in a local church and continued until a permanent school building was constructed in the 1930's (Community website, retrieved March 8, 2016). This early commitment to education is still evident in the community and is reflected in the school district's academic success. The district was ranked on U.S. News and World Report's best schools list (2016). The district's 90% reading proficiency ranks among the best in the state (U.S. News and World Report, 2016).

Academic success such as San Animado's has been linked to teacher job satisfaction (Turner, 2007). An important factor influencing teacher job satisfaction are student body characteristics (Turner, 2007). There are 1,029 students in the San Animado

School District: 294 at the high school, 225 at the middle school, and 510 at the elementary school. San Animado High School has a graduation rate of 82% and a Go-on Rate of 54% (<http://www.greatschools.org>; retrieved February 5 2017). This is the percentage of students who go on to a post-high school institution after graduation. Forty-seven percent of the students in the district are on the free and reduced lunch program. Sixteen percent of students in the district identify themselves as Hispanic, 82 % identified themselves as Caucasian, and another 4% were identified as Other (<http://www.greatschools.org>; retrieved February 5 2017).

Researchers may consider Turner's (2007) call for additional studies examining student characteristics as well as teacher characteristics to determine job satisfaction levels. This study, however, focuses only on the school characteristic of compensation in the form of pay for performance to see if there is a valid and reliable link between it and teacher job satisfaction. The participant pool was limited to only administrators, faculty, and staff in the district.

The participants lived over 350 miles away from the researcher. Emails and phone calls from the researcher to the members of the participant pool were made to introduce the researcher and the study. This allowed participants to understand the scope of the research, the motives of the researcher, and how the research would affect them individually. The research would be conducted by anonymous online surveys through Qualtrics (2016) as well as through telephone interviews recorded on a Sony ICD-PX440 digital recorder and transferred via SD card to the researcher's laptop computer. Participants were assured that their identities and responses would be protected. The data was password protected and the researcher was the only person who had access to it.

Survey and research questions would ask participants their views of how the district's pay for performance plan affected the job satisfaction components of autonomy, efficacy, and purpose (Deci & Ryan, 2011). The researcher's motive in examining this phenomenon was to establish whether or not there exists a link between pay for performance and teacher job satisfaction. The researcher took steps necessary to protect participants and their responses. There was to be no foreseeable affect on the participants of this study.

For the first part of this research, participants responded to survey questions that were designed to identify correlations between teacher pay for performance and the following variables:

- teacher autonomy
- teacher self-efficacy
- teacher sense of purpose

Participants self-identified their gender, grade-level taught, years in education, and years in the district. These additional demographic descriptions by the study's participants added to the depth of the study. By comparing and contrasting these demographics, the research was able establish the validity and reliability of the study.

In addition to the quantitative survey portion of this study, a qualitative interview process was also conducted. Participants in the survey were asked to volunteer to be interviewed and six people volunteered. A cross section of administrators, teachers, and support staff were represented among the volunteers. A week after the initial interviews, participants were contacted and were asked follow-up questions to clarify their answers from the original interview.

Data Collection

The data for this study was gathered from the administrators, teachers and staff in the San Animado School District. A potential pool of 65 participants was identified from this group. Before contacting faculty and staff, the researcher gained permission from the district Superintendent to conduct this study (Appendix A). The Superintendent then worked with the researcher to identify the district employees for the study and to provide their contact information. Participants were invited to participate by phone calls and by emails. Those who were willing to be part of the study were asked to sign an informed consent form and were notified that they could withdraw at any time from the study and that all participation in the study was voluntary (Appendix B). Everyone in the district had the same chance of participating in the study. Kalton (1983) and later Creswell (2011) define this as random sampling.

The final survey question asked if participants were willing to take part in the interview portion of the study. Three people initially agreed. These three individuals were asked to identify colleagues who also may be willing to be interviewed. They identified three more interview participants to bring to total number of interview participants to six. The first survey questions asked participants to self-identify their gender, educational level, years working in the district, and years working in education. Knowledge of the participants' demographics and backgrounds allowed the researcher to make assumptions and to draw conclusions from the data that was gathered.

Before data was gathered, the researcher requested permission to conduct this study from the Human Research Review Committee (HRRC) at Northwest Nazarene University (Appendix C). At the same time that the HRRC was granting permission for

the study, the researcher was trained and received certification from the National Institute of Health on conducting ethical research (See Appendix D). The research strategy presented to the HRRC was to begin with the gathering of quantitative data from an online survey (Appendix D). Before the survey was distributed, it was piloted to twelve school superintendents to ensure that the questions were clear and understandable. Feedback from this pilot was used to modify and clarify the survey questions so that they were free from bias (Appendix E). The qualitative portion of this dissertation was also piloted. Five educators from elementary school, middle school and high school levels were asked to review the interview questions. This pilot group mirrored the population targeted in the school district for the dissertation. Again, feedback from this group was used to clarify the interview questions and to remove bias.

After getting permission from the school district and piloting the study, educators were invited to participate. The study was explained and participation was requested via emails and phone calls. Since the survey did not ask for personal information, a follow-up email was sent requesting volunteers to contact the researcher if they were willing to be interviewed. At the end of each of these interviews, those interviewed were asked if they could recommend a district colleague who could offer additional insight into the pay for performance program.

Participants in the quantitative portion of the study completed the 25-question survey on a likert-like scale. Response choices were strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, and strongly agree. The last question on the survey asked participants if they were willing to be interviewed for the study. The researcher was contacted by three participants who agreed to be interviewed. Three additional interview

participants were identified and included in this qualitative piece of data gathering. As previously mentioned, the participants and the researcher lived over 350 miles apart. Because of this distance between the researcher and the participants, the interviews were conducted by phone. A digital recorder was used by the researcher that plugged into the researcher's cell phone and recorded the conversations. The interviews were recorded on an SD card in the cell phone and transferred to the researcher's computer for transcription. Participants consenting to be interviewed were asked to voluntarily provide their name, phone number, and email address for further communication. All interviews were recorded digitally with the interviewees' consent. The researcher transcribed the interviews and was the sole individual having access to the recordings. The transcriptions were written onto a template that cross-referenced responses to the theoretical framework of the study (Appendix F).

During this entire data gathering process, the researcher was deliberate in protecting the identity of the participants. For example, the researcher changed the name of the target district in the study to the fictitious San Animado School District. The researcher sent a mass email to the staff so that no one individual was isolated in communications (See Appendix B). The email explained the purpose of the study, the steps the researcher took to protect participants, a timeline of the study, and a link to the survey portion of the dissertation. The participants could click on a link to take them to the Qualtrics website where they could take the survey and remain completely anonymous. At no time were participants asked to enter any identifiable information on the survey. They were identified by unique user numbers on the website that had no correlation to their names. There was no way that the researcher could identify the

respondents' names.

For the interview portion of this dissertation, respondents did provide identifiable information. In the email that requested survey participation, the researcher also asked for volunteers to be interviewed. Names and phone numbers were provided to allow the researcher to contact participants and arrange the interviews. Interviews were digitally recorded. The researcher was the only person who had access to the interview recordings. The recordings were erased after they were transcribed. The researcher transcribed the interviews which prevented anyone else having access to the interviewees' contact information.

Table 1

Data Collection for Research Study

| Data Collection | Research Methods | Number of Participants |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------------|
| Staff Surveys | Quantitative | 35 |
| Interviews | Qualitative | 6 |

Analytical Methods

Quantitative data was gathered for this study via surveys, which were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistical Version 20 (IBM SPSS, 2016). Specific research practices were implemented in the analysis of the survey feedback to clearly show where there were correlations in the data and where there were none. Cronbach's Alpha was used to examine the internal consistency and validity of the survey questions by comparing the reliability of summated, multi-item questions (Gleim & Gleim, 2003). Survey questions and interview questions were grouped into themes according to the study's theoretical framework that allowed the analysis of summated, multi-item questions.

The quantitative data gathered in this study came from ordinal survey results. were also compared using the Kruskal-Wallis H Test. The Kruskal-Wallis H Test is a ranked-based, nonparametric test used to determine if there are statistically significant differences between independent variables (Laerd Statistics, 2016; Meyer & Seaman, 2008; Sachs, 1984). The independent variables in the study were the faculty and staff's perceptions of autonomy, self-efficacy, and sense of purpose. The dependent variable was the teacher pay for performance program.

The interview questions used in this dissertation were piloted for reliability and validity. A pilot group of five educators reviewed the interview questions and gave feedback to the researcher (Appendix F). The pilot test of the interview to five professional educators established reliability by verifying that the survey instrument would provide feedback from each item (Creswell, 2008). In addition to the pilot, the interview questions were analyzed using a template analysis that allowed the researcher to categorize the interview responses (Marshall & Rossman, 2011) (Appendix G). Interviews were transcribed, coded, and placed into categories and themes. Best practices in pay for performance implementations were identified in the literature review of this study and provided the categories used on the template. The pilot test of the interview to five professional educators established reliability by verifying that the interview instrument would provide feedback from each item (Creswell, 2008).

Role of the Researcher

The researcher began his career in education as a paraprofessional translating for migrant students and families. He moved up the ranks from paraprofessional to teacher to

vice principal to principal to superintendent. He has worked in elementary schools, middle schools, high schools, and adult education settings.

Early in his tenure as a superintendent, a pay for performance program was introduced by the State Department of Education (Russell, 2011). Teachers in the district expressed to him their concerns when the pay for performance incentives were awarded. Pay for performance bonuses were paid to teachers according to the student achievement in the buildings where the teachers worked. Different buildings seemed to be favored over others due to the range of measurements available to each level. High schools could qualify by meeting a variety of metrics such as standardized test scores, graduation rates, college credits offered, and the percentage of students going on to college. Elementary school staff had a narrower window with limited ways to qualify for the incentive, mainly test scores.

Instead of being a positive addition to a teacher's salaries, the pay for performance program proved to be divisive as teachers began to resent each other and teamwork efforts began to break down. Some teachers who received the incentive asked if they could share it with other teachers. Most teachers wanted to share it with the paraprofessionals with whom they worked, which was contrary to the guidelines given to the districts. Because incentives were awarded to building teams, teachers who were on probation, who had been dismissed, or who had resigned from their positions were given a share of the money. This discord further exacerbated the deteriorating climate in the district.

The superintendent subscribed to a Servant Leadership philosophy (Greenleaf, 1977). Traditional leadership involves gathering power and making decisions from the

top of the pyramid (Gandara, 2013). By comparison, the servant-leader shares power and puts the needs of others first to help people develop and perform as highly as possible (Galvin, Lange, & Peterson, 2012). With this servant-leadership mindset, the superintendent looked for promising practices that could transform the pay for performance program into a positive innovation for his district and staff. If positive elements of a pay for performance program could be identified, a successful pay for performance program could be created and replicated.

Limitations

Bias of the researcher and of the participants should be recognized. The researcher intended to identify elements of pay for performance that contribute to teacher job satisfaction. By looking at all views on pay for performance, negative elements in pay for performance were also identified in this dissertation. Participant bias came in the form of teachers' distrust of policy makers. Teachers are working in what has been described as a climate of political controversy (Brown, 2015). Because of the climate of distrust, teachers have a negative perception of state-mandated programs such as pay for performance (Mooney, 2016). It is true that the San Animado pay for performance program began before the ill-fated state program described earlier in this study (Russell, 2011), but data was gathered for this dissertation after the state mandated pay for performance program had been introduced. It is possible that negativity toward the State plan may have tainted responses relating to the district's plan.

Participants did not know the researcher prior to the surveys and interviews. Attempts were made to reduce the affective filter of the participants, but the fact remained that they were giving feedback to a stranger. It is also assumed that the small

sample size ($n = 35$) is representative of a typical school district in the United States. A larger sample size could have been obtained by expanding the study beyond the San Animado School District, but this did not happen. This study was confined to the San Animado School District because of their unique pay for performance program. Other topics such as the political climate of public education and the teacher shortage would have been enlightening regarding teacher job satisfaction, but the questions in this study were limited to pay for performance.

Chapter IV

Results

Introduction

A nationwide teacher shortage has been featured in headlines across the United States (Dupay & Longtree, 2017; Francovich, 2017; Perkins, 2017). This shortage has left school boards and administrators looking for ways to attract and retain educators. Pay for performance programs have a long history in public school and are now being revisited as a way to boost pay and fill vacancies. (Aragon, 2016; Cortez, 2017; Hauer & Umhoefer, 2016; Morello, 2015). Research on teacher pay for performance finds strong opinions for and against the idea. Proponents say that pay for performance systems align with American values of hard work and results, will encourage teachers to focus their efforts, help recruit and retain teachers and remedy low teacher pay (Barnett & Ritter, 2008; Lewis, 2014; Manno 2012). Critics counter that pay for performance erodes teacher collaboration, cannot be reliably linked to student achievement, will lead to dishonest reporting of test scores, and is not a long-term solution to low teacher pay (Lewis, 2014; Marshall, 2009; Troller, 2010).

Drilling down further into pay for performance research, there appear to be few studies linking it to teacher job satisfaction (Beneman, 2014; Max, 2014; Podursky & Springer, 2006). In fact, there has been little correlation of any kind between compensation and job satisfaction (DeNisco, 2015; Gerhart, Parks & Rynes, 2005; Ritter, 2014). Morrison (2013) described the current research on teacher pay for performance as thin. Ballou, et al. (2010) suggested additional study of teacher pay reform and pay for

performance. Viscardi (2014) proposed further study to investigate ways teachers and policy makers could collaborate to develop fair pay for performance programs.

As more and more states consider pay for performance, the link between pay for performance and job satisfaction warrants investigation. Other reasons for studying this phenomenon are its impact on teacher morale and the notion that extrinsic motivation can cancel the benefits that intrinsic motivation can provide. (Deci, et. al., 1999; Judge, et al., 2010; Lee, Macia & Markow, 2013; Perry & Yoon, 2009).

This study examined job satisfaction and pay for performance in a small, rural school district. Results are divided into four topics; three of which come from the study's theoretical framework with an additional topic coming from a suggestion by the target district's Superintendent. (Ciau, Curren, Deci, Ryan & Waterman, 2014; Chiu, Deci, Ma, Marsden & Ryan; 2014; Deci & Gagné, 2005). This study's research questions reflected these four topics:

1. Does pay for performance affect teacher autonomy?
2. Does pay for performance affect teacher mastery?
3. Does pay for performance affect teachers' sense of purpose?
4. Does pay for performance affect attainment of district goals

Data Collection

The following steps were taken to collect data for this dissertation:

- A link to an online likert scale survey instrument was distributed to 65 certificated staff members in the target district. Thirty-five surveys were completed. Six of the survey participants agreed to be interviewed. Survey and interview questions identified aspects of participant demographics as

well as pay for performance's effect on teacher autonomy, mastery, and sense of purpose.

- Digitally recorded, individual interviews were conducted with 6 staff members. Interview responses were transcribed, coded, and cross-referenced to the study's themes and theoretical framework.

The data collected by surveys and interviews was placed on a triangulation matrix (Sager, 2000). In order to establish validity and reliability, the triangulation matrix demonstrated that the data accurately reflects the true responses of the study's participants and that the data is accurate. This dissertation's triangulation matrix is found in Appendix H.

Data from the survey instrument was collected in Qualtrics and then transferred into SPSS statistical software where analysis, frequency, and reliability tests were conducted. Survey questions were rated on a 5-item Likert scale. The 5-item scale was selected because it has been shown to be more reliable than a 2- or 3- point scale and its reliability is the same as 7-, 9-, and 14-point scales (Krosnick & Presser, 2010). Five items are also less burdensome for respondents than scales with larger item numbers. Survey respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement to each question using the following scale: 1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *neither agree nor disagree*, 4 = *agree*, 5 = *strongly disagree*. Each survey and each interview question correlated to one of the four research themes of autonomy, mastery, sense of purpose and district goals.

Survey Validity and Reliability

A two-step process was used to achieve content validity. These two steps were to pilot both the survey and the interview questions and also to apply Cronbach's alpha

analysis. The survey was piloted to a group of 15 veteran educators in Idaho and Utah. The survey questions were emailed to these educators on November 5, 2014. By November 10, 2014, the pilot group had responded with suggestions for increasing the validity and reliability of the survey instrument. Changes were made to the survey based on this feedback and the pilot group was satisfied that the questions would provide accurate information on pay for performance and teacher job satisfaction (Appendix D).

Cronbach's alpha. Cronbach's alpha was used to measure the internal consistency of the survey instrument utilized in this dissertation (Allen & Yen, 2002; Bland & Altman, 1997). This test has become common practice in research involving multiple-item measure survey items such as the likert scale used in this study (Dennick & Tavakoj, 2011). An alpha value of 0.9 or above has been deemed an excellent level of internal consistency and a value above 0.7 is considered acceptable (George & Mallory, 2003). The application of Cronbach's alpha to this study's survey instrument resulted in a consistency level of .897, which exhibits a good level of consistency between the 35 participants in the quantitative portion of this dissertation. (see Table 2).

Table 2

Reliability Using Cronbach's Alpha

| Response and Participation | <i>n</i> | Total |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Survey Respondents | 35 | .897 |

Frequency

An assessment of the frequency distribution of a research data set can identify common themes in a research study (Peersman, 2014; Tanner, 2012). By placing the survey participants into three groups based on years of experience, the researcher was

able to compare the frequency of similarly answered questions. Participants were placed in groups of those who had been teaching from 1 to 10 years, 11 to 20 years, and more than 20 years. The frequency analysis from the SPSS program showed that the answers from all three of these demographic groups were consistent on *agrees* or *disagrees* and none of the answers were below a 65% difference. Across all three groups, 65% of the responses were similar in either *strong agree/agree* or *strongly disagree/disagree*. Put another way, 100% of the participants responded similarly to 13 of the 20 questions asked. When the frequency level was raised to 80%, 58% of the study's participants answered in a similar fashion. In other words, 58% of the participants answered 16 of the 20 survey questions in a similar fashion. However, when the frequency was raised to 90%, only 28% of the questions were answered similarly. In other words, 28% of the participants answered similarly to 18 of the 20 survey questions. Taken as a whole, the participants answered consistently to either *agree/strongly agree* or *disagree/strongly disagree* to 65% of the questions asked in the survey. Table 3 represents survey participant responses that were similar.

Table 3

Survey Response Frequency Percentages

| Frequency of Similar Responses | Total Percentage |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 65% or higher in agreement | 100% of participants |
| 80% or higher in agreement | 58% of participants |
| 90% or higher in agreement | 28% of participants |

Survey Distribution and Participation

Data collection for this study began by surveying the staff members in the San Animado School District. After gaining permission from the district's Superintendent, the researcher contacted staff members by phone and by email to explain the study and invite their participation. Participants were invited to complete a 25-item likert scale survey by logging anonymously onto the Qualtrics website where the survey instrument was created. Participants provided their written consent prior to taking the survey. The survey was open for participation from January 13, 2015 to January 23, 2015. Sixty-five potential participants were contacted by the researcher. Thirty-five people responded positively to the invitation to take the survey, giving the study a 54% participation rate. Participants accessed the survey via the Qualtrics website and data was exported into IBM SPSS Statistical Software Version 20 (IBM, SPSS, 2013; Qualtrics, 2013). Table 4 contains the demographic profile of the survey participants.

Table 4

Demographic Profile of Survey Participants

| Gender | | Age | | Grade Level Taught | |
|---------------|-----|----------------|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Female | 74% | 20-29 yrs. old | 9% | K - 3 rd | 31% |
| Male | 26% | 30-39 yrs. old | 20% | 4 th - 5 th | 11% |
| | | 40-49 yrs. old | 43% | 6 th - 8 th | 9% |
| | | 50-59 yrs. old | 23% | 9 th - 12 th | 49% |
| | | 60 + yrs. old | 6% | | |

| Years of Experience | | Years in the District | |
|----------------------------|-----|------------------------------|-----|
| 1 - 5 years | 21% | 1 - 5 years | 34% |
| 6 - 10 years | 9% | 6 - 10 years | 6% |
| 11 - 20 years | 35% | 11 - 20 years | 34% |
| 21+ years | 35% | 20+ years | 26% |

Research Question #1

People want to be able to direct their own lives. This is true for personal growth and also for the work place (Deifendorft, Liu, Kim, & Moran, 2012). Kubansky (2011) suggested that people thrive when they take responsibility for their own lives. Prevost (2013) proposed that the right level of autonomy will produce happy and productive employees. Nauert (2011) referred to experts who found that when workers believe they are free to make decisions at work, and are then held accountable for those decisions, they are happier and more productive. Research into autonomy's role in job satisfaction combined with teacher pay for performance headlines led to this study's first research question:

Does pay for performance affect teacher autonomy?

Critics of pay for performance suggest that it creates a perception in employees that they are being controlled, which reduces workplace autonomy (Balkin, Rousel & Werner, 2015). When teacher pay for performance is linked to teachers taking on additional roles, teachers are less likely to volunteer for extra duties. Balkin, et. al. (2015), suggest that intrinsic motivation can be found in autonomous acts like volunteering for committees. But when the extrinsic factor of pay for performance is linked to the intrinsic activity of volunteering for committees. Proponents of pay for performance counter that it can enhance intrinsic motivators such as workplace autonomy when it is aligned to the core values of the organization (Snyder & Neubauer, 2007).

In this study, five survey questions asked if teachers felt that pay for performance affects their freedom and autonomy in the classroom. The interview portion of this study also asked about pay for performance's affect on autonomy. An explanation of the interview responses is presented below, followed by an explanation of the survey

questions. The interview responses will be presented here followed by the results of the survey questions.

Interview responses highlighted the importance of staff having a voice in decisions and having control over how to reach the goals required to qualify for the pay for performance incentive. Freedom in the classroom was a theme that was repeated throughout the interviews. Fear of having that freedom compromised was also expressed. Another concept that emerged through the interviews was the importance of the organizational culture. The supportive and collaborative attitude of district administration towards teachers was a theme that is woven throughout all of the interview questions. The district superintendent was referred to as “great because he wants our (teachers’) help and asks for our input.”

Interview responses that reflected positively to pay for performance and autonomy included, “Recommendations go out to staff, and we have a chance to give our input,” “The district sets the parameters and we have all the freedom we want within those parameters,” and “My principal still makes sure I am doing what I am supposed to, but I have a ton of freedom in my classroom.” Comments negative towards pay for performance limiting autonomy were that “The State’s program is negative because they based the money on test scores,” “We have no control over students’ attitudes when they test,” and “Some students choose to bomb a test to get back at a teacher.” Table 5 presents the interview responses regarding pay for performance and teacher autonomy.

Table 5

Interview Comments Related to Pay for Performance and Autonomy

| Staff Member | Excerpt Supporting Pay for Performance's Affect on Autonomy | Excerpt Critical of Pay for Performance Affect on Autonomy |
|---------------------|---|--|
| SM1 | We all have input. It's fair. Teachers have input on goals. | We have no control over a student's attitude, kids bomb tests to get back at teachers. It's negative to base money on only one test score. |
| SM2 | We meet and talk. We decide how to measure teacher performance. It's all on me and my students. | |
| SM3 | The district defines the parameters, we have freedom within those parameters. There is no lockstep way to do it. We have a lot of leeway. | There is fear about the Common Core taking away teacher freedom |
| SM4 | That's what makes him (administrator) great, he wants help from staff and he listens. I have all the freedom I want. | |
| SM5 | We all have a voice. We still have freedom in classroom. | |
| SM6 | It (pay for performance) is very positive. It's not a carrot to make you work harder. We all have input. Leadership teams recommendations go out to all the staff, staff give input It's fair | State program negative because they base the money on test scores. We have no control over students' attitudes when they test. Students can choose to bomb to get back at a teacher I've seen students try to hurt teachers by doing poorly on tests. |

There were five survey questions that also addressed the first research question regarding pay for performance and whether or not it affects teacher autonomy:

- One of the strength's of the district's Pay for Performance program is that teachers and staff have ownership in it.
- Other Pay for Performance programs are hurt by being top-down mandates
- My positive self-image as an educator is promoted by the district's Pay for Performance program.
- The district's Pay for Performance program influences what I do
- Overall, I like the district's Pay for Performance program

The participants were divided into three groups based on their years of experience in order to compare and analyze their responses. Table 6 represents this grouping. The table also presents the percentage of staff that fell into each grouping.

Table 6

Percentage of Staff Grouped by Years of Experience

| Years of Experience | Percentage of Staff |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 – 10 years | 30% |
| 11 - 20 years | 35% |
| 21+ years | 35% |

A majority of the respondents, 71% agreed or strongly agreed that teacher ownership plays a role in the success of the district's pay for performance program. Only 15% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that it does not (See Table 7).

Table 7

Staff Ownership of the Pay for Performance Program.

| Responses | | Percentage of Answers |
|------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. | Strongly Disagree | 6% |
| 2. | Disagree | 9% |
| 3. | Neither Agree nor Disagree | 14% |
| 4. | Agree | 54% |
| 5. | Strongly Agree | 17% |

The next question relates to the perception that the pay for performance bonus is seen as a reward. For the incentive to be viewed positively, respondents acknowledge that they value it and that it does limit their freedom in finding satisfaction in what they do as educators. Sixty-one percent agreed or strongly agreed that the incentive was seen as a reward for the positive decisions and actions they take. Thirty-four percent of the respondents disagreed.

The third question related to pay for performance and autonomy asked about the notion of top-down mandates. None of the respondents indicated that a top-down mandate regarding pay for performance was seen as positive. However, 47% could not agree nor could they disagree to any degree that other programs are not successful because they are top-down mandates. Fifty-three percent agreed or strongly agreed that top-down mandates hurt their programs because of the lack of feedback from those affected by the program.

Table 8

Other Pay for Performance programs are hurt by being top-down mandates.

| Responses | | Percentage of Answers |
|------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. | Strongly Disagree | 0% |
| 2. | Disagree | 0% |
| 3. | Neither Agree nor Disagree | 47% |
| 4. | Agree | 38% |
| 5. | Strongly Agree | 15% |

The next question asked participants if they felt that their self-image as an educator was affected by the district's pay for performance program. Only 33% agreed or strongly agreed that it did. Fifty-three percent disagreed or strongly disagreed. Twenty-four percent neither agreed nor disagreed to any degree that the program affected their self-image.

The final survey question connected to the first research question asked if the district's pay for performance program influenced what teacher's do in their classroom. Out of the five survey questions relating to teacher autonomy and pay for performance, this question brought the most even responses. Thirty-eight percent disagreed or strongly disagreed that classroom decisions and actions were influenced by the pay for performance incentive. Forty percent agreed or strongly agreed that the incentive influences what a teacher does in the classroom. Twenty-three percent could neither agree nor disagree to any degree.

The Kruskal-Wallis H Test can be used to determine if there are statistically significant differences between two or more groups of an independent variable on a

continuous or ordinal scale. The Kruskal-Wallis H test is an extension of the Mann-Whitney U test used to compare more than two data sets (Laerd Statistics website, 2016; McDonald, 2015; Tanner, 2011). Basic assumptions should be met in order to use the Kruskal-Wallis H test (Laerd Statistics website, 2016; McDonald, 2015; Tanner, 2011).

Assumption #1: The variables being tested must be continuous or ordinal in nature.

Assumption #2: There should be one independent variable and two or more categorical, independent groups.

Assumption #3: There should be an independence of observations. There should be different participants in each group with no participant being repeated in any group.

All three of these assumptions are met in this study. The variables are ordinal due to the likert instrument used to gather the data. The dependent variable in the study was the pay for performance program. The independent variables were staff perceptions of autonomy, mastery, sense of purpose, and ability to meet district goals. All participation was independent. Results from the survey portion of this study were collected using a five-item Likert scale instrument, which led to a resulting ordinal data set. The participants in the study were cleanly divided into three independent groups based on how long they have worked in education: 1 to 10 years, 11 to 20 years, and more than 20 years. This division insured that there was no cross-participation among the groups.

The null hypothesis for Research Question #1 was that there is a no statistical significant difference between perceptions that pay for performance affects the autonomy of teachers of varying levels of experience. This can be represented as:

H₁₀: the medians of the groups are equal.

The alternate hypothesis for Research Question #1 is that there is a statistically significant difference between perceptions of pay for performance's effect on autonomy among teachers of varying levels of experience. This can be represented as:

H_{1A}: the means of the groups are not equal.

In order to analyze these questions relating pay for performance to autonomy, the survey responses were combined into the following table.

Table 9

Compilation of Responses Regarding Pay for Performance and Autonomy

| Responses | Years of Experience | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-----------|
| | 1 – 10 years | 10 – 20 years | 20+ years |
| Strongly Disagree | 10 | 6 | 5 |
| Disagree | 10 | 10 | 12 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 18 | 12 | 18 |
| Agree | 10 | 19 | 22 |
| Strongly Agree | 15 | 14 | 17 |

Answers were then ranked and given a value prior to being used in Kurskal-Wallis H test calculations. Strongly disagree responses were given a value of 1, disagree responses were given a value of 2, neither agree nor disagree responses were given a value of 3, agree was given a value of 4, and strongly agree was given a value of 5. The next table illustrates the weighted values.

Table 10

Weighted Responses Related to Pay for Performance and Autonomy

| Responses | Years of Experience | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| | 1 – 10 years | 10 – 20 years | 20+ years |
| Strong Disagree | 10 | 6 | 5 |
| Disagree | 20 | 20 | 24 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 54 | 36 | 24 |
| Agree | 40 | 76 | 88 |
| Strongly Agree | 75 | 70 | 85 |

Again, the null hypothesis for the first research question is that all medians are equal. H_0 : All medians are equal. The alternative hypothesis is that at least one median is different. H_1 : At least one median is different. Table 13 shows the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test.

Table 11

Kruskal-Wallis H Test for Research Question #1

| Method | DF | H-Value | P-Value |
|------------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|
| Not adjusted for ties: | 2 | 0.135 | 0.935 |
| Adjusted for ties: | 2 | 0.135 | 0.930 |

With a significance level of 0.05, it appears that both the adjusted and the not adjusted P values exceed the significance level for Research Question #1, which leads researcher to reject the null hypothesis that the medians for the three groups are equal.

For the groups who have been teaching for 1 to 10 years, 10 to twenty years, and more than twenty years that there is significant support for the notion that their district's pay for performance program supports teacher autonomy.

This question of pay for performance's effect on teacher autonomy was also asked in the interview portion of this study. Interview responses highlighted the importance of staff having a voice in decisions and having control over how to reach the goals that were required to qualify for the pay for performance incentive. Freedom in the classroom was a theme that was repeated throughout the interviews. Fear of have that freedom compromised was also expressed. Another concept that emerged through the interviews was the importance of the organizational culture. The supportive and collaborative attitude of administration towards teachers was a theme that is woven throughout all of the interview questions. The district superintendent was referred to as "great because he wants our (teachers') help and asks for our input."

Other interview responses that reflected positively about pay for performance and autonomy included, "Recommendations go out to staff, and we have a chance to give our input," "The district sets the parameters and we have all the freedom we want within those parameters," and "My principal still makes sure I am doing what I am supposed to, but have a ton of freedom in my classroom." Comments that seemed to be negative about pay for performance were that "The State's program is negative because they based the money on test scores," "We have no control over students' attitudes when they test," and "Some students choose to bomb a test to get back at a teacher."

Research Question #2

Teachers who have a strong sense of self-efficacy seem to attain high levels of student motivation and achievement while teachers with low self-efficacy seem to produce lesser student achievement and also have lower job satisfaction. (Chiu & Klassen, 2010). High self-esteem correlates with job performance and job satisfaction (Bono & Judge 2001). This strong sense of mastery contributes not only to a rich and stimulating educational environment, it also promotes a positive perception about teachers and their profession (Barbaranelli, et. all, 2006). Self-efficacy, the sense teachers have that they are mastering their craft, is an internal motivator (Bergeron & Dean, 2013, Swanson, 2013, Trahan, 2014). Extrinsic motivators tend to weaken intrinsic motivators. Again, the concept of pay for performance being introduced into school districts with little consideration of the consequences on teachers' sense of mastery led to the second research question:

2. Does pay for performance affect teachers' sense of mastery?

Hollense and Guthrie (2000) studied group goal setting and offered insight on possible effects pay for performance plans could have on self-efficacy. These researchers suggested further study to refine the understanding of pay for performance's relationship with intrinsic motivation. Proponents of pay for performance say it focuses employee efforts on what makes the company successful, thereby making employees successful and building mastery and self-efficacy (Bartol & Durahm, 2009). Critics find that pay for performance actually destroys intrinsic motivation such as self-efficacy and mastery. "The more intrinsic motivation present at the beginning (before pay for performance is introduced), the more of it can be destroyed" (Osterloh, Rost & Weibel, 2010, p. 404).

These competing views provide an opportunity for this dissertation to address pay for performance and teacher mastery.

The following survey questions asked about teacher self-efficacy and mastery of their craft:

- * The district's pay for performance program influences my colleagues' willingness to improve our craft?
- * The district staff's positive attitude about our profession is influenced by the pay by the performance program.
- * District staff's willingness to implement effective teaching strategies is influenced by the pay by the performance program.
- * District staff's willingness to collaborate is influenced by the pay by the performance program.
- * My attention to lesson planning is affected by the district's pay for performance program.

The first survey question to address the research question regarding pay for performance and teacher efficacy asks about teachers improving their craft. Pay for performance is often based on teachers reaching individual or team goals. Does the pressure to meet public individual and team goals lead teachers to seek to become better teachers or would teachers do this on their own? Thirty-nine percent of the teachers said that pay for performance does not lead them to improve their craft. Thirty-five percent said that yes, they are influenced by pay for performance to improve their craft. Twenty-six percent neither agreed nor disagreed to any degree that they are influenced by pay for performance to improve.

Table 12

Does the District's Pay for Performance Program Influences my Colleagues' Willingness to Improve our Craft?

| Responses | Percentage of Answers |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Strongly Disagree | 15% |
| 2. Disagree | 24% |
| 3. Neither Agree nor Disagree | 26% |
| 4. Agree | 29% |
| 5. Strongly Agree | 6% |

The next survey question asks if pay for performance affects teachers' attitude about their profession. Only 15% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Sixty-four percent disagreed or strongly disagreed and were of the mindset that pay for performance does not influence how they view their profession. Just over a fourth of the respondents, 26%, neither agreed nor disagreed at any level with this statement.

Table 13

District staff's positive attitude about our profession is influenced by the pay by the performance program

| Responses | Percentage of Answers |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Strongly Disagree | 15% |
| 2. Disagree | 24% |
| 3. Neither Agree nor Disagree | 26% |
| 4. Agree | 29% |
| 5. Strongly Agree | 6% |

Effective teaching strategies lead to classroom success. But does pay for performance affect teacher willingness to implement such strategies? Only 35% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that it does. Fifty-three percent disagreed or strongly disagreed. Only 12% neither agreed nor disagreed to any degree.

The next survey question to address pay for performance's affect on teacher efficacy asked about collaboration. Only 35% of respondents supported this notion of pay for performance influencing collaboration. Sixty-five percent disagreed or strongly disagreed that pay for performance influences teacher collaboration. Eleven percent neither agreed nor disagreed to any degree.

The last survey question to address teacher efficacy asked if pay for performance influences a teacher's attention to lesson planning. Konen (2016) suggested that half of the battle in teaching lies in preparation, and Madeline Hunter's lesson planning template has become a standard best practice. Does pay for performance affect this best practice? Sixty-three percent of the survey's respondents disagreed or strongly agreed that it does. Only 29% agreed or strongly agreed and 9% neither agreed nor disagreed.

Table 14

My attention to lesson planning is affected by the district's pay for performance program.

| Responses | Percentage of Answers |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Strongly Disagree | 20% |
| 2. Disagree | 43% |
| 3. Neither Agree nor Disagree | 9% |
| 4. Agree | 20% |
| 5. Strongly Agree | 9% |

The null hypothesis for Research Question #2 is that there is not a statistically significant difference between the perceptions that pay for performance affects mastery among the three groups. This is represented as:

H₀: the medians of the groups are equal.

The alternate hypothesis for Research Question #2 is that there is a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of pay for performance's effect on mastery among teachers of varying levels of experience. This is represented as:

H₁: the medians of the groups are not equal.

Tables illustrating how the survey questions relating to mastery were scored are found in this study's appendix.

The null hypothesis for the second research question is that all medians are equal.

H₀: All medians are equal. The alternative hypothesis is that at least one median is different. H₁: Table 33 below presents the p-values of the Kruskal-Wallis H test.

Table 15

Kruskal-Wallis H Test for Research Question #2

| Method | DF | H-Value | P-Value |
|------------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|
| Not adjusted for ties: | 2 | 0.12 | 0.942 |
| Adjusted for ties: | 2 | 0.12 | 0.942 |

With a significance level of 0.05, it appears that both the adjusted and the not adjusted P values exceed the significance level for Research Question #2. This leads the researcher to fail to reject the null hypothesis that the medians for the three groups are the same. It appears that for the groups who have been teaching for 1 to 10 years, 10 to

twenty years, and more than twenty years that there is significant support for the notion that their district's pay for performance program supports teacher mastery, as illustrated in Tables 16 and 17.

Table 16

District staff's willingness to implement effective teaching strategies is influenced by the pay by the performance program.

| Responses | | Percentage of Answers |
|------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. | Strongly Disagree | 12% |
| 2. | Disagree | 41% |
| 3. | Neither Agree nor Disagree | 12% |
| 4. | Agree | 26% |
| 5. | Strongly Agree | 9% |

Table 17

District staff's willingness to collaborate is influenced by the pay by the performance program.

| Responses | | Percentage of Answers |
|------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. | Strongly Disagree | 14% |
| 2. | Disagree | 51% |
| 3. | Neither Agree nor Disagree | 11% |
| 4. | Agree | 27% |
| 5. | Strongly Agree | 5% |

The qualitative data in this study provided a deeper understanding of the relationship between pay for performance and teacher mastery than the quantitative data did on its own. Responses to the interview questions highlighted a theme of teachers striving to master their craft. Interview participants voiced the importance of striving constantly improvement, a strong work ethic present in the district, and a culture of concern for student success. These themes brought a richer understanding to the survey questions. The district culture surrounding the pay for performance program seems to have contributed to its success.

Responses to this question of mastery include, “We want to be the best teachers we possibly can,” “If I am a good enough teacher than I will get that money. If I am not, I am going to work hard to get it,” “We are already teaching well. Pay for performance rewards make us want to improve,” and “We have really great teachers and schools. Whether we get the bonus or not, we are going to do everything we can to be good teachers.” Interview responses related to pay for performance and mastery are found in Table 34 in this study’s Appendix.

Interview responses related to pay for performance and mastery highlighted a culture of high expectations and collaboration. Responses were mixed between giving credit to the pay for performance program for supporting teacher mastery and acknowledging the organizational culture in the district for the high levels of teacher self-efficacy. Chapter 5 will further expound upon the influence of pay for performance and culture on teacher mastery.

Research Question #3

People can find a sense of purpose by connecting to what they perceive to be a cause that is bigger than they are (Deci & Ryan, 2011). When teachers find purpose in being connected to the noble goals of education, they can find deep levels of job satisfaction (Fast, 2015). Zappala (2007) linked job satisfaction to on-line teachers' sense of connectedness to each other and to their sense of purpose as teachers. Weir (2013) offered that job satisfaction could be found when employees find purpose in their work to improve other people's lives. Nobody wants to feel that they are wasting their time and effort. A strong sense of purpose is vital to psychological well-being, maintains motivation, inspires to confront challenges, and can buffer pressure and stress (Barrett, 2015). This leads to the third research question:

3. Does pay for performance affect teachers' sense of purpose?

As in the first two research questions, there are proponents of pay for performance who say that it does indeed enhance employee sense of purpose (McPhie & Sapin, 2006; Miller, 2014; Richardson, 2014). There are also critics who say that pay for performance harms that sense of purpose (Culbert, 2008; Gerdeman, 2013; Hauenstein, 2011). The concept of employee sense of purpose has been intriguing enough that it has warranted calls for further study (McKee, 2015; Skrypnek & Kinjerki, 2006; Renjin, 2014).

A major criticism of pay for performance has been that it pits teacher against teacher. This breakdown in collaboration isolates teachers and makes it difficult for them to feel part of district team and thus, they are separated from the district's purposes. This disconnect can lead to isolation and low job satisfaction levels (Panesar, 2010; Proctor,

2014). The following survey questions explore this idea of teachers being connected to their profession's sense of purpose:

- * My district's high levels of morale are affected by the district's pay for performance program.
- * The district's willingness to work together in teams is affected by pay for performance.
- * District staff's willingness to collaborate is affected by the district's pay for performance program.
- The district's pay for performance program affects staff's positive sense of purpose as educators
- The high levels of support from the district's administrators for teachers and staff is influenced by the Pay for Performance program.

Under the shadow of all-time low teacher morale levels, the first survey question exploring teacher sense of purpose asks teachers whether or not they think pay for performance affects their districts morale (Voris, 2011). The link between morale and job satisfaction has been established (Blackburn, 2015; Hearn, 2013). It stands to reason that if pay for performance affects morale, policy-makers should revisit how it is being implemented. Just over half of the survey respondents, 51%, disagreed or strongly disagreed that pay for performance affects district morale. Twenty-nine percent agreed or strongly agreed that morale is affected by pay for performance. Twenty percent neither agreed nor disagreed to any degree that pay for performance affects their district's morale.

Table 18

My district's high levels of morale are influenced by the pay by the performance program.

| Responses | Percentage of Answers |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Strongly Disagree | 14% |
| 2. Disagree | 37% |
| 3. Neither Agree nor Disagree | 20% |
| 4. Agree | 26% |
| 5. Strongly Agree | 3% |

The next survey question exploring this sense of purpose research questions asks teachers if their willingness to work in teams is affected by pay for performance. Again, more than half of the respondents, 56%, disagreed or strongly disagreed that willingness to work together is influenced by pay for performance. Fourteen percent did not agree nor disagree in any degree, and only 29% agreed or strongly agreed that pay for performance affects teacher willingness to work together in teams.

Table 19

The district staff's willingness to work together to increase student achievement is influenced by the pay by the performance program

| Responses | Percentage of Answers |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Strongly Disagree | 11% |
| 2. Disagree | 46% |
| 3. Neither Agree nor Disagree | 14% |
| 4. Agree | 23% |
| 5. Strongly Agree | 6% |

The third survey question is more direct and asks teachers if their sense of purpose is affected by pay for performance. Only 26% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this comment. Fifty-seven percent disagreed or strongly disagreed with 17% neither agreeing nor disagreeing.

Table 20

The district staff's sense of purpose as educators is affected by pay by the performance.

| Responses | Percentage of Answers |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Strongly Disagree | 20% |
| 2. Disagree | 37% |
| 3. Neither Agree nor Disagree | 17% |
| 4. Agree | 24% |
| 5. Strongly Agree | 2% |

Again, answers were then ranked and given a value prior to being used in Kurskal-Wallis H test calculations. Strongly disagree responses were given a value of 1, disagree responses were given a value of 2, neither agree nor disagree responses were given a value of 3, agree was given a value of 4, and strongly agree was given a value of 5. The next the following table illustrates the weighted values to survey questions that tied into the third research question in this study.

The null hypothesis for the third research question is that all medians are equal. H_0 : All medians are equal. The alternative hypothesis is that at least one median is different. H_1 : At least one median is different. Table 31 shows the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test for Research Question #3.

Table 21

Kruskal-Wallis H Test for Research Question #3

| Method | DF | H-Value | P-Value |
|------------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|
| Not adjusted for ties: | 2 | 0.12 | 0.942 |
| Adjusted for ties: | 2 | 0.12 | 0.942 |

With a significance level of 0.05, both the adjusted and the not adjusted P values exceed the significance level for Research Question #3, which leads researcher to a reject the null hypothesis that the medians for the three groups are equal. Because these values exceed 0.05 for each of the three groups examined, there is significant support that the district's pay for performance program supports teachers' sense of purpose.

Qualitative Data

Six district employees volunteered to be interviewed and provided the qualitative data used in this study. Interviews were digitally recorded and then transcribed by the researcher. Responses were coded and labeled according to how they correlated with this study's research questions. The interview coding template is found in the Appendix.

Themes that emerged from the interviews were highlighted and interview responses were organized under these themes. These themes from Self-Determination Theory formed the theoretical framework of this dissertation. Self-Determination was identified as a viable construct in literature and is based on the themes of autonomy, efficacy, and a sense of purpose by being connected to a cause greater than the self. The fourth research question was requested by the district superintendent and asks about pay

for performance's influence on district goals. Chapter 5 will provide an explanation and analysis of this qualitative data.

The chart in Appendix H illustrates the Interview Coding Template used in this portion of the study. One hundred and sixty-four statements made by the interview participants were organized under the headings, or codes, of autonomy, self-efficacy and mastery, connectedness to a greater sense of purpose. After interview statements were coded, the following themes emerged that brought a deeper understanding to the research questions.

Emerging Themes from Qualitative Data

1. Teachers value freedom in the classroom.
2. Teacher value collaboration among staff.
3. Teachers value support from administration.
4. Teachers recognize a focus on constant improvement.
5. Teachers are proud of their strong work ethic.
6. Concern for student success is the principal focus in the district.
7. Teachers recognize and appreciate strong district leadership.
8. Teachers give credit to a positive organizational culture.

Conclusion

This chapter presented the data gathered through surveys and interviews. The mixed-methods design of this study was organized so that the qualitative data would shed light on the quantitative data. Both survey and interview responses were placed into categories of autonomy, efficacy, and connectedness to a purpose greater than the self. Autonomy, efficacy, and connectedness to a purpose greater than the self for the

theoretical framework of Self-Determination Theory on which this study is based. No attempt was made in this chapter to explain the data or draw conclusions from it.

In Chapter 5 of this dissertation, an analysis of the Chapter 4 data will be presented. Links between the survey results, interview feedback, and research will be compared and contrasted. Data will be evaluated to justify whether or not pay for performance data supports job satisfaction. Key pieces from research and data collection will be synthesized into steps for decision makers to follow to create a pay for performance program that is likely to enhance job satisfaction. Further areas where research is needed will also be proposed.

Chapter V

Discussion

Introduction

This mixed-methods study sought to determine if pay for performance programs affect teacher job satisfaction. Amid a nation-wide teacher shortage, pay for performance programs are being revisited as a way to incentivize teachers and as a tool to attract and retain the best and brightest to the profession. This study examined pay for performance through the theoretical framework of Self-Determination Theory (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 1999; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Fang, Gerhart & Ledford, 2013; Marciano, 2010; Sahrberg, 2014; Williams, 2013). Self-Determination Theory suggests that people feel motivated and develop a sense of job satisfaction when the following needs are met:

- * Autonomy – The desire to direct our lives.
- * Mastery – The urge to get better at something that matters.
- * Purpose – The yearning to do what we do in the service of something larger than ourselves (Pink, 2008).

In addition to looking at pay for performance from a Self-Determination Theory perspective, the Superintendent in the school district that participated in this study asked for data to show if pay for performance has affected how teachers meet district goals. This led to a fourth theme:

- * District Goals – Does pay for performance affect district goals?

Teacher pay for performance programs stretch back to the late 1800's (Gratz, 2009; Podursky & Springer, 2010; Stedman, 2001; Wisconsin Education Association Council, 2011). Since then, pay for performance programs have sprung up from time to

time with varying degrees of success. (Holley, et al., 2008; Johnson, 2010; Wagner, 2009). The rationale behind these programs has been that bonuses based on performance objectives will increase motivation and performance levels. However, a growing body of research indicates that these kinds of bonuses will likely lead to decreased performance levels over time (Iberman, 1998; U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2010). A common thread woven through successful pay for performance programs has been to link them to incentives that teachers value. (Eccles, 2009; Lee, Ijoo & Jung, 2008). Motivation theory identifies the types of incentives teachers value. (Jensen, Tippetts & Yamashiro, 2011; Lunenberg, 2011; Scholl, 2002).

If teachers view district incentives as positive enough to seek after, they will likely remain in the district (Eccles, 2009; Lunenberg, 2011; Scholl, 2002). Teachers must understand the link between their performance and their pay. Teachers may expect that their performance will warrant a reward, but they are sometimes discouraged by difficult performance goals, unclear performance ratings, lack of instructional material, lack of administrative support, little coaching and feedback, disconnected professional development, and unmotivated students (Doyle, 2009; Guajardo, 2011). A key to pay for performance influencing teacher motivation is for teachers to see a link between their effort, their performance, and the reward (Harvey-Beavis, 2003; Heskett, 2007; Jensen, 2010). An effective pay for performance program will provide teachers an equal opportunity to earn the reward and opportunities to succeed as well as the resources needed to be successful (Eccles, 2009; Lunenberg, 2011; Scholl, 2002). Research suggests that a successful pay for performance program can be built upon the Self-Determination Theory tenets of autonomy, mastery, and sense of purpose (Deci, Koestner

& Ryan, 1999; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Fang, Gerhart & Ledford, 2013; Marciano, 2010; Sahrberg, 2014; Williams, 2013).

Self-Determination Theory and the suggestion from the target district Superintendent led to this study's four research questions:

1. Does pay for performance affect teacher autonomy?
2. Does pay for performance affect teacher mastery?
3. Does pay for performance affect teacher sense of purpose?
4. Does pay for performance affect district goals?

This study employed a mixed methods approach to answer these questions. This approach provided the pathway to an in-depth examination of the perceptions teachers have of pay for performance (Caruth, 2013; Curry, 2009). The combination of quantitative data gathered from surveys and qualitative data from interviews offered a richer, deeper understanding of pay for performance than either method could have provided alone (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007; Malina, Norreklit, & Selto, 2011; Marshall & Rossman, 2011).

Data was collected in two ways for this study. First, an on-line survey was distributed to district staff. These questionnaires were completed via the online survey tool Qualtrics. Data was then transferred from Qualtrics into SPSS software for analysis. At the end of the survey, respondents were invited to volunteer to be interviewed. Questions from both the survey instrument and from the scripted interviews were linked to the research questions. Staff interviews were transcribed by the researcher and analyzed. This process of collecting and analyzing the data gave the researcher in-depth knowledge of how staff viewed the topic of pay for performance and allowed the

researcher to break down their insights into Self-Determination Theory tenets. The rest of the chapter presents a discussion of how this study's data compares with current research to address this study's research questions.

Summary of Results

Table 22 represents the raw data collected in this study. Responses are presented as percentages of Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, and Disagree that pay for performance has an affect on job satisfaction. For purposes of this table, Disagree and Strongly Disagree are combined into one category. Agree and Strongly Agree are also combined into one category. As Allen and Seaman suggest, collapsing these categories would not be acceptable for statistical analysis, but in this case, the scale is collapsed only to illustrate the raw data (2007).

Table 22

Percentages of Disagree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, and Agree Responses: Does Pay for Performance Affect Job Satisfaction?

| | Disagree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Agree |
|------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| Autonomy | 25% | 24% | 51% |
| Mastery | 57% | 16% | 27% |
| Sense of Purpose | 40% | 24% | 36% |
| District Goals | 40% | 20% | 40% |
| Overall Opinion | 40.5% | 21% | 38.5% |

Forty-one and a half percent of the participants in the survey portion of this study did not think that pay for performance affected teacher job satisfaction. Thirty-nine and a half percent responded that pay for performance does affect job satisfaction. Twenty-one

percent were undecided. Only two percentage points separate the number of teachers who did not see pay for performance affecting job satisfaction from those who did. This does not present a clear picture of whether or not pay for performance affects job satisfaction. To describe a truer picture of what the survey results portray, a statistical analysis of this quantitative data was broken down by research question.

Research Questions: Autonomy, Mastery, Purpose, and District Goals

There were five survey questions that related to each of the four research questions. The n for the study was 35. Multiplying the number of participants in this study by the number of questions relating to each research question provided 175 data points for each research question. Teachers were asked in five different ways if they thought pay for performance supported teacher autonomy, which is the first tenet of Self-Determination Theory. There was significant agreement between groups of teachers who have been teaching for 1 to 10 years, 10 to twenty years, and more than twenty years. An application of the Kruskal Wallis H test to these survey questions led the researcher to determine there was not a statistically significant difference between responses. With a significance level of 0.05, the P values exceeded the significance level for survey questions that correlated to Research Question #1. This led the researcher to fail to reject the null hypothesis that the medians for the three groups are equal. The Kruskal Wallis H test showed that for the groups who have been teaching for 1 to 10 years, 10 to twenty years, and more than twenty years support for the notion that their district's pay for performance program supports teacher autonomy.

Adjusted and the not adjusted P values for survey questions correlating to Research Question #2 also exceeded the 0.05 significance level, which again led

researcher to fail to reject the null hypothesis that the medians for the three groups were equal. Across all groups of experience, there was significant agreement that the district's pay for performance program supported teacher mastery. The same held true for the survey questions correlated to Research Questions #3 and #4. The application of the Kruskal Wallis H test showed that pay for performance has supported teacher mastery, teachers' sense of purpose, as well as district goals.

These findings are contrary to what research on extrinsic motivation, job satisfaction, and Self-Determination Theory has shown. Extrinsic rewards, such as pay for performance, should be de-motivators that harm performance and creativity (Marciano, 2010; Williams, 2013). There should be negative consequences associated with pay for performance (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 1999). This study's findings would be understandable if the responsibilities of teachers were rote tasks such as assembly line work or grocery baggers. If that were the case, the carrot and stick motivation of pay for performance could be expected to be an effective management tool. Teachers' roles and duties are much more complicated than piecemeal type work. Teachers are constantly faced with non-routine, creative tasks.

Research tells us that positive job satisfaction is often supported by intrinsic motivators, but rarely by extrinsic motivators such as pay for performance (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 1999; Fang, Gerhart & Ledford, 2013; Sahrberg, 2014). Extrinsic rewards are likely to have negative effects on teachers, but in this study the opposite was true. (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 1999). Teachers in this study indicated that pay for performance supported their views of autonomy, mastery, sense of purpose, as well as

supporting district goals. It was surprising that these concepts were supported by the extrinsic reward of pay for performance.

Regarding autonomy, one interview participant commented that even though leadership teams decide recommendations, staff has the chance to offer input before decisions are finalized. Another participant said that it is the teachers who have the final say in how teacher performance is measured. A third participant offered there is a lot of areas for teacher freedom and that teachers have a very strong voice in how pay for performance is distributed. Teachers have all the freedom they want in the classroom “as long as we address the district’s goals and as long as we address the curriculum.” The pay for performance bonuses have not affected teacher freedom in the classroom. All of the interviewees commented that teacher input into the pay for performance program is valued, freedom in the classroom is valued, and the district administration leadership style that is focused on collaboration is appreciated.

The interview participants also shared how the district supports their efforts to master their craft. Teachers have a strong work ethic and work together to reach students. Teachers are willing to share their expertise. One teacher commented that pay for performance has spurred teachers to do a better job. There is a long-standing culture of improvement in the district. Pay for performance is “a bonus I get for doing my job well.” These comments reflect the importance of teachers mastering their craft and show that pay for performance has not hindered improvement efforts in the district.

According to this qualitative feedback, pay for performance has also not hindered teacher’s feelings of being connected to the very purposeful effort to raise student achievement. Teachers said repeatedly that students are the focus in the district, not the

pay for performance bonuses. Staff members are dedicated to education. They understand that there are different levels of students and teachers work together to focus on student growth as they make decisions. One interviewee summed up the concept of belonging to an important cause by saying, “It’s just our culture to do what’s best for students. We are considered one of the better schools in the state and nobody wants to be less than that.”

The district Superintendent asked for feedback on how pay for performance has affected district goals. Again, the qualitative data showed that pay for performance had no negative affect on this issue. Teachers commented that pay for performance did not drive them to reach district goals because they were already working to meet them and would do so even if there was not pay for performance program in place. Part of this was because of the collaborative efforts made by the Superintendent. Teachers had a voice not only in how the pay for performance program was distributed, but they also said they had a voice in the direction the district needs to go and they were listened to by leaders at the district level.

The disconnect between this study’s data, both quantitative and qualitative, and the literature on motivation and Self-Determination Theory led the researcher to look deeply at these results for an explanation of the disparity. Because this is a mixed-methods study, the qualitative data gathered through interviews provided a deeper understanding than the quantitative data gathered from surveys would not have provided on its own. This combination of quantitative and qualitative data provided a clearer picture of the district’s pay of performance program than either method could provide alone. By looking at the themes that emerged from combining the quantitative data with

the qualitative data, the researcher was able to reconcile this study's results with what research says was reasonably expected from a pay for performance program.

Mixed-Methods Results

The first research question asked teachers if pay for performance affects the first tenet of Self-Determination Theory: autonomy. Survey responses related to Research Question #1 were compared between groups of teachers according to how long they have been working in education. Along with survey responses, the researcher also analyzed data gathered from interviews and was able to identify three themes relating to Research Question #1.

Emerging Themes from Research Question #1

1. Teachers value freedom in the classroom.
2. Teacher value collaboration among staff.
3. Teachers value support from administration.

Teachers value freedom in the classroom. The data collected by the survey indicated that 54% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their ownership in pay for performance was important. 37% feared losing freedom in their classroom because of pay for performance. It is clear that pay for performance affected the idea of teacher freedom in the classroom. Most felt ownership in the pay for performance program while others feared a loss of freedom. An examination of interview responses linked to this topic found that teachers felt they have input and freedom within the parameters set by the district. The idea of everyone having an equal chance to earn the pay for performance bonus was important to teachers because it allowed a sense of fair play and an absence of favoritism in how the bonuses were awarded. Interview comments such as, "We decide,"

“We have a voice,” “We have input,” “We have freedom,” and “It’s on me and my students,” indicate that teachers are empowered by the district culture to use pay for performance as a tool to meet their professional goals.

Teachers also expressed fears that circumstances outside of their control would limit their ability to earn the pay for performance bonus. More than one interview participant spoke of students sabotaging test scores to retaliate against teachers. One interview participant expressed that they know, “students bomb tests sometimes to retaliate against teachers and sometimes there is nothing we (teachers) can do about it.” Another teacher expressed their concern, “I am afraid to lose freedom in my classroom.” This comment is noteworthy because it aligns with what research says about a narrowing of focus, which can result from extrinsic motivators. As pay for performance becomes more and more important to teachers, their creativity is limited as their focus becomes more concentrated. Shortsighted administrators also contribute to the loss of classroom freedom and autonomy when large and small classroom decisions are dictated by office administration. Interview participants stated that basing pay for performance bonuses only on test scores has a negative impact on teachers. Pink (2008) explained that extrinsic rewards their very nature narrow our focus and concentrate our minds; which is why they can be successful in many cases. Deci and Ryan (2017) took this concept a step further by stating that in complex activities (such as teaching), extrinsic controls lead people to narrow their focus and take shortcuts. People become too focused on the outcome instead of becoming engaged with the activity itself. Teachers who participated in this study’s interviews expressed the importance of staying focused on students, and not the pay for performance bonuses.

Teachers value collaboration among staff. Teacher collaboration was another theme that emerged from examining survey and interview responses related to the first research question. A large majority of the survey respondents, 71%, indicated that they either agreed or strongly agreed that their ownership in the pay for performance program was a key to its value to teachers. The interview responses gave the additional insight that staff value collective ownership as much as individual ownership in the district's pay for performance program. Teachers and staff were given the chance to share in the decision making process when the pay for performance program was created. According to the literature, this kind of autonomy enhances job satisfaction. The Superintendent was able to unify staff to organizational goals and build their capacity by allowing them to voice their opinions and shape the program to their needs (Heskett, 2007; Kouzes & Posner, 2012; McKinney, 2015; Smallwood & Ulrich, 2004). Part of building worker capacity is giving them opportunities to become autonomous in their areas of responsibility (Baxter, 2013; Marzano & Waters, 2006, VanWart, 2004). The Superintendent built this kind of workplace autonomy by using shared leadership strategies to implement the pay for performance program and gather support for it. Researchers Dawson, Dancefield, & Leitch (2016) and Fullan (2014) found that shared leadership strategies such as those displayed by the Superintendent are effective ways to gather support from staff.

Staff collaboration was another important key to the pay for performance program. Collaboration helped create the district's healthy culture, as evidenced in interview responses. Interview respondents suggested that the pay for performance program should not create competition among staff and that it is their district culture to work together to do what's best for kids. It was important from the beginning that the pay

for performance program did not detract from the district's culture of collaboration.

Teachers value support from administration. Seventy percent of respondents thought that the pay for performance program had no affect on the level of support they received from district administrators. Staff indicated that there is a culture of supportive leadership in the district that is not a result of the pay for performance program. An unsupportive work environment is one of four factors causing a nationwide teacher shortage (Carver-Thomas, et al., 2016). According to this report, of those teachers who choose to leave voluntarily, most list dissatisfaction with the workplace as an important or as an extremely important factor in their decision to leave the profession. A supportive environment is the factor that is most consistently associated with a teacher's decision to stay or leave a school (Carver-Thomas, et al., 2016). Multiple times in the interviews, teachers expressed appreciation for the supportive culture in their district. A third of the teachers have been in the district for more that 20 years, which indicates a high level of satisfaction in the district. Interviewees expressed appreciation for their Superintendent who has been supportive and positive. Interview comments expressed gratitude for the Superintendent's collaborative efforts and professional culture in the district. Support from school district leadership is underscored by interview responses. Interview participants offered that their Superintendent listened to what staff had to say about the pay for performance program. They also said that teachers are given freedom within the parameters of the pay for performance program that they helped create. Goals were clearly communicated, but teachers were allowed freedom in their classroom on how they reached those goals. As one interview respondent commented, "Our superintendent listened to what we had to say. That's what makes him so great. He wanted our help and

reached out to us. He listened to what we had to say. He has done a really nice job of making pay for performance a positive program for teachers.”

Emerging Themes from Research Question #2

The second research question in this study asked if pay for performance affects teacher mastery. This component of Self-Determination Theory suggests that job satisfaction is enhanced when people feel they are doing their job at high levels of effectiveness and efficiency. When people are caught up in the mastery of their craft, they are driven internally (Ahmed, 2011). This internal determination is markedly different from being externally driven, where factors such as comfort, money, power, or fame are the motivating force (Cherry, 2016; Csikszentmihalyi, 2009; Derosiers; 2016; McDermott; 2016). As the researcher compared the survey questions relating to this research question to the interview responses, the following themes became clear.

1. Constant Improvement.
2. Teacher Work Ethic.
3. Concern for Student Success

Constant Improvement. Thirty-nine percent of the respondents did not think that pay for performance was a driver in teachers’ willingness to improve their craft. This is interesting because even although teachers supported the pay for performance program, staff did not see it supplanting their desire to be effective teachers and reach their students. Just over half of the respondents, 53%, said that pay for performance did not affect their willingness to use effective teaching strategies. These educators were already willing to use effective strategies. A larger percentage, 63%, did not see pay for performance affecting the professional attitude among teachers in the district. The use of

sound teaching practices was not seen to be driven by pay for performance. These elements were already present in the culture of the district. Successful teachers who inspire students can be motivated by the flow of their craft (Csikszentmihalyi, 2004). Activities that are intrinsically rewarding lend themselves to extraordinary voluntary efforts. Such intrinsically rewarding activities are seen as difficult but also worthwhile. Csikszentmihalyi (2004). This theme of mastery is supported by Self-Determination research and also appears to be an important part of the district's organizational culture. Pay for performance does not detract from this theme. Teachers in the district said that they want to be the best they possibly can be. One interview participant touched on this theme when they said, "There are teachers who are constantly pushing themselves, even though they are good teachers. I don't think pay for performance made any difference to them."

Teachers are driven to improve in the district. Some of the interview responses indicated that this drive is influenced in some way by pay for performance, "We're working hard and we get a nice little bonus," "It's bonus we get for a job well done," and "Pay for performance focuses on improving the actual work and performance of individual teachers." But just as in the survey data, there was a majority of interview responses that did not view pay for performance as a driver for teachers to improve. It is evident that teachers in the district recognize a strong culture that promotes constant improvement. Opinions were mixed however between the minority who see pay for performance affecting their improvement efforts and a majority who think that it does not. Twenty-two percent of staff who took the survey said that pay for performance affects their willingness to improve. Thirty-three percent said that it does not. Literature

suggests that over time, the positive affects of extrinsic motivation fade. Willingness to become proficient in one's craft becomes limited. People become focused on the reward instead of focusing on the task and their motivation diminishes (Deci & Ryan, 2006; Pink, 2008).

Teacher Work Ethic. The educators who responded to this study's survey and interview questions indicated that they have a very strong work ethic. Only 14% of the survey participants thought that pay for performance does not influence teachers to work to increase student achievement. While this question presented the idea of a willingness to work to become highly effective teachers, the interviewees gave additional perspectives. As one interview participants put it, "Legislators don't understand that we want to be the best teachers we can possibly be. We want our kids to do well." Beyond this strong desire to be effective and to help students succeed, teachers commented on their own efforts as well as the efforts of their colleagues to help their students succeed. One interview They see themselves as focused and hard working. There is a longstanding culture of improvement. Teachers work at it constantly. They are considered one of the better schools in the state, none of them want to be less than that. Interview Participant #3 commented, "There was always a push to improve. Pay for performance targets the actual work of individual teachers, but there was already a long-standing culture or atmosphere of improvement." This culture of continuous improvement elevates productivity and job satisfaction. Empowering employees with freedom to make decisions and own their position enables a fulfilling work environment that elevates productivity and job satisfaction (Prevost, 2014). This type of leadership can foster culture where employee freedom and autonomy can flourish (Drucker, 2006). DuFour, DuFour, and Eaker (2006)

urged school leaders to foster a healthy organizational culture that supports teachers.

For the five survey questions that tied to teacher mastery, there were 150 responses that disagreed or strongly agreed that pay for performance influenced teacher mastery. 176 responses agreed or strongly agreed that there was an influence. There 17% more responses that indicated agreement or strong agreement that pay for performance influences teacher mastery than there are in disagreement or strong disagreement.

Highly motivated teachers, such as those in this study, can promote high levels of drive in students. Teachers who use professional judgment and academic freedom to meet the needs of students can then share autonomy with students (McCombs, 2014). Choice allows people to be both autonomous and productively interdependent with others (Morgenson, 2009). Likewise, autonomous students take responsibility for their learning and are aware of their learning styles and strategies (Chu, Sakai & Takagi, 2010). The district's culture of strong work ethic has allowed teachers to show gains in test scores and students to meet district academic goals. Most of the respondents indicated that this would occur even if there was no pay for performance program.

Concern for Student Success. Just as in the previous theme, the concern for student success is seen as a motivator for teachers. Pay for performance's effect on this theme is not clear. Interviews linked the concern for student success to the district's culture, but not to the pay for performance program. This theme relates to research on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. As discussed in Chapter 2 of this study, extrinsic rewards can become de-motivators that harm performance and creativity (Marciano, 2010; Williams, 2013). Carrot and stick motivators encourage unethical behavior, create addictions, and foster short-term thinking. For rote tasks, carrot and stick motivators can

be effective. For non-routine, creative tasks, however, research suggests that a focus on extrinsic rewards can have negative effects (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 1999; Fang, Gerhart & Ledford, 2013). Stronger performance, greater health, and higher overall well being results from a focus on intrinsic rewards. Internal reward systems should consider autonomy, mastery, and purpose of tasks. These three elements are the building blocks of motivation (Sahrberg, 2014). For the teachers in the San Animado School District, concern for student success is an intrinsic motivator and a driver of job satisfaction. Interview responses indicated that teachers find value and motivation in seeing their students succeed. Their responses included, “We want our students to succeed,” “We are concerned about our individual classes,” “We try to do what’s best for students,” “Whether we get the bonus or not, we are going to work hard to make our class the best we can,” and, “Students are still the focus that drives teachers.”

The third research question asked district employees if pay for performance affects the third Self-Determination Theory tenet: the sense of purpose as teachers. Interview conversations dwelt in part on this question. Repeatedly, the certain themes were brought up and discussed independently by each interviewee.

Emerging Themes from Research Question #3

1. Collaboration
2. Strong leadership
3. Organizational culture

Collaboration. Again, collaboration among staff becomes an issue that teachers value. However, survey responses were mixed in regards to pay for performance’s effect on collaboration. Survey Question #12 asked specifically if collaboration was affected by

pay for performance. Table 23 illustrates how staff answered this question.

Table 23

District staff willingness to collaborate is affected by the pay for performance program.

| Responses | Years of Experience | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-----------|
| | 1 – 10 years | 10 – 20 years | 20+ years |
| Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Disagree | 3 | 6 | 8 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Agree | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Strongly Agree | 0 | 0 | 2 |

Across all three groups, 23% of respondents indicated that pay for performance affected collaboration. 57% responded that it did not. Collaboration appeared to be valued by teachers, but not enhanced by pay for performance. Two comments gathered during interviews illustrate this point further. Interview Participant #3 stated, “Teachers were already working very hard. I don't think pay for performance made any difference on that.” Interview Participant #5 commented, “It's just in our culture to do what's best for students. Pay for performance doesn't change that.”

It is evident through survey responses and interviews that the district staff is very willing to improve, but it was not clear that pay for performance drives this culture of mastery. Interview Participant #6's comments make this clear. “We are not trying to get better just for the money. Whether we get the money or not, we are going to make our classes the best we can. Students are the focus that drives teachers.” Dufour, Dufour, and Eaker (2006) describe the benefits of a healthy school culture focused on learning.

Deming would suggest that a healthy organizational culture focuses on the process and not the rewards (Guthrie & Hollensbe, 2000; Hassibi, 2013). Pink (2008) would suggest that we should pay teachers at such a high level that compensation does not enter into the conversation about job satisfaction. In the San Animado School District, the focus is on students, not compensation.

Strong leadership. In 2006, the researcher met the superintendent of the district where this study took place. The superintendent shared with the researcher the outline of how the pay for performance program was developed. The amount of the pay for performance bonus was key decision as it had to be enough that teachers saw it as a reward but not so much that the money would become the focus of their efforts rather than student achievement. After initial board approval, the superintendent sought input from teachers. Teachers were given the parameters of the program and asked to set appropriate goals and metrics for evaluating whether or not teachers qualify for a pay for performance bonus.

Data collected for this dissertation recognized the role strong district leadership played in the success of the pay for performance program. 35% of participants disagreed or strongly disagreed that their district leadership was affected by the pay for performance program. 25% agreed or strongly agreed that there was influence on district leaders. Interview Participant #6 commented on the Superintendent's leadership this way, "That is what makes him great, he wants our help and he listens. He gives us freedom. He gives us a voice in decisions being made." These results suggest that teachers recognize and appreciate the autonomy and choice they are given in the district. District leadership is supportive and collaborative. The Superintendent extended ownership of the pay for

performance program to staff and gave them opportunities to collaborate with him. Leadership kept the focus on student achievement. Research suggests that a poor school climate, weak administrative leadership, and a low quality of the school facilities have been associated with teacher dissatisfaction (Moore, 2012; Huicochea, 2014; Richmond, 2012). This is not the case in the San Animado School District. Carver-Thomas, Darling-Hammond, and Sutchter (2016) listed supportive school leadership as a factor to retaining teachers amid a nationwide teacher shortage. Additional comments from this study's interviews align with literature in support of the district's strong leadership. "Our superintendent is fantastic. He does a lot of positive things and will come around and tell us we are doing such a great job, he so positive about it." "Administrators make sure we are doing what we are supposed to do, but we have ton of freedom." "Our superintendent listened to what we had to say. And that's what makes him so great. He wants help and he seeks input from the staff. We have had a strong voice in how our pay for performance has been distributed." "Staff likes this system a lot better than the convoluted (pay for performance) systems that are out there." The district positive culture has been created by collaboration between the Superintendent and staff. The success of the pay for performance program can be attributed to this culture. There is no evidence that the pay for performance program framed the district's culture. Quantitative and qualitative data suggest that the district culture framed the program instead.

Organizational culture. All of the emerging themes discussed up to this point describe the district's organizational culture. Teacher freedom in the classroom, collaboration among staff, support from administration, a focus on student achievement, strong teacher work ethic, concern for students, and strong district leadership paint a

picture of a district with a healthy culture, which correlates with what is found in literature (Dufour, Dufour, & Eaker, 2006; Drucker, 2006; Prevost, 2008). Pay for performance has been viewed positively because of the supportive culture of the district.

Fullan (2001) suggested that successful companies focus on people and relationships to get sustained results. Attention to the interactions between people and how they are treated contributes to a healthy culture (Lewin & Regine, 2000). These authors talk about the soul of an organization being evident in how people are treated. Reflecting on Self-Determination Theory and the idea that being connected to a clear sense of purpose motivates employees. Lewin and Regine (2000) say that this is true for both the collective organization as well as the individuals within the organization:

Most people want to be part of their organization; they want to know the organization's purpose; they want to make a difference. When the individual soul is connected to something deeper – the desire to contribute to a larger purpose – to feel they are part of a greater whole...we should pay as much attention to how we treat people – co-workers, subordinates, and customers – as we do to structures, strategies, and statistics (p. 27).

It follows, then, that an organization that focuses on people and relationships can build a culture where staff members are intrinsically motivated. This is the kind of culture that seems to be present in the San Animado School District. The data that has been collected indicate that the district staff valued having a strong voice in how pay for performance is distributed. It is also noteworthy that pay for performance has not affected the freedom teachers have in the classroom. It was important to teachers that pay for performance not be used as a carrot to try to motivate them nor that it promote an environment of

competition that would harm collaboration. With this intrinsically motivated culture in place, the school district was able to introduce a pay for performance program that garnished general support from staff. But it was not the program that drove motivation, it was the culture. As one interview participant said, “Whether or not we get the pay for performance money, we are going to make our classes the best we can. Students are what drives our teachers.” Another interviewee summed up this idea of a healthy culture by stating, “We meet together to give input. We are still focus on students. We have freedom...we have a voice.”

Conclusions

This mixed-methods study explored the following Self-Determination Theory based questions, as well as the Superintendent suggested question:

1. Does pay for performance affect teacher autonomy?
2. Does pay for performance affect teacher mastery?
3. Does pay for performance affect teacher sense of purpose?
4. Does pay for performance affect district goals?

In the San Animado School District, pay for performance affected teacher job satisfaction in each of the three Self-Determination Theory tenets of autonomy, mastery, and sense of purpose. Pay for performance also affected district goals. This study gathered quantitative data via an online survey and compared the responses from three groups of teachers based on the number of years they have been teaching.

The Kruskal-Wallis H Test was conducted to compare survey responses. A significance level of 0.05 was set by the researcher. The adjusted and non-adjusted p-values for all research questions ranged from 0.930 to 0.942. All p-values exceeded the

level of significance ($p=.05$). This led the researcher to fail to reject that null hypotheses that for each research question as the medians of the three teacher groups were equal. This means that responses were fairly similar. Results were not skewed in either direction by a small number of extremely high or low values. Because the medians were similar across all three groups of teachers, it can be assumed that their responses were typical and representative of all teachers in general.

A series of scripted, semi-structured interviews were conducted with staff members who have been involved in the district's pay for performance program. The shared perspective of the interview participants was that pay for performance does have an affect on the four research question themes. The findings from this study's quantitative data and its qualitative data were contrary to what the literature on extrinsic motivation suggests could have been expected (Iberman, 1998; U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2010). The interview participants offered additional insights to the survey responses, which explained why this study's findings appeared to contradict literature on job satisfaction and motivational theory. The literature suggested that extrinsic motivators, such as pay for performance programs, have a negative affect on job satisfaction (Deci & Ryan, 2006; Markos, 2010; Lunenberg, 2011; Pink, 2008; Proctor, 2014; Redmond, 2016). This study's survey response indicated that in the San Animado School District, the opposite was true. Pay for performance did not have a negative affect on teacher job satisfaction. An examination of the qualitative data explains why this is. As has been discussed elsewhere in this chapter, the San Animado School District has a healthy culture that is supportive of teachers and focuses on students. One interviewee offered that it is a great place to be because teachers and administrators work together to

support students; and students are the focus in the district, not the pay for performance program. Amid this supportive atmosphere, teachers express high levels of satisfaction. All of the interview participants spoke favorably of the district. Although they shared fears about pressure outside of the district affecting education (Common Core and State mandates), all were complementary what they saw happening in their district. The district's focus on students, the collaboration among staff, and supportive administrators contributed to their job satisfaction. It is on top of this strong culture that pay for performance has found its place in the district. The district's pay for performance program is aligned with Self-Determination Theory and has not detracted from teacher job satisfaction, as evidenced by survey and interview responses.

Scholars and teachers agreed that a strong culture is important for the successful introduction of innovations such as the district's pay for performance (Drucker, 2006; DuFour, DuFour, & Eaker; 2006; Prevost, 2014). In interviews, teachers repeatedly pointed to the district's culture as a critical piece to success of the district's pay for performance program. Without a supportive district culture, it is unlikely that the pay for performance program could have found the success it has.

Interview respondents also indicated that the focus of teachers has been on improving student achievement, and not the pay for performance program itself. The pay for performance program, while greatly appreciated by all of the respondents, is not the focus of the district. Being student focused is in line with the Self-Determination Theory concept that people find job satisfaction when they are part of a purpose greater than themselves (Deci & Ryan, 2006, Pink, 2008). It is clear in the voices of the participants, that they find their purpose in serving students and being excellent school employees.

The extrinsic reward of pay for performance is just a bonus to doing their best to meet their purpose.

Deming helped to build post-World War II manufacturing success in Japan by promoting a culture that valued workers and empowered them to excel at their jobs (Berry, 2011; Van Ho, 2011). According to district staff, the Superintendent of the San Armino School District understood this concept of empowering teachers to excel at their jobs by allowing them to define the metrics used to reward bonuses through the pay for performance program. This level of autonomy allowed teachers to have ownership in the program, which contributed to its success. This compares favorably to literature on job satisfaction. Innovations in the work place often fail when factors affecting job satisfaction are ignored (Aminoff, et al., 2009). Employee input should be encouraged, especially when new programs are in the planning stages (Green, 2011; Lavinsky, 2013; Randall, 2013). This type of employee engagement was an important part of Deming's work on management, which incorporated a positive work environment and shared leadership (Deming, 1982). Deming valued workers and empowered them to excel at their jobs (Berry, 2011; Van Ho, 2011).

Another hallmark of the district's pay for performance program has been that everyone has an equal chance to be rewarded. Not only was this evident in interviews with staff, but it is also supported in literature on motivation (Bluestein, 2015; Clotfelter, 2010; Depano, 2008). Employees should have the same opportunity to earn bonuses as other employees doing their same job. Favoring one type of teacher over another will demotivate. Elementary teachers, core subject teachers, elective teachers, and special services teachers need to see a level playing field where bonuses are attainable by

everyone on staff (Bluestein, 2015; Clotfelter, 2010; Depano, 2008)

The teachers in the San Animado School District valued collaboration. Collaboration with administration led to the pay for performance parameters used to reward teachers. Collaboration with each other led to strategies to increase student achievement. There is a body of research on Professional Learning Communities that aligns with this kind of collaboration. Grade-level teams and subject area teams in Professional Learning Communities collaborate with each other as administrators delegate decision-making power over areas that affect teachers (Arroyo, Richter, & Wiseman, 2012; Dufour, Dufour, & Eaker, 2008). Staff collaboration and administrative support in the Professional Learning Community setting can enhance teacher job satisfaction (Ackerman, 2011; Trace 2016; Song, 2015).

Comments from interviews also touched on meaningful rewards, such as professional development opportunities. A lack of professional learning opportunities has been listed as a factor contributing to the nationwide teacher shortage (Carver-Thomas, et al., 2016). The importance of teachers valuing what is offered as a reward is a key to the success of the pay for performance program. Professional development that empowers teachers to improve their craft can be a powerful motivator (DuFour, DuFour, & Eaker, 2008). If teachers do not feel value in what is being offered, there is no motivation to seek after incentives (Deci & Ryan, 2006; Pink, 2008).

A final topic that was expressed in this study's interviews dealt with district leadership. Drucker (2006) suggested effective leaders take responsibility for communication. If workers do not understand organizational goals and vision, it is up to managers to communicate these clearly (Berry, 2011; Van Ho, 2011). Collaboration

between administration and staff, especially when the pay for performance program was in the planning stages, contributed to its success (Green, 2011; Lavinsky, 2013; Randall, 2013). It is ultimately up to the administrators to define organizational goals and work with staff to map out a strategic plan to reach them (Dawson, Dancefield, & Leitch, 2016; Fullan, 2014). The use of pay for performance should be an enhancement to existing programs, as was shared in interviews. As interview participants shared, “It’s just our culture, we do what’s best for students. Students are still the focus. We’re working hard and then we get a nice little reward at the end and we appreciate it.”

The characteristics of the San Animado School District’s pay for performance program provide a blueprint other districts can consider as they seek to use pay for performance to enhance teacher job satisfaction. Survey responses, interviews, and research corroborate each other. The following list is a summation of the literature and this study’s research findings outlining steps that are likely to lead to a pay for performance program that is valued by teachers: satisfaction:

1. Pay for performance should be introduced after a culture of collaboration has been created.
2. Pay for performance should be linked to constant improvement in student achievement.
3. Teachers should define the metrics of the pay for performance program.
4. Everyone should have an equal opportunity to earn the pay for performance bonus.
5. Teachers should be able to collaborate to develop strategies to meet their goals for improving student achievement.

6. Teachers should collaborate in the cycle of continuous improvement.
7. Meaningful professional development should assist staff in qualifying for pay for performance.
8. District leadership should support for staff and find ways to collaborate with staff.
9. District leadership should frame pay for performance as an opportunity instead of a carrot to drive student achievement.
10. The district's focus should be student achievement, not pay for performance.

Recommendation for further research

Future research could explore the connection between pay for performance, job satisfaction, and organizational culture. District culture emerged in this study as having a large role in the pay for performance program. Further study of district culture may prove beneficial for future pay for performance programs.

A second topic that warrants further study is pay for performance's effect on student achievement. The research conducted for this study as well as the data that was later collected indicated that the intrinsic motivator of increasing student achievement contributed to teacher job satisfaction. There are gaps in the literature linking pay for performance to increased student achievement (Schmidt, 2014). Comments from participants in this dissertation questioned whether their teaching efforts would change or not if there was no pay for performance program. Future studies on student achievement's link to pay for performance could prove enlightening.

A final topic for future research is to compare the San Animado's pay performance program to the statewide pay for performance program. The statewide

program was beyond the scope of the current study. A comparison of the two programs could highlight how extrinsic and intrinsic factors affect motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2006; Pink, 2008).

Implications for Professional Practice

There is little research linking pay for performance to job satisfaction (Park, 2009). Compensation and job satisfaction play a role in the nationwide teacher shortage (Carver-Thomas, et al., 2016). An Idaho survey on the teacher pipeline reported that half of the districts surveyed indicated that they were unable to fill their open positions in 2016 (Mortenson, 2016). Twenty-two of 55 districts surveyed cancelled classes or programs because they could not find teachers. Twenty-three of those 55 districts hired substitute teachers to cover classes at the beginning of the school year hoping to make permanent hires. Compensation was identified as a key factor in this teacher shortage (Richert, 2015). Innovative funding, changes in school and community culture, and a call for changed thinking have been suggested as starting places to address the shortage. (D. Mortimer & T. Siddoway, personal communication, April 21, 2016).

In addition to compensation issues, job satisfaction plays a role in attracting and retaining teachers (Giacometti, 2005; Horrison-Collier, 2013; Ouyang, 2006). Wyoming and Washington are both border states to Idaho and pay their teachers significantly higher wages than Idaho. A climate negative to teachers coupled with low wages makes it difficult to attract the best and brightest graduates to teach in Idaho classroom. Statewide efforts to improve the political environment to be more supportive of teachers can lay a foundation where pay for performance can be valued by teachers and improve job satisfaction.

Conclusion

Pay for performance has been offered as a way to reward teachers for their hard work and for increasing student achievement. The rationale behind it is that it helps to recruit and retain teachers by increasing their compensation (Chiang, et. al., 2014; Connor, 2013; Travis, 2014). A large body of research, including Self-Determination Theory research, suggested that extrinsic motivation such as pay for performance can erode teacher collaboration, is difficult to monitor, cannot be reliably linked to student achievement, leads to dishonest reporting of test scores, and is not a long-term solution to low teacher pay (Deci & Ryan, 2001; Goodman & Turner, 2013; Hussey, Schnieder, & Schnyer, 2011). Some researchers have found that extrinsic reward systems, such as pay for performance, can cancel the benefits that intrinsic motivation provides (Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 1999; Judge, Piccolo, Podasakoff, & Rich, 2010; Perry & Yoon, 2009). As policy makers consider different pay for performance models, the effect on teacher job satisfaction is a valid concern (Beneman, 2014; DeNisco, 2015; Gerhart, Parks, & Rynes, 2005; Max, 2014; Podursky & Springer, 2006; Ritter, 2014)..

This study examined pay for performance using the theoretical framework of Self-Determination Theory (Deci, & Ryan, 2001; Pink, 2008). This theory states that satisfaction comes from freedom in the workplace (autonomy), opportunities to improve job skills (mastery), and from making a difference in the world (purpose). The researcher found that a comparison of quantitative data and qualitative data showed that pay for performance can contribute to teacher job satisfaction, but only under the right conditions. A healthy culture was identified as the most important factor needed before pay for performance could improve teacher job satisfaction.

References

- Adams, S. J., Heywood, J., & Rothstein, R. (2009). *Teachers, performance pay, and accountability: What education should learn from other sectors* (Report No. 1). Retrieved from EPI website: http://s3.epi.org/files/page/-/pdf/teachers_performance_pay_and_accountability-full_text.pdf.
- Ahmad, M., Ferdoos, A., Latif, M.S., Mushtaq, M., Naeem, H., & Qasim, M. (2013). Impact of employee's job satisfaction on organizational performance. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(5). Retrieved from [http://pakacademicsearch.com/pdf-files/ech/517/166-171%20Vol%205,%20No%205%20\(2013\).pdf](http://pakacademicsearch.com/pdf-files/ech/517/166-171%20Vol%205,%20No%205%20(2013).pdf).
- Aknin, L.B., Anik, L., Dunn, E.W., Norton, M.I., & Quoidbach, J. (2013). Prosocial bonuses increase employee satisfaction and team performance. *PLoS One*, 8(9). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0075509>
- Akrani, (2011). *Importance of management – Significance of management*. Retrieved from <http://kalyan-city.blogspot.com/2011/06/importance-of-management-significance.html>.
- Albares, N., Leachman, M., Masterson, K., & Wallace, M. (2016). *Most states have cut school funding, and some continue cutting*. Retrieved from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/state-budget-and-tax/most-states-have-cut-school-funding-and-some-continue-cutting> .
- Almy, S., & Tooley, M. (2012). *Building and sustaining talent: Creating conditions in high-poverty schools that support effective teaching and learning*. Retrieved from The Education Trust website <http://www.edtrust.org/>

- Aminoff, A., Eriksson, A., Gripenberg, P., Segercrantz, B., Sveiby, K. (2009). *Unintended and undesirable consequences of innovation*. Retrieved from <http://www.sveiby.com/articles/UnintendedconsequencesISPIMfinal.pdf>.
- Aragon, S. (2016). *Teacher shortages: What we know*. Retrieved from The Education Commission of the States website: <http://www.ecs.org/ec-content/uploads/Teacher-Shortages-What-We-Know.pdf>.
- Ariely, D., Gneezy, U., Loewenstein, G., & Mazar, N. (2009). Large stakes and big mistakes. *Review of Economic Studies*, 76, 451-469. Retrieved from <http://people.duke.edu/~dandan/Papers/UpSide/largeStakes.pdf>.
- Ariely, D., Himmelstein, D., Woolhandler, S. (2014). Pay-for-performance: Toxic to quality? Insights from behavioral economics. *International Journal of Health Services*, 44(2), 203-214. DOI: 10.2190/HS.2.a
- Ariely, D., & Woolhandler, S. (2012). *Will pay for performance backfire? Insights from behavioral economics*. Retrieved from <http://healthaffairs.org/blog/2012/10/11/will-pay-for-performance-backfire-insights-from-behavioral-economics/>.
- Armstrong, A. (2012). Build higher levels of job satisfaction. *The Leading Teacher*, 7(6), 3-5. Retrieved from http://learningforward.org/docs/leadingteacher/may12_lead.pdf?sfvrsn=2.
- Assor, A., Kanat-Maymon, H., & Roth, G. (2007). Autonomous motivation for teaching: How self-determined teaching may lead to self-determined learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(4), 769-774. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net.
- Ayena, C.O., Popoola, S.O., & Tella, A. (2007). Work motivation, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of library personnel in academic and research

- libraries in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1118&context=libphilprac>.
- Ayhan, A., Sarier, Y., Uysal, S. (2012). *The effect on job satisfaction of teachers: A meta-analysis study*. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 356-362.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.122>
- Babauta, L. (2016). *Eight experiments in motivation*. Retrieved from <https://zenhabits.net/experiments/>.
- Bainbridge, C. (2017). *Extrinsic motivation*. Retrieved from Very Well website: <https://www.verywell.com/extrinsic-motivation-1449181>.
- Baird, C. (2016). *Top healthcare stories for 2016: Pay-for-performance*. Retrieved from <https://www.ced.org/blog/entry/top-healthcare-stories-for-2016-pay-for-performance>.
- Bainbridge, C. (2017). *Extrinsic motivation*. Retrieved from Very Well website <https://www.verywell.com/extrinsic-motivation-1449181>
- Bakeman, J. (2015, July 16). As race to the top ends, controversy continues. *Politico*. Retrieved from <http://www.politico.com>
- Baker, D.P., Day, R., & Salas, E. (2006). Teamwork as an essential component of high-reliability organizations. *Health and Educational Trust*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1955345/pdf/hesr0041-1576.pdf>.
- Bakotic, D. (2013). The relationship between job satisfaction and organisational performance. *Economic Research*, 29(1), 118-130.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2016.1163946>

- Ball, J. (2003). *Understanding Herzberg's motivation theory*. Retrieved from <http://www.accaglobal.com/us/en/student/exam-support-resources/fundamentals-exams-study-resources/f1/technical-articles/herzbergs-motivation.html>
- Ballotpedia Website. (2016). *Education reform at the state and local levels (2016)*. Retrieved from [https://ballotpedia.org/Education_reform_at_the_state_and_local_levels_\(2016\)](https://ballotpedia.org/Education_reform_at_the_state_and_local_levels_(2016)).
- Ballou, D., Hamilton, L., Le, V., Lockwood, J.R., McCaffrey, D., Pepper, M., Springer, M.G., & Stecher, B. (2010). *Teacher pay for performance: Experimental evidence from the Project on Incentives in Teaching*. Nashville, TN: National Center on Performance Incentives at Vanderbilt University.
- Banfield, J. (2014). Increasing student intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy through gamification pedagogy. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 7(4), 1-8. DOI: 10.19030/cier.v7i4.8843
- BaniAta, H., & Yadav, M. (2013). Factorizing demotivation, finding motivation: A constructive approach to quality enhancement. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70(2013), 120-130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.047>
- Barba Alvarez, A. (2010). Frederick Winslow Taylor y La Administracion Cientifica: Contextos, Realidad, y Mitos. *Gestion y Estrategia*, 38, 17-29. Retrieved from <http://gestionyestrategia.azc.uam.mx/index.php/articulos?format=raw&task=download&fid=59>
- Barnett, J., Denney, G., Jensen, N., Lo, W., & Ritter, G. (2014). *Merit pay programs for improving teacher retention, teacher satisfaction, and student achievement in primary and secondary education: A systemic review*. Retrieved from Campbell

- Collaboration website: <https://www.campbellcollaboration.org/library/merit-pay-teacher-satisfaction-student-achievement.html>
- Barnum, M. (2016, April 26). *The merit pay myth: Why the conventional wisdom about paying teachers is wrong*. Retrieved from The 74 website: <https://www.the74million.org/>
- Bartol, K., & Zhang, X. (2010). Linking empowering leadership and employee creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation, and creative process engagement. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 107-128.
- Barth, P., Dillon, N., Holland Higgins, B., & Hull, J. (2016). *Fixing holes in the teacher pipeline: An overview of teacher shortages*. Retrieved from Center for Public Education website: <http://www.centerforpubliceducation.org>
- Bates, J. (2016). *The essential ingredient for finding a sense of purpose in life*. Retrieved from <http://www.refinethemind.com/finding-purpose-in-life/>.
- Berry, B. (2011). *There is a relationship between systems thinking and W. Edward Deming's theory of profound knowledge*. Retrieved from the Berrywood Group website: <http://www.berrywood.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/demingpaper.pdf>
- Birkenshaw, J., & Goddard, J. (2009, January 8). What is your management model? *MIT Sloan Management Review*. Retrieved from <http://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/what-is-your-management-model/>
- Bivona, L. (2012). *Pay for performance in Idaho*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Center for Educator Compensation Reform.

- Blake, A., & Mosely, J. (2010). One hundred years after the principles of scientific management: Frederik Taylor's life and impact on the field of human performance technology. *Performance Improvement*, 49(4), 27-34. DOI: 10.1002/pfi.20141
- Blanchard, C.M., Pelletier, L.G., Taylor, S., & Tremblay, M.A. (2009). Work extrinsic and intrinsic motivation scale: Its value for organizational psychology research. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 41(4), 213-226. DOI: 10.1037/a0015167
- Blazer, C. (2010). *Twenty strategies to increase student motivation*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED544660.pdf>.
- Bluestein, G. (2015, December 8). *Gov. Nathan Deal all in on merit pay for teachers*. Retrieved from My AJC website: <http://www.myajc.com/news/state--regional-govt--politics/gov-nathan-deal-all-merit-pay-for-teachers/GhDvt66jwTHvCZinhAJhJL/>
- Bodkin, D. (2016, June 7). Teacher shortage in East Idaho called a 'famine.' Retrieved from Idaho Education News website: <https://www.idahoednews.org/news/teacher-shortage-east-idaho-called-famine/>
- Bonner, J.L. (2012, September 29). *Idaho teachers leave profession in bigger numbers*. *Idaho Press*. Retrieved from <http://www.idahopress.com>
- Bowman, R. (2016, March 29). *Motivation theory and practice: Equity theory vs. expectancy theory*. Retrieved from <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/motivation-theory-practice-equity-vs-expectancy-rodric>.
- Boyce, C., & Neale, P. (2006). *Conducting in-depth interviews: A guide for designing*

- and conducting in-depth interviews for evaluation input.* Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/ebd1/92df43768b41b1e0b8785ca4b5647c983f34.pdf>.
- Bowles, D., & Cooper, C. (2009). *Staff morale: Driving performance in challenging times.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bozeman, D., Scogin, S., & Stuessy, C. (2013). *Job satisfaction of high school science teachers: Prevalence and association with teacher retention.* *Electronic Journal of Science Education, 17*(4). Retrieved from <http://ejse.southwestern.edu/article/view/11465/8432>.
- Brenneman, R. (2015, April 21). *Fewer high school students show interest in teaching, study says.* Retrieved from EdWeek website: http://blogs.edweek.org/teachers/teaching_now/2015/04/fewer-students-report-wanting-to-teach-study.html.
- Brown, G.T.L., & Harris, L.R. (2010). *Mixing interview and questionnaire methods: Practical problems in aligning data.* Retrieved from <http://pareonline.net/pdf/v15n1.pdf>.
- Bushaw, W. J., & Lopez, S. J. (2013). The 45th PDK/Gallup poll of the public's attitudes towards the public schools: Which way do we go? *Kappan Magazine, 95*(1), 9-25. Retrieved from http://pdkintl.org/noindex/2013_PDKGallup.pdf.
- Buck, S., & Greene, J.P. (2011). Blocked, diluted, and co-opted: Interest groups wage war against merit pay. *Education Next, 11*(2). Retrieved from <http://educationnext.org/blocked-diluted-and-co-opted>.

- Burton, N. (2012). *Our hierarchy of needs. Why true freedom is a luxury of the mind.*
Retrieved from [https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/hide-and-
seek/201205/our-hierarchy-needs](https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/hide-and-
seek/201205/our-hierarchy-needs)
- Cajandar, A., Clear, T., Daniels, M., McDermott, R., & Zarb, M. (2016). *Motivation, optimal experience and flow in first year computer science.* Retrieved from Robert Gordon University website: <https://openair.rgu.ac.uk/>
- Campell, J.L., Osserman, J., Quincy, C., & Pedersen, O.K. (2013). Coding in-depth semistructured interviews: Problems of unitization and intercoder reliability and agreement. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 42(3), 294-320.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124113500475>
- Cassell, C., & Symon, G. (2004). *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publishing.
- Castle, J., & Hess, F. (2007). *Teacher pay and 21st-century school reform.* Retrieved from https://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/20081211_TeacherPayHess.pdf.
- Cavanaugh, S. (2011). Race to top winners feel heat on teacher evaluations. *Education Week*, 31(3), 20-21. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org>.
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2013). *Does money really affect motivation? A review of the research.* Retrieved from Harvard Business Review website: <https://hbr.org/2013/04/does-money-really-affect-motiv>.
- Chandler, M.A. (2011, June 21). New teacher evaluation plan approved in Maryland. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonpost.com>
- Chapman, A. (2017). *Frederick Herzberg motivational theory.* Retrieved from Businessballs.com website: <http://www.businessballs.com/herzberg.htm>

- Chaundhary, S., & Kashyap, C. (2016). Job satisfaction and pay for performance (P4P). *IOSR Journal of Business and Management, Special Issue, 55-60*. DOI: 10.9790/487X-15010010155-60
- Chen, M. (2014). The effect of training on employee retention. *International Conference on Global Economy, Commerce and Service Science (GECSS 2014)*. Retrieved from <http://scholar.google.com>
- Cherry, K. (2016). *What is intrinsic motivation?* Retrieved from Very Well website: <https://www.verywell.com/what-is-intrinsic-motivation-2795385>.
- Cherry, K. (2017). *Motivation: What's the difference?* Retrieved from Very Well website: <https://www.verywell.com/differences-between-extrinsic-and-intrinsic-motivation-2795384>.
- Chiang, H., Constantine, J., Glazerman, S., Hallgren, K., Herrmann, M., Glazerman, S., ... Wellington, A. (2015). *Evaluation of the teacher incentive fund: Implementation and impacts of pay-for-performance after two years. Executive summary* (Report No. 2015-4021). Retrieved from Institute of Education Sciences website: <https://ies.ed.gov/>
- Choi, J. (2016). *How to boost productivity: Autonomy, mastery, and purpose* [Blog Post]. Retrieved from <https://www.edutopia.org/blog/student-autonomy-compliance-and-intrinsic-motivation-maurice-elias>
- Chu, M., Shien, S., & Takagi, A. (2010). Promoting learning autonomy: Student perceptions of Responsibilities in language classroom instruction in East Asia. *Educational Perspectives, 43*(1-2), 12-27.

- Chumoriya, B. (2016). *Theories of motivation in management business* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://www.wisenepali.com/2015/01/theories-of-motivation-in-organization.html>.
- Chyung, S.Y. (2007). Invisible motivation of online learning during contract learning. *Journal of Educators Online*, 4(1). Retrieved from <http://www.thejeo.com/Volume4Number1/ChyungFinal.pdf>.
- Ciurczak, E., & Mississippi, G. (2016, October 22). Teachers wait for merit pay. *The Clarion-Ledger*. Retrieved from <http://www.clarionledger.com>
- Cohen, D., Dean, D., & Muslim, N.A. (2016). Employee job search motivation factors. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 35(2016), 532-540. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com>
- Comaford, C. (2013, March 13). The 3 things all humans crave – And how to motivate anyone, anytime, anywhere. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com>
- Connell, C. (2010, September 21). Merit pay study: Teacher bonuses don't raise student test scores. *USA Today*. Retrieved from www.usatoday.com
- Conner, T. (2013). Apples or sticks: The promise and pitfalls of merit pay policies. *The Blue Review*, 1(2). Retrieved from <https://thebluereview.org/>
- Constantine, J., Glazerman, S., Hallgren, K., Max, J., Sperioni, C., & Wellington, A. (2004). *Evaluation of the teacher incentive fund: Implementation and early impacts of pay-for-performance after one year* (Report No. 2014-4019). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

- Cotterell, A. (2013). *Report: Idaho Teachers Feel “An Undercurrent of Despair.”* [Boise State Public Radio Report]. Retrieved from <http://boisestatepublicradio.org/post/report-idaho-teachers-feel-strong-undercurrent-depair>.
- Cotterell, A. (2012). *Idaho teacher pay for performance: Research vs. experience*. Retrieved from <http://boisestatepublicradio.org/post/idaho-teacher-pay-performance-research-vs-experience>.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2009). *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Craig, T., Hamilton, M., & Stauffer, S. (2016). *Idaho teacher STEM education experiences*. Retrieved from University of Idaho website: www.uidaho.com
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Cui, G., Yao, M., & Zhang, X. (2017). *The dampening effects of perceived teacher enthusiasm on class-related boredom: The mediating role of perceived autonomy support and task value*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5356221/>.
- Dahl, M. (2016, August 29). How to motivate your employees: Give them compliments and pizza. *New York Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://nymag.com>
- Dary, T., & Pickeral, T. (2013). *School climate practices for implementation and sustainability*. Retrieved from National School Climate Center website: <http://www.schoolclimate.org>
- Deci, E.L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R.M. (1999). A meta-analysis of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological*

- Bulletin*, 125(6), 627-668. Retrieved from http://www.rug.nl/gmw/psychology/research/onderzoek_summerschool/firststep/content/papers/4.4.pdf.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2011). Levels of analysis, regnant causes of behavior, and well-being: The role of psychological needs. *Psychological Inquiry*, 22, 17-22. doi: 10.1080/1047840x.2011.545978.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “What” and “Why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychology Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268. Retrieved from http://www.selfdeterminationtheory.org/SDT/documents/2000_DeciRyan_PIWhatWhy.pdf.
- Den Hartog, & D., Koopman, P. (2011). *Leadership in organizations*. Handbook of Industrial, Work & Organizational Psychology. Retrieved from <https://secure.sagepub.com/northouseintro2e/study/chapter/handbook/handbook4.1.pdf>.
- Delisio, E. (2016). *Pay for performance: What are the issues?* Retrieved from Education World website: http://www.educationworld.com/a_issues/issues/issues374a.shtml.
- Deming, W. (1982). *Out of the crisis*. Boston: MTI.
- Dennick, R., & Tavakol, M. (2011). Making sense of Cronback’s alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, 53-55. doi: 10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd.
- Denning, S. (2011, October 5). *Valuing employees (really!): Lessons from India*. Forbes. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com>
- DeShields, O.W., & Kara, A. (2005) Determinants of business student satisfaction and retention in higher education: applying Herzberg's two-factor theory. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 19(2), 128-139.

- Desrosiers, R. (2016). *Procrastination, motivation, & flow (Honors Thesis)*. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/>
- Dione, E. (2015, November 24). *Teaching gave me a nervous breakdown - And I know I'm not alone*. Retrieved from Bustle website: <https://www.bustle.com/articles/121971-teaching-gave-me-a-nervous-breakdown-and-i-know-im-not-alone>.
- Dominico, S.I., & Ryan, R.M. (2017). The emerging neuroscience of intrinsic motivation: A new frontier in self-determination theory. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 11*. DOI: 10.3389/fnhum.2017.00145
- Doorey, N. A. (2013). Coming soon: A new generation of assessments. Retrieved from <http://et.nwresd.org/files/Assessment%20systems.pdf>.
- Doshi, N., & McGregor, L. (2015, November 25). How company culture shapes employee motivation. Harvard Business Review. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/>
- Dowlan, S. (2014). *Mixed methods research*. Retrieved from <https://prezi.com/5piorufb6jae/mixed-methods-research/>.
- Downing, P. (2016). *Effects of teacher evaluation on teacher job satisfaction in Ohio* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 10118324)
- Drake-Knight, N. (2007). *Boomerang!* London: Pollinger in Print.
- Drucker, P. (2010). *The practice of management* (Reissue ed.). New York: HarperCollins.
- DuFour, R., DuFour R., & Eaker, R. (2006). *Professional learning communities at work*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

- DuFour, R., Mattos, M. (2013). How do Principals really improve schools? *The Principalship* 7(70). Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/apr13/vol70/num07/How-Do-Principals-Really-Improve-Schools%C2%A2.aspx>.
- Dulay, M.G., Mohiuddin, M. (2015). Employee motivation in a non-profit: Evidence from a community based voluntary organization. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 10(11). Retrieved from <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ijbm/article/view/52634>.
- Eberle, S. (2016). *The importance of scientific management training*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2016/06/27/job-benefits-scientific-management-training-essay>.
- Elias, M.J. (2016). *Student autonomy, compliance, and intrinsic motivation* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://www.edutopia.org/blog/student-autonomy-compliance-and-intrinsic-motivation-maurice-elias>.
- Ensley, M.D., & Hmieleski, K.M. (2005). A comparative study of new venture top management team composition, dynamics and performance between university-based and independent start-ups. *Research Policy*, 34(7), 1091-1105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2005.05.008>
- Evans, P. (2015). Self-determination theory: An approach to motivation in music education. *Musicae Scientiae*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1029864914568044>
- Fallon Taylor, N. (2016). *Should you hire a former employee?* Retrieved from Farm Equipment website: <https://www.farm-equipment.com/articles/12967-should-you-hire-a-former-employee>.

- Falout, J. (2010). Strategies for teacher motivation. *The Language Teacher*, 34(6), 27-32.
- Fang, M., & Gerhart, B. (2014). Pay for (individual) performance: Issues, claims, evidence, and the roll of sorting effects. *Human Resource Management Review*, 24(1), 41-52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2013.08.010>
- Fang, M., Gerhart, B., & Ledford, G.E. (2013). *Negative effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation: More smoke than fire*. Retrieved from Center for Effective Organizations website: <http://ceo.usc.edu>
- Fein, B. (2016). How would Donald Trump or Hillary Clinton affect the military morale? *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bruce-fein/how-would-donald-trump-or_b_11306504.html.
- Fidel, R. (1984). *The case study method: A case study*. Retrieved from University of Washington website: <http://faculty.washington.edu/fidelr/RayaPubs/TheCaseStudyMethod.pdf>.
- Fisher, E. A. (2009). Motivation and leadership in social work management: A review of theories and related studies. *Administration in Social Work*, 33(4), 347-367. doi: 10.1080/03643100902769160
- Flannery, M.E. (2016, March 15). Survey: Number of future teachers reaches an all-time low. *NEA Today*. Retrieved from <http://neatoday.org/>
- Fleming, N. (2011, September 16). Some states, districts abandoning pay for performance plans. *EdWeek*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org>
- Fraser-Thill, R. (2017). *Fearing what we want most*. Retrieved from Elephant Journal website: <https://www.elephantjournal.com>

- Freeman, J. (2009, March 8). *Carrot unstuck*. Retrieved from http://archive.boston.com/bostonglobe/ideas/articles/2009/03/08/carrot_unstuck/.
- Frith, B. (2016, February 5). The most demotivating business behaviors. *HR Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.hrmagazine.co.uk>
- Fullan, M., (2004). *Leadership: Maximizing impact*. Retrieved from http://Michaelfullan.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/14_Spring_Maximizing-Impact-Handout.compressed.pdf.
- Gabor, A. (2000). *The capitalist philosophers: The geniuses of modern business—their lives, times and ideas*. New York: Times Books.
- Gale, E.A.M. (2004). The Hawthorne studies – a fable for our times? *Quarterly Journal of Medicine*, 97(7): 439–449.
- Gawel, J. E. (1997). Herzberg’s theory of motivation and Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 5(11). Retrieved from <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=5&n=11>
- Gehart, B., & Fang, M. (2013). Pay for performance: Issues, claims, evidence and the role of sorting effects. *Human Resource Management Review*, 24(1), 41-52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2013.08.010>
- Giannantonio, C. M., & Hurley-Hanson, A. E. (2011). Frederick Winslow Taylor: Reflections on the relevance of *The Principles of Scientific Management* 100 years later. *Journal of Business and Management*, 17(1), 7-10. Retrieved from <http://www.chapman.edu/>
- Gilgun, J. F. (2010). The power of the case. Current issues in qualitative research: An occasional publication for field researchers from a variety of discipline. *Current*

- Issues in Qualitative Research*, 1(4), 1-4. Retrieved from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/36079001/The-Power-of-the-Case>.
- Gkolia, A., Belias, D., & Koustelios, A. (2014). Teacher's job satisfaction and self-efficacy: A review. *European Scientific Journal*, 10(22). Retrieved from <http://eujournal.org/index.php/esj/article/viewFile/3923/3714>.
- Gleeson, B. (2017). The fundamental differences between leadership and management. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/>
- Goldhaber, D., & Walch, J. (2011). *Strategic Pay Reform: A Student Outcomes-Based Evaluation of Denver's ProComp Teacher Pay Incentive* (CEDR Working Paper 2011-3). Retrieved from CEDR website: [http://www.cedr.us/papers/working/WP%202011-3%20Procomp%20Strategic%20Compensation%20\(9-28\).pdf](http://www.cedr.us/papers/working/WP%202011-3%20Procomp%20Strategic%20Compensation%20(9-28).pdf)
- Goldring, R., Taie, S., & Riddles, M. (2014). *Teacher Attrition and Mobility: Results From the 2012–13 Teacher Follow-up Survey* (NCES 2014-077). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved April 18, 2015 from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>.
- Goodman, S. F., & Turner, L. J. (2013). The design of teacher incentive pay and educational outcomes: Evidence from the New York City Bonus Program. *Journal of Labor and Economics*, 31(2). Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/>
- Goodnow, J. (2016). How business leaders can attract and motivate millennial workers. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/>
- Gorden, R. (1992). *Basic interviewing skills*. Itasca, IL: Peacock.

- Gratz, D. B. (2009). The problem with performance pay. *Educational Leadership*, 67(3), 76-79. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/>
- Grieve, V. (2012, February 20). Idaho sees big exodus of teachers. *Blackfoot Journal*. Retrieved from <http://blackfootjournal.com/idaho-sees-big-exodus-of-teachers/>.
- Green, H. (2011). Why engaging your employees is the answer to strategic planning. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com>
- Hakoboyan, M. (2015, December 21). Are you treating your employees like people or processes. Huffington Post. Retrieved from <http://www.huffingtonpost.com>
- Hamel, G. (2010). *HCL: Extreme management makeover [Blog Post]*. Retrieved from <https://blogs.wsj.com/management/2010/07/06/hcl-extreme-management-makeover/>.
- Hanushek, E.A. (2007). The single salary schedule and other issues of teacher pay. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 82(4), 574-586. Retrieved from <http://hanushek.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/hanushek.2007%20PeabodyJEd%2082%284%29.pdf>.
- Hartwig, S. (2016). *Motivating employees – carrot or stick?* [Blog Post]. Retrieved from <http://www.mcpheeandrewartha.com.au/motivating-employees-carrot-stick/>.
- Harrison, C. (2016). *Hygiene factors* [Blog Post]. Retrieved from <http://chrisharrison.biz/blogs/2016/08/05/hygiene-factors/>.
- Hassibi, L. (2013). 3 barriers to successful pay-for-performance implementation. *Compensation Today*. Retrieved from <http://www.payscale.com/compensation-today/2013/08/3-barriers-to-successful-pay-for-performance-implementation>.

Hauer, S., & Umhoefer, D. (2016). From teacher “free agency” to merit pay: The uproar over Act 10 turns to upheaval in Wisconsin schools. *Journal Sentinel*. Retrieved from [https:// projects.jsonline.com/news/2016/10/9/from-teacher-free-agency-to-merit-pay-the-uproar-over-act-10.html](https://projects.jsonline.com/news/2016/10/9/from-teacher-free-agency-to-merit-pay-the-uproar-over-act-10.html).

Heathfield, S. (2016). *The advantages and disadvantages of merit pay: Merit pay rewards employee performance and contribution*. Retrieved from The Balance website: <https://www.thebalance.com/the-advantages-and-disadvantages-of-merit-pay-1919083>.

Heitin, L. (2012, March 7). Survey: Teacher job satisfaction hits a low point. *EdWeek*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org>.

Hendrickson, M. (2014). *Douglas county school district’s pay-for-performance teacher scores under scrutiny*. Retrieved from <http://www.thedenverchannel.com/news/local-news/douglas-county-school-districts-pay-for-performance-teacher-scores-under-scrutiny>.

Heneman, H. G., Kimball, S., & Milanowski, A. (2007). *Teacher performance pay: Synthesis of plans, research, and guidelines for practice* (Policy Brief No. RB-46). Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED48341.pdf>.

Hermie, M., Schmidt, W., & Tirozzi, G. (2012). The trouble with pay for performance. *EdWeek*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/04/12/28tirozzi.h31.html>.

Herzberg, F. (2003). One More Time: How do You Motivate Employees. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2003/01/one-more-time-how-do-you-motivate-employees>.

- Heskett, J. (2007). How should pay be linked to performance. Retrieved from Harvard Business School website: <http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/how-should-pay-be-linked-to-performance>.
- Hindle, T. (2008). *Guide to Management Ideas and Gurus*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hill, P.T., & Sperry, S.R. (2015). *The politics of K-12 education small rural school districts: The case of Idaho*. Retrieved from The Rural Opportunities Consortium of Idaho website: http://www.rociidaho.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/ROCI_2014_K-12Politics_FINAL.pdf.
- Hogans, C.H. (2007). *Learning to lead: Principals' of the principalship using Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://repository.lib.ncsu.edu/ir/bitstream/1840.16/9098/1/etd.pdf>.
- Hollensbe, E.C., Guthrie, J.P. (2000) Group pay-for-performance plans: The role of spontaneous goal setting. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4). Retrieved from <http://www.csus.edu/indiv/s/sablynskic/documents/GroupPayforPerformance.pdf>.
- Hollingsworth, H. (2011, June 18). Kansas City School District tries out pay-for-performance. *Columbia Missourian*. Retrieved from <http://www.columbiamissourian.com>
- Hsieh, P. (2011). *Mastery Orientation*. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007%2F978-0-387-79061-9_1722.
- Hughes, A.S. (2016). *Mixed methods research*. Retrieved from Association for Psychological Science website:

- <https://www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/mixed-methods-research#.WT7JgxPyvdc>.
- Hughes, W. H., & Pickeral, T. (2013). School climate and shared leadership. In T. Dary & T. Pickeral (Eds.), *School climate practices for implementation and sustainability*. New York: National School Climate Center.
- Hui, E., & Tsang, S. (2012). Self-determination as a psychological and positive youth development construct. *The Scientific World Journal*, 2012.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1100/2012/759358>
- Huicocochea, A. (2014, January 9). Area teachers express high level of dissatisfaction. *Tuscon.com*. Retrieved from <http://tucson.com/>
- Hupfield, K., Reichardt, R., Shclang, J., & Snow R. (2008). *Overwhelmed and out: Principals, district policy, and teacher retention*. Retrieved from Connecticut Center for School Change website:
<http://www.nctq.org/nctq/research/1220022778926.pdf>.
- Hussey, P.S., Schneider, E.C., & Schnyer, C. (2011). *Analysis of models of performance measurement implications*. Retrieved from Rand Corporation website:
http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical_reports/2011/RAND_TR841.pdf.
- Hyun, S. (2009). *Re-examination of Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation in the Korean Army Foodservice Operation* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from Iowa State University Digital Repository: <http://lib.dr.uastate.edu>
- Idaho State Department of Education (2015). Retrieved from <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/edsources/2011/oct/Pay-for-performance.htm>.

- Jacquette, F. (2017, September 21). *Hygiene factors and the creation of customer experience magic* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://www.jacquette.com/hygiene-factors-and-the-creation-of-customer-experience-magic/>
- Jensen, U., Tibbetts, K.A., & Yamashiro, G. (2010). *What we know about teacher pay for performance*. Retrieved from Kamehameha Schools website: <http://www.ksbe.edu/spi/reports/>
- Johnson, K. (2012, September 23). What do teachers deserve? In Idaho, referendum may offer answer. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/>
- Johnson, S. M., Kraft, M. A., & Papay, J. P. (2012). How context matters in high-need schools: The effects of teachers' working conditions on their professional satisfaction and their students' achievement. *Teachers College Record*, 114(10), 1-39. Retrieved from <https://scholar.harvard.edu>
- Johnson, R.B., & Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-26. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3700093>
- Judge, T.A., Piccolo, R.F, Podsakoff, N.P., Shaw, J.C., & Rich, B.L. (2010). The relationship between pay and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of the literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(2), 157-167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.04.002>.
- Juma, D.S. (2013). *The relationship between emotional intelligence of principals and the overall organizational climate of public elementary schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3564904)

- Kaliannan, M., & Nahr Adjovu, S. (2015). Effective employee engagement and organizational success: A case study. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 172(27), 161-168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.350>
- Kahlenburg, R.D., & Potter, H. (2014). *Why teacher voice matters*. Retrieved from American Federation of Teachers website: from www.aft.org/ae/winter2014-2015/kahlenberg_potter_sb.
- Kahn, R. (2016, October 12). There's a problem with 'pay for performance.' *Business Insider*. Retrieved from <http://www.businessinsider.com>
- Klein, A. (2016, December 13). Final ESSA rules flesh out accountability, testing details. EdWeek. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/>
- Kompier, M. A. (2006). The 'Hawthorne Effect' Is A Myth, But What Keeps the Story Going? *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment, & Health*, 32(5), 402–412.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2012). *The leadership challenge: How to make extraordinary things happen in organizations* (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kubacka, K. (2014, September 1). *How do teachers really feel about their job?* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://oecdeducationtoday.blogspot.com>
- Kumar, S. (2015, July 24) 5 reasons merit-pay hurts average workers. *Fortune Insiders*. Retrieved from <http://fortune.com>
- Lavinsky, D. (2013, April 11). Why employees need a say in your business planning. *Entrepreneur*. Retrieved from <http://www.entrepreneur.com>

- Lavy, V. (2007). Using performance-based pay to improve the quality of teachers. *Future Child*, 17(1), 87-109. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17407924>
- Lee, C. (2015). *Employee job satisfaction and engagement: Optimizing organizational culture for success*. Retrieved from Society for Human Resource Management website: <https://www.shrm.org/>
- Leitch, J., Lancefield, D., & Dawson, M., (2016, Autumn). 10 principles of strategic leadership. *Strategy + Business*, 84. Retrieved from <https://www.strategy-business.com>
- Leonardatos, H., & Zahedi, K. (2014). Accountability and racing to the top in New York State: A report from the frontlines. *Teachers College Record*, 116(9). Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org>
- Lewis, B. (2016, October 3). *Pros and cons of merit pay for teachers: Should teachers be rewarded for performance like everyone else?* Retrieved from ThoughtCo website: <https://www.thoughtco.com/pros-and-cons-of-merit-pay-2081479>.
- Llopis, G. (2012, June 4). The top 9 things that ultimately motivate employees to achieve. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com>
- Lucco, J. (2014, December 2). *How employees are motivated: Autonomy, mastery, and purpose* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://www.clearpointstrategy.com/how-employees-are-motivated-autonomy-mastery-purpose/>
- Luebke, B. (2016, May 19). *Teacher pay, part II: How we pay teachers*. Retrieved from Civitas Institute website: <https://www.nccivitas.org/2016/teacher-pay-part-ii-how-we-pay-teachers/>.

- Lunenburg, F. C. (2011). Expectancy theory of motivation: Motivating by altering expectations. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration*, 15(1), 1-6. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org>
- Manno, M. (2012, August 9). *The pros and cons of merit based pay for teachers* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://teach.com/blog/the-pros-and-cons-of-merit-based-pay-for-teachers>
- Manzoor, Q. (2011). Impact of employees motivation on organizational effectiveness. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 3(3). Retrieved from <http://iiste.org>
- Marciano, P. L. (2010). *Carrots and sticks don't work: Build a culture of employee engagement with the principles of RESPECT*. New York: McGraw-Hill. Chicago
- Markow, D., & Pieters, A. (2012). *The MetLife teachers, parents, and the The MetLife survey of the American teacher: Teachers, parents, and the economy*. New York, New York: MetLife, Inc.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing qualitative research* (5 ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publishing.
- Maslow, A. (1943). *A Theory of Human Motivation*. [Kindle]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.
- Marciano, P.L. (2010). *Carrots and sticks don't work: Build a culture of employee engagement with the R.E.S.P.E.C.T. principle*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Marzano, R.J., & Waters, J.T. (2006). *School leadership that works: The effect of superintendent leadership on student achievement* (Working Paper). Retrieved from Semantic Scholar website: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/>

- Matsaganis, M.D. (2016). Multi- and mixed-methods approaches to urban communication research: A synthesis and the road ahead. *International Journal of Communication, 2016*(10), 1331-1350. Retrieved from <http://ijoc.org>
- McCallion, G., & Stedman, J.B. (2001) *Performance-based pay for teachers* (Report No. RL30217). Retrieved from Cornell University website:
<http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu>
- McClelland, D.C. (1967). *The achieving society*. New York: Free Press.
- McCombs, B. (2014). *Developing responsible and autonomous learners: A key to motivating students*. Retrieved from
<http://www.apa.org/education/k12/learners.aspx>
- McGuire, K. (2012, March 25). Like never before, teachers under scrutiny. *Star Tribune*. Retrieved from <http://www.startribune.com>
- McKeown, K. (2015, February 12). *What bevy of behaviors make you a strong leader?* Retrieved from Leadership Close Up website:
<http://www.leadershipcloseup.com/2015/02/12/4-key-traits-of-effective-frontline-leaders/>.
- McLeod, S. (2007). *Maslow's hierarchy of needs*. Retrieved from Simply Psychology website: <https://www.simplypsychology.org/maslow.html>
- McPhie, N. (2006). *Designing an effective pay for performance compensation system*. Retrieved from U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board website:
<http://www.mspb.gov>

Miller, S. (2016, February 8). *Employers seek better approaches to pay for performance.*

Retrieved from Society for Human Resource Management website:

<https://www.shrm.org>

Mohamoud, N. (2016). *The effect of performance-based rewards on the performance of teachers' in private secondary schools of Mogadishu.* Retrieved from

http://www.academia.edu/13173568/the_effect_of_performance-based_rewards_on_the_performance_of_teachers_in_private_secondary_schools_of_Mogadishu

Mohan, R. (2013). *Workforce Issues Affecting Public School Teachers* (Report No. 13-01). Retrieved from Idaho Legislature website:

<http://legislature.idaho.gov/ope/publications/reports/r1301.pdf>

Moore, N. F. (2012). *The Relationship between high school teacher perceived principal leadership practices and teacher morale levels* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved

from http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/view_content.cgi?article=1560&context=doctoral

Morgan, M., & O'Leary, M. (2004). The job satisfaction of beginning primary teachers.

Irish Journal of Education, 35, 73–86. Retrieved from <http://www.erc.ie/>

[documents/vol35chp5.pdf](http://www.erc.ie/documents/vol35chp5.pdf).

Morganroth, T. (2015). *How role models affect role aspirants' motivation and goals*

(Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from

<https://ore.exeter.ac.uk/repository/bitstream/handle/10871/18483/>

[MorgenrothT.pdf?sequence=1](https://ore.exeter.ac.uk/repository/bitstream/handle/10871/18483/MorgenrothT.pdf?sequence=1)

- Morrell, D. (2011). Employee perceptions and the motivation of nonmonetary incentives. *Compensation and Benefit Review*, 43(5), 318-323.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886368711407998>
- Morrison, N. (2013, December 30). The eight characteristics of effective school leaders. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com>
- Mortenson, P. (2015). *Investigating teacher shortages in Idaho and the impact on district hiring*. Retrieved from https://legislature.idaho.gov/wp-content/uploads/sessioninfo/2015/standingcommittees/150309_sedu_0300PM_Attachment_3.pdf.
- Myers Giacometti, K.S. (2005). *Factors affecting job satisfaction and retention of beginning teachers* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://theses.lib.vt.edu>
- Nadarasa, T., & Thuraisingam, R. (2014). The influence of principals' leadership styles on school teachers' job satisfaction – A study of secondary schools in Jaffna District. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 4(1). Retrieved from <http://www.ijsrp.org/>
- Neave, H.R. (1987). Deming's 14 points for management: Framework for success. *The Statistician*, 561(36). DOI: 10.2307/2348667
- Nemanti, S.K., & Redmond, B.F. (2016, September 17). *Expectancy theory overview* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://wikispaces.psu.edu/display/PSYCH484/4.+Expectancy+Theory>.
- Neumark, V. (2014, July 1). *Teachers' wellbeing: Under scrutiny and underappreciated* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/teacher-network/teacher-blog/2014/jul/01/teachers-wellbeing-under-scrutiny-underappreciated>.

- Nicholson, N. (2003, January). How to motivate your problem people. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org>
- Ololube, N.P. (2006). *Teacher job satisfaction and motivation for school effectiveness: An assessment*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED496539.pdf>
- Oregon School Boards Association (2009). *Motivating teachers to improve instruction*. Retrieved from http://www.osba.org/Resources/Article/Employee_Management/Motivating_Teachers_to_Improve_Instruction.aspx
- Orey, M. (2010). *Emerging perspectives on learning, teaching, and technology*. Retrieved from <http://www.textbookequity.org>
- Oshrin, S. (2017). *Ybarra on teacher shortage: 'Accountability is everybody's responsibility.'* Retrieved from IdahoNews.com website: <http://kboi2.com/news/local/ybarra-on-teacher-shortage-accountability-is-everybodys-responsibility>.
- Owens, A. (2016, May 11). *Teachers sound off on possible loss of funding at HB2 air horn protest*. Retrieved from <http://www.wral.com/teachers-fear-loss-of-federal-funding-over-hb2-lawsuit/15698642/>.
- Pal, M., & Ramachandran, V. (2010). *Teacher motivation in India*. Retrieved from <http://www.researchgate.net/>
- Perry, J.L., & Yoon, J.C. (2012). Intrinsic motivation and employee attitudes: Role of managerial trustworthiness, goal directedness, and extrinsic reward expectancy. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 32(4), 382-406. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X11421495>

- Pink, D. H. (2009). *Drive: The surprising truth about what motivates us*. New York: Riverhead Publishing.
- Podgursky, M. J., & Springer, M. G. (2007). *Teacher Performance Pay: A Review* (Working Paper). Retrieved from <http://www.researchgate.net>
- Popkey, D. (2013, April 4). *Idaho Legislature quits after contentious session, revives aspect of Luna Laws* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://blogs.idahostatesman.com/idaho-legislature-quits-for-the-year-after-contentious-session/>.
- Popa, M. (2016). *Organizational values and management prerequisites of organizational commitment*. Retrieved from <http://conference.dresmara.ro/conferences/2016/Popa%20Brindusa.pdf>.
- Popova, M. (2013). *Autonomy, mastery, and purpose: The science of what motivates us, animated*. Retrieved from Brain Pickings website: <https://www.brainpickings.org/2013/05/09/daniel-pink-drive-rsa-motivation/>.
- Prezoisi, B. (2016, January 22). *How reverse accountability increases a leader's productivity*. Retrieved from <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/how-reverse-accountability-increases-leaders-dr-bob-preziosi>.
- Proctor, T. (2014). *Creative Problem Solving for Managers: Developing Skills for Decision Making and Innovation*. London: Routledge.
- Public Health Action Support Team. (2011). *Basic management models and theories associated with motivation and leadership and be able to apply them to practical situations and problems*. Retrieved from <https://www.healthknowledge.org.uk/public-health-textbook/organisation-management/5c-management-change/basic-management-models>.

- Quast, L. (2016, December 12). Sometimes money is not the best employee motivation. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com>
- Radziwell, N. (2012, November 19). *Are Deming's 14 points still valid?* Retrieved from Quality and Innovation website: <https://qualityandinnovation.com>
- Rampell, C. (2009, September 9). *Teacher pay around the world* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://economix.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/09/09/teacher-pay-around-the-world>
- Randall, M. (2013, July 1). Employees can't carry out a strategy if they didn't help plan it. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from <http://www.businessinsider.com>
- Ravitch, D. (2011, March 30). *Why merit pay for teachers doesn't work* [Blog post]. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/post/ravitch-why-merit-pay-for-teachers-doesnt-work/2011/03/29/AFn5w9yB_blog.html.
- Redmond, B.F. (2016). *Self-efficacy and social cognitive theories*. Retrieved from <https://wikispaces.psu.edu/display/PSYCH484/7.+Self-Efficacy+and+Social+Cognitive+Theories>.
- Reeve, J. (2016). A grand theory of motivation: Why not? *Motivation and Emotion*, 40(1), 31-35. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com>
- Resmovits, J. (2011, July 24). New York's teacher discipline process debated. *Huffington post*. Retrieved from <http://www.huffingtonpost.com>
- Richert, K. (2017, August 29). *Statehouse roundup, 2.8.17; Teacher shortages, accountability, and Pre-K*. Retrieved from Idaho Ed News website: <https://www.idahoednews.org>

- Richert, K. (2016, June 7). *Teacher shortage in east Idaho called a 'famine.'* Retrieved from Idaho Ed News website: <https://www.idahoednews.org/>
- Richert, K. (2015, March 9). *Professor: Teacher shortage forces schools to scramble.* Retrieved from Idaho Ed News website: <https://www.idahoednews.org/>
- Richert, K. (2014a). *Teacher 'premium' bill makes its debut.* Retrieved from Idaho Ed News website: <https://www.idahoednews.org/news/teacher-premium-bill-makes-its-debut/>
- Richert, K. (2014b). *Following leadership premium dollars.* Retrieved from Idaho ed News website: <http://www.idahoednews.org/news/following-the-leadership-premium-dollars/#.VVYzsJN Viko>
- Richert, K. (2013, February 20). *Invoking "Luna laws," democrats bash voter initiative bill* [Blog post]. *Idaho Statesman*. Retrieved from <http://blogs.idahostatesman.com>
- Riggs, L. (2013, October 18). *Why do teachers quit? And why do they stay?* *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com>
- Ritter Saunders, E. (2013, May 17). *Idaho's labor force drops to two-year low, jobless rate unchanged.* Retrieved from State Impact website: <http://stateimpact.npr.org/idaho/2013/05/17/idahos-labor-force-drops-to-two-year-low-jobless-rate-unchanged/>.
- Ritter Saunders, E. (2012, September 6). *Idaho education cuts among deepest in the nation.* Retrieved State Impact website: from <https://stateimpact.npr.org/idaho/2012/09/06/idaho-education-cuts-among-deepest-in-the-nation/>.

- Roberts, H. (2005). Creating motivation, identifying incentives and enablers, and encouraging staff development. *Community Eye Health Journal*, 18(56), 122-124.
Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>
- Rosales, J. (2012, February 7). *How bad education policies demoralize teachers*.
Retrieved from NEA Today website: <http://neatoday.org>
- Rosales, J. (2016). *Pay based on test scores? What educators need to know about linking teacher pay to student achievement*. Retrieved from NEA website: <http://www.nea.org/home/36780.htm/>
- Rosen, E. (2011). Every worker is a knowledge worker. *Bloomberg Business*. Retrieved from <http://www.businessweek.com/>
- Rothstein, R. (2009, January 23). Getting accountability right. *EdWeek*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org>
- Russell, B. (2017, April 20). State report raises questions about school districts' distribution of teacher leadership premiums [Blog post]. *The Spokesman-Review*. Retrieved from <http://www.spokesman.com/blogs/>
- Russell, B. (2012a). More Idaho teachers left their classroom last year... [Blog post]. *The Spokesman-Review*. Retrieved from <http://www.spokesman.com/blogs/>
- Russell, B. (2012b). Subdued Luna pledges collaboration for school reform. *Spokesman review*. Retrieved from <http://www.spokesman.com/>
- Sachau, D. (2007). Resurrecting the motivation-hygiene theory: Herzberg and the positive psychology movement. *Human Resource Development Review*, 6(4), 377-393.

- Schieb, L. J., & Karabenick, S. A. (2011). *Teacher motivation and professional development: A guide to resources* (Report No. 0928103). Retrieved from MSPNet website: <http://hub.mspnet.org/index.cfm/22284>
- Schiffbauer, L. (2012, August 29). *Self-determination theory* [Blog post]. Retrieved from Vivifo website: <http://athrivingworkplace.com/2013/08/29/self-determination-theory/>
- Senge, P. (1990, October). The leader's new work: Building learning organizations. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 32(1). Retrieved from <http://sloanreview.mit.edu/issue/fall-1990/>
- Seppela, E. (2016, January 4). To motivate employees, do 3 things well. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/>
- Shangchao, L. (2013). *Practical and theoretical implications of Hawthorne studies*. Retrieved from National Academy of Economic Strategy, CASS website: <http://naes.org.cn/english/article/18325>.
- Sharberg, K. (2014, September 10). *Hope, meaning, and challenge: The building blocks of motivation*. Retrieved from ASCD In Service website: <http://inservice.ascd.org/hope-meaning-and-challenge-the-building-blocks-of-motivation/>.
- Shead, M. (2016). *The definition of management*. Retrieved from <http://www.leadership501.com/definition-of-management/21/>.
- Shepard, J. K. (2012). *The Evolution of a Pay-for-performance Program: A Case Study of a Public School's District's Collaboration with an Intermediary Organization*

- (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://ir.uiowa.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3327&content=etd>.
- Shiffbauer, L.W. (2013). *The pursuit of self-esteem: A help or a hindrance in the workplace* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3596255)
- Sifferlin, A. (2014, November 7). Having a sense of purpose helps you live longer. *Time Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://time.com/>
- Smallwood, N., Ulrich, D., & Zenger, J. (2004). *Results-Based Leadership*. Boston: Presidents and Fellows of Harvard College.
- Smith, J.L. (2012, October). Face of quality: Pride in workmanship. *Quality Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.qualitymag.com>
- Smith, J.L. (2011, October). *Management: The lasting legacy of the modern quality giants* *Quality Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.qualitymag.com>
- Springer, M. G., & Winters, M. A. (2009). *The NYC pay-for-performance program: Early evidence from a randomized trial* (Civic Report, 56). Retrieved from Manhattan Institute for Policy Research website: http://www.janhattan-institute.org/html/cr_56.htm.
- Staniec, S.A. (2013). *The implementation of pay for performance in Idaho schools: A case study of teacher perceptions* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations * Theses Global. (Order No. 3572690)
- Stecker, M., & Tranquillo, J. (2016). Using intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in continuing professional education. *Surgical Neurology International*, 7, 197-199. doi: 10.4103/2152-7806.179231

- Stiggins, R. (2013). The absence of assessment for learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83(10), 758-765. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170208301010>
- Stoskopf, G. (2002). *Salary structures policies and practices*. Retrieved from <https://www.worldatwork.org/waw/adimLink?id=65885>.
- Strauss, A. (1991). A Personal History of the Development of Grounded Theory. *Qualitative Family Research*, 5(2), 1-2. Retrieved from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/44659994/Anselm-Strauss-Writes-A-Personal-History-of-Grounded-Theory-Other-Articles>.
- Strauss, V. (2016, August 16). Think teachers aren't paid enough? It's worse than you think. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonpost.com>
- Strauss, V. (2015, July 25). Teacher blasts popular classroom training program: It is turning us into robots. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonpost.com>
- Swidell, J. (2014, January 6). Teacher pay overlooked in governor's budget. *Idaho Education News*. Retrieved from <http://www.idahoednews.org>
- Taylor, S. (2103, July 21). The power of purpose: Why a sense of purpose is so essential for our well-being? [Blog post]. *Psychology Today*. Retrieved from <https://www.psychologytoday.com/>
- Tek, B. (2014). *An investigation of the relationship between school leadership, teacher job satisfaction, and student achievement* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss/221/.
- Toth, M. (2013, February 28). *The no. 1 leadership trait you really need to be successful*. Retrieved from Talent Management and HR website: <http://www.tlnt.com>

- Torres, A. S. (2012). "Hello, goodbye": Exploring the phenomenon of leaving teaching early. *Journal of Education Change*, 13, 117-154.
- Tanner, D. (2012). *Using statistics to make educational decisions*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Travis, S. (2014, June 21). Teacher merit pay plan gets few takers. *Sun Sentinel*. Retrieved from <http://www.sun-sentinel.com>
- Truesdell, C. (2011). *Book review: The leadership challenge*. Retrieved from <https://www.scribd.com>
- Turan, H. (2015). Taylor's "scientific management principles": Contemporary issues in personnel selection period. *Journal of Economics, Business, and Management*, 3(11), 1102-1105. DOI:10.7763/JOEBM.2015.V3.342
- Turner, D. (2010a). Qualitative interview design: A practical guide for novice investigators. *The Qualitative Report*, 15(3), 754-760. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol15/iss3/19>.
- Turner, D. (2010b). States push to pay teachers based on performance. *USA Today*. Retrieved from <http://usatoday30.usatoday.com>
- U.S. Department of Education's National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for School Reform* (Stock No. 065-000-00177-2). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Van Raaji, F. W., & Wandwossen, K. (1978). Motivation-need theories and consumer behavior. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 5, 590-595. Retrieved from <http://www.acrwebsite.org/>
- Vance R. J. (2006). *Employee engagement and commitment: A guide to understanding*,

- measuring and increasing engagement in your organization*. Arlington, VA: Society for Human Resource Management Foundation.
- Vander Hart, S. (2014, December 12). *Race to the top loses all funding in "cromnibus."* Retrieved from Truth in American Education website:
<https://truthinamericaneducation.com/>
- Van Ho, P. (2011). *Total quality management approach to the information systems development processes: An empirical study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://theses.lib.vt.edu>
- Van Wart, M. (2004). A comprehensive model of organizational leadership: The leadership action cycle. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 7, 173-208. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/>
- Vara-Orta, F. (2014, August 31). Somerset says linking teacher pay to performance works. *San Antonio Express News*. Retrieved from <http://www.expressnews.com>
- Vermeer, A. (2013, January). *Finding flow by Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi – Summary*. Retrieved from <https://alexvermeer.com/finding-flow/>
- Vollmer, J. (2010). *Schools Cannot Do It Alone: Building Public Support for America's Public Schools* (ed.). [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.
- Vorhauser-Smith, S. (2014, August 14). How the best places to work are nailing employee engagement. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com>
- Viscardi, D. (2014). *The teacher pay for performance phenomenon* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://scholarship.shu.edu>
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.

- Uchtdorf, D.F. (2013, April). *Four titles*. Retrieved from The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints website: <https://www.lds.org>
- Wagner, L. (2014, May 8). Gov. McCrory unveils latest teacher pay and education reform plan. *NC Policy Watch*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncpolicywatch.com/>
- Wallace Foundation, The. (2013). *The school principal as a leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning*. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org>
- Watson, Z. (2014, October 28). *4 real-world examples that explain intrinsic motivation* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://technologyadvice.com/blog/marketing/4-real-world-examples-clearly-explain-intrinsic-motivation/>
- Weber, L. (2016, July 19). Job satisfaction hits a 10-year high – But it’s still below 50%. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <https://www.wsj.com>
- Webb, D.O. (2014). *The relationship between principal leadership and teacher morale in the elementary schools in a northwest Georgia school district* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3615800)
- Weir, K. (2013, December). More than job satisfaction. *Monitor on Psychology*, *44*(11), 1-39. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/monitor>
- Welner, K. (2012, March 7). Teacher job satisfaction plummets (Perhaps teacher bashing isn’t productive [Blog post]. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/>
- Whitney, C. (2016, January 7). *Top 11 causes of winter blues at the office* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://justworks.com/blog/top-causes-winter-blues-office>.

- Wisconsin Education Association Council. (2011). *What do we know about merit pay?* (Brief No. 20). Retrieved from <http://www.weac.org/pdf/2011-12/merit.pdf>
- Williams, R. (2013, November 22). Carrot and stick motivation revisited by new research [Blog post]. *Psychology Today*. Retrieved from <https://www.psychologytoday.com>
- Williams, Y. (2015). *Intrinsic motivation in psychology: Definition, examples & factors*. Retrieved from Study.com website: <http://study.com/academy/lesson/intrinsic-motivation-in-psychology-definition-examples-factors.html>.
- Williams Richardson, F. (2014). *Enhancing strategies to improve workplace performance* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.waldenu.edu>
- Wootten, J. (2016, June 23). Teacher shortage: School districts struggle to find workers. *MagicValley.com*. Retrieved from <http://magicvalley.com/>
- Wootton, J. (2012, November 14). Idaho teacher to get performance bonuses, despite proposition 2 repeal. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.huffingtonpost.com>
- Ybarra, S. (2016, September 29). We need multiple strategies to address Idaho's serious teacher shortage. *Idaho Education News*. Retrieved from <https://www.idahoednews.org>
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4 ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publishing.
- Zubova, E. (2014). *Motivation and satisfaction of employees. Influences of cultural differences on motivation* (Bachelor's thesis). Retrieved from

https://www.theseus.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/74572/Zubova_Ekaterina.pdf?sequence=1

Appendix A

Human Research Review Committee Approval



Joel Wilson <joelwilson@nnu.edu>

HRRC protocol 942014

1 message

Northwest Nazarene University <jabankard@nnu.edu>

Wed, Apr 16, 2014 at 10:12
AM

To: Joel Wilson <joelwilson@nnu.edu>

Dear Joel,

The HRRC has reviewed your protocol: Merit Pay and Teacher Job Satisfaction: A Case Study in a Rural Idaho School District. You received a "Full Approval". Congratulations, you may begin your research. If you have any questions, let me know.

Joseph Bankard
HRRC Member

Appendix B

National Institute for Health Certification

Certificate of Completion

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research certifies that **Joel Wilson** successfully completed the NIH Web-based training course “Protecting Human Research Participants”.

Date of completion: 10/25/2013

Certification Number: 1312782

Appendix C**Letter Requesting Permission for Study**

January 13, 2014

Superintendent
School District Office

Dear Superintendent [REDACTED],

Thank you for speaking to me about a possible dissertation study I would like to conduct in the [REDACTED] School District. As you recall, I would like to survey staff and conduct interviews in your district regarding their attitudes concerning merit pay. Please see the accompanying sheet for a more complete summary of my study.

If this study is agreeable to you, please send me a letter confirming your willingness to allow this study. I have also included a template for such a letter. Please send the letter to me at:

Joel Wilson
Preston School District Office
105 E. 2nd S.
Preston, ID 83263

When my study is complete, I will be more than happy to share the results with you and your staff.

Thank you,



Joel Wilson

Appendix D

Study Overview Sent to Potential Participants

Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership – Joel Wilson

Dissertation Title

Pay for Performance and Teacher Job Satisfaction: A Mixed-Methods Study

Purpose Statement

Deci (2009) offered Self Determination Theory as a mechanism to predict the effectiveness of school reform efforts. Strategies are likely to succeed when teachers feel “competent in their environment, autonomous in regulating their behavior, and related meaningfully to others (p. 246).” The **purpose** of this study is to investigate the role Self Determination Theory played in the implementation of merit pay efforts in a small, rural Idaho school district. This study will highlight the impact merit pay has on the job satisfaction level of district employees.

Research Questions

The following guiding questions will shape this study:

1. What effect has merit pay had on schools meeting teacher and administrator selected goals?
2. What role does merit pay have on teacher job satisfaction?
3. How has merit pay impacted teacher autonomy, efficacy, and sense of purpose?

Methods

A case study approach will investigate the impact merit pay has had on a small, rural Idaho school. Using the perspective of Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), aspects of merit pay implementation will be examined. An analysis of ex post facto data will examine the correlation between merit pay and teacher job satisfaction. In addition, the following will be gathered:

- 1) **District wide likert survey.** District employees will respond to questions regarding their role in the implementation of merit pay efforts and the impact they perceive merit pay has had on their job satisfaction. Respondents will also provide demographic information to gain a better understanding of their perspectives.
- 2) **Analysis of variables outlined in district merit pay program.** Statistical analyses will determine correlations between variables, and be conducted using SPSS.
- 3) **Interviews with 8 teachers and administrators** will provide additional information

concerning the impact of merit pay on job satisfaction.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Joel Wilson

Appendix E

Informed Consent Form

A. Purpose and Background

I am currently a doctorate student at Northwest Nazarene University and I am conducting a research study related to pay for performance and teacher job satisfaction.

The purpose of this study is to determine how pay for performance programs affect teacher job satisfaction.

You are being asked to participate in this study because you are over the age of 18 and you fit the criteria for the study.

B. Procedures

If you agree to be in the study, the following will occur:

1. You will be asked to sign an Informed Consent Form, volunteering to participate in the study.
2. You will be interviewed and will allow for the interview to be digitally recorded.
3. After the interviews have been disseminated you will be asked to read the write-up to make sure that the information you gave is correct.

C. Risks/Discomforts

There is minimal risk involved if you volunteer for this research. You will not be identified in the research, all interviews and responses will be kept confidential with all data will be secured.

Some of the questions in the interview may make you uncomfortable, but you are free to decline to answer any questions you do not wish to answer or to stop participation at any time. There will be no compensation for your participation in this study.

D. Benefits

There will be no direct benefit to you from participating in this study. However, the information you provide may help principal preparation programs and future K-12 administrators.

E. Payments

There are no payments for participating in this study.

F. Questions

If you have any questions or concerns about participation in this study, please feel free to contact the research investigator, Joel Wilson. He can be contacted at 208-541-2641 or at joelwilson@nnu.edu

Appendix E

Informed Consent (continued)

You may also contact his Faculty Advisor, Dr. Heidi Curtis via e-mail at or via telephone at hlcurtis@nnu.edu or (208) 467-8250

Should you feel distressed due to participation in this study, you should contact your own health care provider.

G. Consent

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep.

Participation in research is voluntary. You are free to decline to be in this study, or to withdraw from it at any point. This research study has been approved by the Northwest Nazarene University Human Research Review Committee in August, 2012, approval #7062012.

I give my consent to participate in this study:

Signature of Study Participant

Date

I give my consent for the interview to be audio taped in this study:

Signature of Study Participant

Date

I give my consent for direct quotes to be used in this study. No person identifying information will be used in the report from this study:

Signature of Study Participant

Date

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent

Date

Appendix F

Interview Questions

Interview #1

1. Tell me a little about yourself?
2. Tell me about your experiences before you became a teacher/administrator?
3. What made you want to go into education?
4. Did you always want to be a teacher/administrator?
5. How has your experience been as an educator/administrator been so far?
6. How many years have you been a teacher/administrator?
7. What college/university did you attend to obtain your teaching certificate?
8. Tell me what kind of freedom you have to use your professional experience to meet district goals?
9. Tell me how you are compensated. What are the criteria for the amount of your compensation?
10. How has merit pay made you feel about your profession?
11. What challenges do you see in merit pay systems?
12. What do your colleagues say about merit pay?

Interview #2

1. How was merit pay developed in your district?
2. How were teacher involved in the implementation of merit pay?
3. Please explain the strengths you see in the merit pay system?
4. Please explain the weaknesses you see in the merit pay system?
5. How is your district's merit pay system different from other merit pay systems?
6. Why would you recommend or not recommend teacher merit pay to policy makers?
7. How does merit pay affect your freedom to make decisions in your classroom?
8. How does merit pay affect your ability as an educator?
9. How does merit pay affect you sense of pride in your profession?
10. If you were to design a compensation system for teachers, what would it look like?

Appendix G
Survey Questions

1. Which grade level are your students?
2. What is your gender?
3. What is your age?
4. How long have you worked in education?
5. How long have you worked in this district?
6. My district's high test scores are influenced by the Pay for Performance program.
7. My district's high morale levels are influenced by the district's Pay for Performance program.
8. District staff's willingness to work together in teams is influenced by the district's Pay for Performance program.
9. District staff's positive attitude about our professional is influenced by the district's Pay for Performance program.
10. District staff's willingness to implement effective teaching strategies is influenced by the district's Pay for Performance program.
11. District staff's willingness to collaborate is affected by the district's Pay for Performance program.
12. District staff's' willingness to support district goals is influenced by the district's Pay for Performance program.

Appendix G (Continued)**Survey Questions**

13. My attention to lesson planning is affected by the district's Pay for Performance program.
14. The district's Pay for Performance program makes me feel rewarded for the good work I do.
15. The district's Pay for Performance program influences my colleagues' willingness to improve our craft.
16. One of the strength's of the district's Pay for Performance program is that teachers and staff have ownership in it.
17. Other Pay for Performance programs are hurt by being top-down mandates.
18. My positive self-image as an educator is promoted by the district's Pay for Performance program.
19. The district's Pay for Performance program encourages staff members meet district goals and benchmarks
20. District staff's willingness to work together to increase student achievement is influenced by the district's Pay for Performance program.
21. Other Pay for Performance programs would be more successful if they mirrored my district's Pay for Performance program
22. The district's Pay for Performance program influences what I do in my classroom.
23. The district's Pay for Performance program affects staff's positive sense of purpose as educators.

Appendix G (Continued)**Survey Questions**

24. The high levels of support from district administrators towards staff is influenced by the district's Pay for Performance program

25. Overall, I like the district's Pay for Performance program.

Appendix H

Interview Coding Template

| Respondent | Excerpt | Code | Theme or Category |
|------------|---------|------|-----------------------|
| 1 | | AT | Autonomy |
| 1 | | EF | Efficacy |
| 1 | | PP | Purpose/Connectedness |
| 1 | | DG | District Goals |
| 2 | | AT | Autonomy |
| 2 | | EF | Efficacy |
| 2 | | PP | Purpose/Connectedness |
| 2 | | DG | District Goals |
| 3 | | AT | Autonomy |
| 3 | | EF | Efficacy |
| 3 | | PP | Purpose/Connectedness |
| 3 | | DG | District Goals1 |
| 4 | | AT | Autonomy |
| 4 | | EF | Efficacy |
| 4 | | PP | Purpose/Connectedness |
| 4 | | DG | District Goals |
| 5 | | AT | Autonomy |
| 5 | | EF | Efficacy |
| 5 | | PP | Purpose/Connectedness |

| | | |
|---|----|-----------------------|
| 5 | DG | District Goals |
| 6 | AT | Autonomy |
| 6 | EF | Efficacy |
| 6 | PP | Purpose/Connectedness |
| 6 | DG | District Goals |

Appendix I

Deming's 14 Points

1. Create constancy of purpose toward improvement of product and service, with the aim to become competitive and to stay in business, and to provide jobs.
2. Adopt the new philosophy. We are in a new economic age. Western management must awaken to the challenge, must learn their responsibilities, and take on leadership for change.
3. Cease dependence on inspection to achieve quality. Eliminate the need for inspection on a mass basis by building quality into the product in the first place.
4. End the practice of awarding business on the basis of price tag. Instead, minimize total cost. Move toward a single supplier for any one item, on a long-term relationship of loyalty and trust.
5. Improve constantly and forever the system of production and service, to improve quality and productivity, and thus constantly decrease costs.
6. Institute training on the job.
7. Institute leadership (see Point 12 and Ch. 8). The aim of supervision should be to help people and machines and gadgets to do a better job. Supervision of management is in need of overhaul, as well as supervision of production workers.
8. Drive out fear, so that everyone may work effectively for the company (see Ch. 3).
9. Break down barriers between departments. People in research, design, sales, and production must work as a team, to foresee problems of production and in use that may be encountered with the product or service.
10. Eliminate slogans, exhortations, and targets for the work force asking for zero defects and new levels of productivity. Such exhortations only create adversarial relationships, as the bulk of the causes of low quality and low productivity belong to the system and thus lie beyond the power of the work force.
 - Eliminate work standards (quotas) on the factory floor. Substitute leadership.
 - Eliminate management by numbers, numerical goals. Substitute leadership.
11. Remove barriers that rob the hourly worker of his right to pride of workmanship. The responsibility of supervisors must be changed from sheer numbers to quality.
12. Remove barriers that rob people in management and in engineering of their right to pride of workmanship.
13. Institute a vigorous program of education and self-improvement.
14. Put everybody in the company to work to accomplish the transformation. The transformation is everybody's job

Retrieved from: <https://deming.org/management-system/fourteenpoints>.