ABSTRACT

Title of Document:	ORGANIZATIONAL FOCUS AS A MODERATOR OF THE RELATION BETWEEN STUDENT EXTERNALIZING BEHAVIOR AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION.
	William P. Bovender, Master of the Arts, 2013
Directed By:	Professor Gary D. Gottfredson, Department of Counseling, Higher Education, and Special Education

Examined how schools' organizational focus affects teachers' job satisfaction and intent to stay in their jobs. Analyses considered both individual teacher perceptions of clarity and consistency regarding school goals, expectations, and priorities, as well as the aggregate of these teacher perceptions as a measure of schools' level of focus. The study examined the hypothesis that organizational focus attenuates the correlation of externalizing student behavior and teacher job satisfaction. Data from three years of county-wide (N schools = 45) teacher self-report surveys were examined using hierarchical linear modeling. Schools with higher focus had significantly higher job satisfaction, and individual teacher perceptions of school focus significantly predicted higher job satisfaction across all samples. Hypothesized attenuating interaction was found nonsignificant, suggesting teachers' individual perceptions of clarity in their schools' roles and expectations and perceptions of their students' behavior are more predictive of

satisfaction than school-wide perspectives on either. Findings warrant further study of organizational focus as a potential school-level target for intervention.

ORGANIZATIONAL FOCUS AS A MODERATOR OF THE RELATION BETWEEN STUDENT EXTERNALIZING BEHAVIOR AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION.

By

William P. Bovender

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of the Arts
2013

Advisory Committee:
Professor Gary D. Gottfredson, Chair
Associate Professor William O. Strein
Assistant Professor Matthew J. Miller

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

American teachers are charged with many responsibilities beyond teaching curriculum. As universal public education is commonly touted as a lynchpin of a fair democratic society, and as the engine that provides equal access to the opportunities of that society, there are multiple shareholders with a wide range of expectations regarding the functions of schools and teachers. Depending on whom is asked, teachers' mandated responsibilities are to provide an optimal education for each student; maintain consistent order and discipline; pass along fundamental life skills, including self-care, social conventions, and self-advocacy; help children develop an appreciation for lifelong learning; reduce the achievement gap between socio-economic classes and ethnic groups; prevent dropouts; instill values of fairness and equity; and foster an understanding of civic duty (Theobald, 1990; Bierlein, 1993). Effectively serving in such a broad range of roles, and doing so with increasingly larger classrooms and with increasingly strained resources, is a difficult goal for schools and teachers.

Beyond these overarching goals, the daily workloads of teachers are also shifting to include the use of new technologies; more team-based lesson planning and program implementation; education of diverse populations with varying levels of English language mastery; and an increased emphasis on standardized data collection, documentation and related paperwork (Valli & Buese, 2007). Furthermore, the ubiquitous pressures for school accountability and reform compound the scrutiny placed on schools and teachers (Conley & You, 2009; Ravitch, 2010). Policy makers emphasize all of these objectives without establishing clear plans to make their attainment possible, forcing schools into a precarious position that often results in superficial and nonsensical attempts to satisfy

these imposed roles (Petersen, 1997; Valli & Buese, 2007). Reform and restructuring initiatives are generally well-intentioned, but the pressure of added policy demands is often confusing and discouraging for those teachers who have to integrate shifting expectations into their already stressful occupation.

Students and class compositions are changing, as well. Following a substantial increase in immigration during the 1990s, one in five school-age children in the U.S. was a member of an immigrant family; in California, children in immigrant families account for almost half (47%) of the elementary population (Capps, et al., 2005). Between 1990 and 2010, the number of White students enrolled in public schools decreased, Hispanic students surpassed Black students as the largest minority group, and Asian student enrollments increased by roughly 50% (NCES, 2012).

In some regions, this demographic shift has resulted in a much larger proportion of students who are likely to enter schools less academically prepared and whose behavior may be less aligned with school expectations (Farkas, 2003). On average, students from ethnic minority groups have lower levels of family income and parental education (Hernandez, 1999), putting these students at a disadvantage for school readiness and adjustment to school behavioral standards, relative to peers. Classroom behavioral expectations continue to reflect European-American norms, maintaining the ethnic disparity in perceived student conduct problems (Boykin, Watkins-Lewis, & Kizzie, 2006). Consequently, in regions with large changes in student demographics, teachers often spend much time addressing student behaviors, making them less able to meet their already challenging array of expected roles and tasks.

As each school tries to address its priorities within the context of its strengths and weaknesses, its members may well face a jumbled and incongruous mix of tasks. Working in schools with high organizational focus, that is, schools whose members share a strong understanding of roles and expectations, may lessen the negative effects of occupational stress on teachers' satisfaction and leave teachers more able to work purposefully toward their goals. Teachers are faced with numerous, sometimes contradictory priorities; it is important to know how schools communicate which priorities are most valued within their school, and to know how the degree of clarity regarding teachers' roles impacts their job satisfaction and intent to stay in the profession.

Role Confusion, Job Satisfaction, Teacher Turnover

In this section, I outline the potential usefulness of ongoing teacher job satisfaction and turnover prevention research. Following that is a brief overview of individual and organizational factors found to predict low teacher job satisfaction and intent to quit, with particular attention to the variables of interest in the proposed study.

Despite the attention researchers have paid to the factors predicting job satisfaction and employee attrition, more investigation is needed to translate knowledge into practical and effective organizational practices that might improve employee satisfaction and performance (Judge, & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012). This is especially true with respect to teachers, considering the importance of their success and the prevalence and cost of teacher turnover. To attain the goals of policy makers, administrators, and the public, teachers must stay in their jobs and provide stability for students and schools. Indeed, teacher turnover may be the most significant challenge facing our education system, but little progress has been made toward establishing

policies and procedures that effectively address the issue (Ingersoll, 2001; Liu & Meyer, 2005; Miller, 2006).

Large-scale data on attrition rates have been more readily available to researchers in the past two decades with the introduction of the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), an extensive nationwide survey including teachers, principals, and administrators of public and private schools, and the accompanying Teacher Follow-Up Survey (TFS). The TFS can be used to determine how many teachers moved from their respective schools or left the teaching field altogether in the year following SASS administration (NCES, 2011). Using this shared data set has not meant that researchers agree on the nature of teacher turnover or on the severity of the problem, but the numbers alone are striking. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) estimated in 2007 that the national teacher attrition rate was nearly 17%, which marks an increase of 50% from the rate they found just fifteen years earlier. Naturally, many schools and districts experience substantially higher attrition rates; private schools and schools in urban districts are particularly affected, as both groups saw over 20% of their teachers leave following the 2007-2008 school year (Keigher, 2010).

Many school districts struggle to maintain a sufficient teaching force, but the causes of and solutions to the turnover problem continue to be debated. The largest popular concern is that staffing problems are a result of a nationwide teacher shortage, brought on by growing student enrollments and increased teacher losses as aging baby boomers reach retirement age (Ingersoll, 2003). Research has largely found this to be an oversimplified explanation, and only partly right. In his analysis of the SASS data, Ingersoll (1995a; 2001) concluded that overall retirement rates (12% of total turnover)

affect teacher supply less than the loss of teachers who pursue jobs elsewhere. Grissmer and Kirby (1997), also using SASS data, emphasized the need to differentiate between "permanent leavers" and "temporary leavers" when they found that 40% of teacher hires in the 1980s were teachers returning to the profession. From this they argued that yearly attrition rates overstate the role of turnover in lessening the teaching reserve pool. Likewise, Harris and Adams (2007) compared teacher turnover to turnover in other helping professions – nurses and social workers – as well as accountants, using national data from the Current Population Survey; they found that teacher turnover rates were similar to those in the comparison professions. Teachers tended to retire earlier, in part because of relatively high pensions, suggesting that retirement has a more significant role in teacher shortages than Ingersoll has assigned it. Regardless of the ongoing debate about why and how teacher turnover is a problem, the general academic consensus remains that turnover is a tremendous hindrance for many schools and the national education system.

At the local level, whether teachers are lost through retirement, attrition from the profession, or through transfer to another school, the challenges are the same. Any turnover requires time and money to recruit and train replacement staff, and even though teachers who change schools do not diminish the overall teacher supply, there are costs associated with bringing them in to new schools and replacing them at their former schools (Ingersoll, 2001). Some degree of turnover helps organizations avoid stagnation, but there is little reason to think that turnover at such high rates constitutes healthy attrition; 8% of all teachers left the profession following the 2007-2008 school year, and only 5.3% of those who left did so because their contracts had been terminated (Keigher,

2010). Accountability advocates often argue that weeding out less talented teachers helps improve the quality of education, yet evidence does not support the notion that less qualified teachers – those without a teaching certificate, with less training, or with lower certification test scores – leave the profession any faster than more qualified teachers (Borman & Dowling, 2008).

Economic repercussions alone make teacher turnover a major concern. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF, 2007) estimated that teacher turnover costs public schools at least $7.3 billion per year. That figure is likely an underestimate, as it does not include private schools and overlooks costs related to teachers changing schools within the same districts, nor does it factor in expenditures at the state and national level used in teacher recruitment initiatives. Some school leaders and public officials have stated the belief that high teacher turnover saves districts money by lowering the average salary of teachers (NCTAF, 2007), but salary savings are vastly outweighed by the costs of recruiting, hiring, and training new staff. The National Education Association (NEA) places those costs at an average of $50,000 per teacher, which in many cases is more than a teacher's yearly salary (Vail, 2005). Mounting financial losses directly lead to diminished quality in education and school functioning (Ingersoll, 2001; Loeb, Darling-Hammond, & Luczak, 2005). Within a context of nationwide budget cuts, the money devoted to immediate staffing issues diverts critical funds away from valuable student services, such as providing up-to-date textbooks, hands-on learning experiences, and student computer training, as well as offering breakfast for children whose families are unable to regularly provide it (Theobald, 1990; Conley & Woosley, 2000). Even meeting the basic goal of recruiting new teachers and

retaining the teachers already working in schools is difficult for districts that are especially hard-hit by revenue shortages (Guarino, Santibañez, & Daley, 2006). School leaders struggling just to maintain the minimum necessary staff numbers are often compelled to gear their efforts toward meeting the minimum necessary student performance on standardized tests to attain attendant monetary incentives (Perlstein, 2007; Ravitch, 2010), with little time or money left to implement school improvement aspirations or to cultivate the skills of existing staff (Liu & Meyer, 2005). As such, high teacher turnover is both a result of and a cause of low student achievement (Hanushek, Kain, & Rivkin, 2004).

Ultimately, it is the students who bear the costs of high turnover in their lost opportunities. Schools with greater staff stability can provide students with a more cohesive curriculum, are more able to build partnerships with parents and the surrounding community, and increase the chance that students will form supportive, ongoing relationships with school personnel. Schools with a revolving door of incoming and outgoing staff, on the other hand, are more likely to have classrooms led by inexperienced and ineffective teachers, and those teachers have fewer opportunities to work with and learn from their colleagues (Shields, 2001). Few new teachers are fully prepared to provide quality instruction while managing classroom behavior and providing the mentoring and emotional support that students need, or possess the requisite expertise to make important curricular decisions when balancing their classes' specific learning needs beyond the content of standardized testing (Loeb et al., 2005). Sanders and Rivers (1996) highlighted the essential role of teacher skill by comparing student performance of those who received instruction from "high-performing" and "low-performing" teachers

from third to fifth grade. They found that one year with a “high-performing” teacher produced improvements for students who had low-performing teachers in previous years, but the residual effect of receiving just one year of instruction from a low-performing teacher was observable in reduced student achievement scores two years later. Consecutive years with skilled classroom teachers are essential for students to develop their maximal academic achievement (Rivkin, et al., 2005). Students in schools with high teacher turnover are at a disadvantage in the classroom, and cash-strapped schools focused on recruitment and retention are in a poor position to provide further programs and resources to make up the difference.

Chapter 2: Why Do Teachers Quit?

Like workers in other professions, teachers become or remain teachers in part in consideration of their satisfaction with the profession relative to their other available options (Hanushek et al., 2004; Guarino et al., 2006). Stockard and Lehman (2004) posited that younger teachers, in particular Caucasian and male teachers, are more likely to have other attractive employment opportunities, and the expectation of finding a job with greater benefits (salary, personal satisfaction with their occupation, and working conditions) significantly determines the likelihood of resignation (Mobley, Horner, & Hollinsworth, 1978). The starting salary for teachers is generally lower than that of other occupations that require a similar amount of training (Grissmer & Kirby, 1997); recent graduates may find their satisfaction with teacher pay challenged as they take on more adult financial responsibilities. It should be noted that teacher survey responses used in the present study occurred before the economic downturn in the US (see "Sample" section below). Declines in the overall economic climate and increases in unemployment rates have been shown to mitigate the relationship between low job satisfaction and intent to quit (Hausknecht, Hiller, & Vance, 2008).

At the same time, there are motivations for individuals who enter and stay in educational occupations that have been found to differ from those of other professionals. In a job attitude survey of college students, education majors placed "contribution to society" significantly higher than did non-education majors, who cited prestige, salary, and job security as more important (Shipp, 1999). Likewise, in a national survey of over 600 new public school teachers (no more than 5 years in the profession), 72% of respondents said a desirable job must contribute to society, and 97% stated the belief that

teaching meets that need; 83% indicated that it was important for a job to involve work that one loves to do, and 96% felt that teaching provides that (Farkas, Johnson, & Foleno, 2000). The nature of teaching and other helping professions are distinct from other occupations, in that their work bears a strong emotional component and their success is only partly observable and quantifiable. Children bring with them a variety of strengths and needs that shift over time, not all of which are academic, and the preferred approaches to meet those needs change as popular trends among policy makers and administrators come and go.

Individual factors

The bulk of teacher turnover research has focused on individual teacher demographics and characteristics, and a number of patterns among individuals have been found (Shen, 1997; Stinebrickner, 1998; Ingersoll, 2001; Liu & Meyer, 2005). These patterns change across teachers' career arcs, and help to frame the understanding of relevant organizational factors throughout their tenure (Borman & Dowling, 2008). While the aims of the present study are focused on environmental and organizational influences on attrition, individual factors are obviously important for understanding attrition, and will be discussed in brief.

Teacher attrition rates show a well-established U-shaped relation with age and experience (Grissmer & Kirby, 1997). That is, teachers are most likely to leave in their first five years in the profession or once over the age of fifty (Ingersoll, 2001; Hanushek et al., 2004). Meta-analysis by Borman and Dowling (2008) found that teachers ages 51 or older were almost 2.5 times more likely to quit than teachers ages 50 or younger, likely due to their proximity to retirement age and eligibility for pension (Harris & Adams,

2007). In the same analysis, Borman and Dowling calculated odds of attrition for teachers in the first five years to be over 5 times greater than those for more experienced teachers. A great deal of attention has been paid to the factors that drive new teacher attrition (Murnane et al., 1991; Stockard & Lehman, 2004), as these are more amenable to change than are aging and retirement. Beginning teachers benefit from collaborative relationships with colleagues (Borman & Dowling, 2008) and early induction initiatives (Shen, 1997; Ingersoll, 2004; Perry & Hayes, 2011). Unfortunately, schools and districts with high staffing needs often put more effort into recruiting new teachers than they do into preparing and supporting those new teachers (Ingersoll, 2001).

A considerable portion of teacher attrition research has considered teacher gender and ethnicity. The majority of literature indicates that women and minority teachers leave the profession at a higher rate than their counterparts (Ingersoll, 2001; Borman & Dowling, 2008; Kearney, 2008). Nevertheless, these trends are not absolute (Shen, 1997), and may be contingent on circumstance. For example, males who teach secondary science and math may also have higher-paying options available to them, and this subgroup does appear to leave more often than other groups, though research has not consistently found this to be the case (Murnane et al., 1991; Grissmer & Kirby, 1997; Shen, 1997; Ingersoll, 2001; Borman & Dowling, 2008). Female teachers are more influenced than are men by personal life events, notably childbirth. Though teachers who become pregnant or who choose to stay home and care for their young children may only temporarily leave teaching (Murnane et al., 1991; Stinebrickner, 1998), the presence of a newborn has been found to be the most predictive factor for female teachers' attrition

(Stinebrickner, 2002). Borman and Dowling (2008) found that new mothers were over 6 times more likely to leave their teaching jobs than those who did not have a new child.

The ethnic-group composition of schools moderates the influence of teacher ethnicity on attrition. Teachers tend to leave schools with higher proportions of minority students more than those with higher proportion of nonminority students (Loeb et al., 2005). The nature of this relationship, however, is dependent in part on the interaction of a teacher's ethnicity with the demographic mix of his or her students. Minority teachers are more likely to stay in schools that have higher proportions of students in the same minority group (Hanushek et al., 2004). School demographics are an important consideration for minority teachers when electing to enter a school, but carry less weight when minority teachers decide whether to stay in the school (Ingersoll & May, 2011). Minority teachers are more likely to serve in communities with higher rates of poverty, which often have concurrent organizational factors that are stronger predictors of teacher attrition than the demographic composition of the studentry. Moreover, the relationship of teacher minority ethnicity and higher attrition has been shown to be reversible when targeted retention strategies for these groups are in place (Kearney, 2008).

There is some indication that teachers with higher levels of training and academic accomplishment are more likely to leave the field. Studies that have compared teachers with graduate degrees to those without have found the former to be slightly more likely to leave (Murnane et al., 1991; Borman & Dowling, 2008). Scores on teacher certification exams and college entrance exams like the ACT have found mixed results for predicting attrition (Podgursky, Monroe, & Watson, 2004; Borman & Dowling, 2008). Overall, the predictive link between higher initial qualifications and likelihood to quit teaching

appears to be slight, but evidence suggests that the link is positive. While initial training qualifications alone do not indicate future teacher effectiveness (Kane, Rockoff, & Staiger, 2008), this relationship implies that teachers who might reasonably be expected to be more competent are at least as likely as others to quit teaching.

Environmental factors

Understanding who is most likely to leave a school informs which groups might benefit most from targeted interventions, but knowing what interventions are most appropriate and how they can be implemented effectively depends on an understanding of the school factors that precede teacher dissatisfaction and attrition. For instance, it is well established that teachers are more likely to leave early in their careers, and school conditions are the strongest predictor of attrition among 1st-year teachers (Loeb et al., 2005). Failing to address the environmental aspects that perpetuate the revolving door for beginning teachers costs schools potentially good teachers before they can reach their peak levels of performance. Personal circumstances that may cause teachers to leave are only under the control of school leaders insofar as they factor into initial hiring decisions. While some of the organizational factors described in this section are similarly dictated by circumstance, many factors in the school environment can be improved (Newmann, Rutter, & Smith, 1989; Boyd et al., 2011). However, school work environments have only begun to receive comparable attention to individual factors, and the collective body of knowledge has not yet translated into consistently effective policy changes (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Shen et al., 2012).

The most consistent organizational variable predicting teacher job satisfaction and retention is salary (Murnane et al., 1991; Weiss, 1999; Ingersoll, 2001; Podgursky et al.,

2004; Stockard & Lehman, 2004; Kelly, 2004; Hanushek et al., 2004; Borman & Dowling, 2008). Dissatisfaction with salary is common in nearly any occupation, but salary is hardly the only determinant of a decision to teach (Shipp, 1999). The meta-analysis by Borman and Dowling (2008) found that teachers later in their careers indicated a greater emphasis on pay than did beginning teachers, suggesting that the popular belief that pay increases will solve the turnover crisis may overemphasize the efficacy of this approach in retaining new teachers. When considering the overall gain of transferring schools or occupations, teachers have expressed a willingness to take a pay cut if they anticipate better working conditions elsewhere (Hanushek et al., 2004). However, school districts that can provide higher salaries also commonly have sufficient resources to provide workplace amenities such as updated textbooks, classroom supplies, and teacher induction strategies (Ingersoll, 2001). Theobald (1990) posited that salaries in more affluent communities may actually play a larger role in teacher job dissatisfaction, in part because of the likelihood that friends and non-teaching neighbors will have larger salaries that make teacher pay seem relatively weaker than in other districts.

Social comparison of salary may be the only retentive weakness for schools in wealthier communities. Turnover is substantially more prevalent in schools with a higher enrollment of students from low-SES backgrounds, as well as schools with a higher percentage of ethnic minority students (Hanushek, 2004; Loeb et al., 2005). It is certainly unfortunate that students' background contexts are associated with inconsistent school staffing and a higher percentage of dissatisfied teachers, but recent literature suggests that school demographics do not directly affect teacher satisfaction and retention (Shen, 1997; Kelly, 2004). It is more likely that community demographic measurements serve as a

proxy for unfavorable working conditions. Evidence suggests that schools with lower-SES students are more likely to have poor behavioral climates, less experienced teachers, and fewer administrative mechanisms in place to train and support new teachers (Stockard & Lehman, 2004; Loeb et al., 2005). Therefore, it is especially important to develop school-level programmatic strategies to help these schools enhance their working conditions (Boyd et al., 2011).

School leadership sets the tone for school culture and climate, which largely determine levels of attachment and commitment to the workplace (Mobley, 1982; Hom & Kinicki, 2001). After factoring out teacher and student characteristics, perceptions of administrative effectiveness have been found to be the most important remaining school contextual factor for teacher attrition or retention (Boyd et al., 2011). Well-managed schools where teachers feel supported are schools where teachers are more satisfied (Shen, 1997; Ingersoll, 2001), and the perceived presence or absence of strong leadership mitigates or exacerbates the effects of demographic and background variables on teacher job satisfaction. School leaders play an important role in establishing more controlled behavioral climates, clear expectations for students and teachers, and a greater understanding of purpose for school staff. The importance of these factors is discussed in the following sections.

Students as work stressors

As one might expect, teachers' perceptions of high student externalizing behavior, that is, observable behaviors like aggression, noncompliance, talking and acting out of turn, and defiance, are repeatedly reported to increase teacher stress and motivation to quit (Kyriacou, 2001; Boyd et al., 2011). Analyses of the Schools and Staffing Survey

(SASS) and Teacher Follow-Up Survey (TFS) consistently find student discipline problems among the factors that are most predictive of job dissatisfaction leading to quitting (Ingersoll, 2001; Kelly, 2004; Liu & Meyer, 2005). Externalizing behaviors disrupt a stable classroom dynamic for learning. Orderly student behavior is a critical requisite for teachers to be able to implement optimal instructional practices (Newmann, Rutter, & Smith, 1989), and student misconduct keeps teachers occupied during instructional time, straining both classroom instruction and the morale of teachers and other students (Montgomery, 2005). The nature and severity of these behaviors may be different in different school contexts, but the negative relationship of student behavior and teacher job satisfaction is consistent across settings (Stockard & Lehman, 2004).

As the distracting behavior of just one or a handful of students can derail the efficacy of learning and teaching, such behavior can derail teachers' sense of their own teaching efficacy and their subsequent satisfaction with working in education. Teachers forced to spend time and energy maintaining order in their classrooms often come to the frustrating conclusion that being a teacher closely resembles being a babysitter (Landers, Alter, & Servilio, 2008). The accumulation of such frustration and the continued discrepancy between professional goals and actual demands significantly diminishes teacher job satisfaction over time (Hastings & Bahm, 2003), which in turn diminishes teachers' energy and availability to deliver high-quality instruction for all students. Chronically stressed and frustrated teachers, therefore, are not only more likely to disrupt school cohesion and continuity through attrition, but provide less value to schools and students when they stay in a school (Leithwood & McAdie, 2007).

The negative impact of disruptive student behaviors on teacher satisfaction may develop differently for various teacher subgroups. For example, veteran teachers can become burnt out after chronically working to correct externalizing student behavior (Friedman, 2000; Schaufeli & Buunk, 2003), or first-year teachers may feel that they've entered a work environment and profession that they were not prepared for (Stockard & Lehman, 2004). Female teachers' satisfaction was found to vary in response to student defiance more so than male teachers', while male teachers were more affected by student apathy and disengagement (Friedman, 1995). Teachers with higher levels of teaching training and certification are more familiar with behavior management strategies, but are more prone to negative self-evaluations than are less-trained support staffs when faced with persistent student externalizing behaviors (Hastings & Bham, 2003). Despite these group distinctions, student conduct significantly predicts attrition for all teacher groups (Ingersoll, 2001; Kelly, 2004).

Student discipline problems have been found to be the most predictive factor relating to low teacher job satisfaction and intent to quit after low salary (Ingersoll, 2004; NCTAF, 2007). Teachers in the 1994-1995 TRF sample listed "better student discipline" (50%) as the second-highest step, behind increased salary (64%), that schools might take to encourage teachers to stay (Ingersoll, 2001). Salaries being set by the school district, this indicates that student externalizing behavior is the largest cause of teacher dissatisfaction at the school level. Teachers know that education is a relatively low-salary job coming into the occupation, so while concerns about pay still most frequently lead to leaving the profession, it may be that student problem behavior erodes the altruistic energy that compels teachers to sign up in the first place (Liu & Meyer, 2005).

The role of roles

As described above, teachers are beset by a wide, shifting, and potentially confounding set of expectations. Managing a balance between the most immediately necessary goals and long-term aspirational goals, often while dealing with increasing class sizes and stagnant or diminished resources, is markedly difficult. Of course, many teachers struggle to find that balance or to hold it for very long. The resulting frustration diminishes teachers' job satisfaction and intent to stay when they perceive their role demands to be unreasonable and the expectations of school administrators to be unclear or conflicting (Reyes & Imber, 1992). While teaching practices and expectations have long been shaped by policy demands and recommended practices, the expectations imposed upon the profession have been particularly expansive during the current era (Valli & Buese, 2007). Recent changes have been less about replacing old role definitions and more about adding new responsibilities to the existing ones (Hargreaves, 2000). This doubtlessly makes it difficult for teachers and administrators to determine what roles school staff ought to be devoting their energy toward fulfilling.

Role ambiguity arises when an individual lacks sufficient knowledge of his or her performance expectations to feel able to work toward fulfilling those expectations (Kahn et al., 1964). Sufficient knowledge entails an understanding of what responsibilities are expected to be met, how those responsibilities are expected to be fulfilled, how various job functions should be prioritized, and the consequences for meeting or failing to meet the responsibilities laid out by overseeing parties (King & King, 1990; Breaugh & Colihan, 1994; Papastylianou et al., 2009). Teachers' role expectations are dictated by a broad cast of agents: federal guidelines, state guidelines, district guidelines, school

administrators, parents, others teachers, and students. These parties rarely agree fully with one another regarding teachers' best instructional and classroom management methods, schedule planning, and how best to evaluate and reward or correct teachers based on their performance (Petersen, 1997). Teachers, then, have both too much and too little information regarding what they ought to be emphasizing and doing in their schools.

The effect of widespread role confusion within an organization on the job satisfaction and efficacy of its members is consistently negative (Abramis, 1994). Conflicting job demands and inadequate information about best approaches to them has been shown to be moderately to highly correlated with teachers' overall reported stress (Kyriacou, 2001; Stockard & Lehman, 2004). It is perhaps unsurprising then that in a review of 73 studies, teachers demonstrated the highest levels of emotional exhaustion for any major occupation in the United States, making teachers at elevated risk for subsequent burnout and dissatisfaction (Schaufeli & Buunk, 2003). Teachers also have their own professional goals and expectations, but when these goals are overshadowed by conflicting, unrealistic, and unclear demands, they may lose their sense of purpose in their work, which can cripple morale, job commitment, and productivity in any workplace (Pascarella & Frohman, 1989; Hulpia & Devos, 2011). Conversely, teachers report feeling emotionally supported in schools where goals are clear, explicit, and shared (Leithwood & McAdie, 2007). The goal of the present study is to investigate whether, within a milieu of job stressors and potentially unattainable goals, teachers are more satisfied when they at least know what they ought to be focusing on.

Clarity at the organizational level is critical if there is to be clarity at the individual level. Consistency in emphases, behavioral expectations, and consequences

within an organization delineate role boundaries and priorities for embedded personnel. An organization that demonstrates a congruent and stable set of goals, and that communicates those goals explicitly to its members, is said to have a clear identity, while an organization characterized by amorphous and inconsonant goals is said to have a diffuse identity (Holland, 1997). The clarity of a school's identity is herein referred to as organizational focus (Gottfredson, 2000). Purposive schools are crucial for concordant teacher practices and student success, but maintaining such schools in an era of extensive reform and restructuring, when the key functions of education are under constant debate, requires meticulous planning and supervision (Petersen, 1997; Conley & You, 2009). The responsibility for establishing goal and role clarity for school employees largely comes from the top down through district administrators and principals (Leithwood & McAdie, 2007; Shen et al., 2012). The strength of a school's organizational focus then emerges from the collective perspective of teachers and staff regarding how stable and well-understood their job expectations are (Perdue et al., 2007).

Organizational focus showed a high positive correlation with a measure of teacher morale across a diverse national sample of schools (Gottfredson, 2000). Perdue et al. (2007) also found that environmental identity by itself indicates a healthier working environment, predicting greater employee satisfaction with job supervision and collegiality with coworkers. It makes sense then that teachers in a high focus school would report higher job satisfaction; stressful situations in such a school should have a more accessible list of responses, planning and scheduling should be better informed, students and staff should have a clearer understanding of behavioral reward and consequences, and teachers should have a more certain sense of their occupational

purpose and efficacy. Schools with clearly defined values and goals, especially when staff members share those goals, can foster a sense of common purpose and shared efforts, which predict higher loyalty and commitment among staff members (Sergiovanni, 1992; Kyriacou, 2001; Hulpia & Devos, 2011). At the very least, members who do not identify with the goals of their school can make a more informed decision about whether they want to remain in the school.

A case study by Petersen (1997) highlights the comparative benefits of high focus in school functioning by describing differences in shared understanding between two schools that had been rated by supervisors as highly purposeful and distinctly less purposeful, respectively. The investigator collected teacher and principal interviews and a random sampling of artifacts (newsletters and bulletins) and tabulated the number of unique values stated from each. Members of the less purposeful school generated more unique value categories, and shared a significantly lower percentage of common categories, when describing school values and identity than did the members of the more purposeful school. The language of each school's principal is particularly telling: the principal of the less purposeful school emphasized goals of "forging ahead" and "muddling through," while the principal of the more purposeful school emphasized "commitment" and "excellence in instruction." From these, Peterson made the interpretation that members of a more purposeful school are more aware of shared goals and more able to coalesce around them. The low sample size of this study (2 schools) makes the generalizability of this interpretation a matter of speculation, but the results support the idea that when school staffs understand the school's identity, the school is more able to focus on long-term goals.

Chapter 3: Study Design and Methodology

Hypotheses

Research has established an expected negative correlation between classroom problem behavior and teacher job satisfaction and intent to quit. One aim of the present study was to investigate how the perceived clarity of a school's goals and expectations by its teachers moderates that relationship. I also assessed whether organizational focus, conceptualized as an environmental characteristic and measured in the proposed study at the level of individual teacher perception, significantly predicted job satisfaction and intent to quit at the individual teacher and school level. These relationships were investigated at the individual level as well as the school level. My expectations were as follows:

1. Perceived organizational focus will correlate positively with job satisfaction and negatively with intent to quit across teachers at the individual level.
2. Organizational focus at the school level will correlate positively with teacher job satisfaction and negatively with intent to quit.
3. Organizational focus will attenuate the negative relationship between student externalizing behavior and teacher job satisfaction and attenuate the positive relationship between student externalizing behavior and intent to quit.

Sample

Elementary school (K-5) teacher respondents (final collection wave, *N* teachers=1637) were located in a suburban Mid-Atlantic school district (*N* schools = 45). Survey responses were collected annually over four years, beginning with the 2005-2006 school year. Data from the second, third and fourth waves (2006-2007, 2007-2008 and

2008-2009) were included in the present study. Collection of survey data occurred in February of each year, in accordance with the school district's scheduling needs. The teacher sample included any staff member responsible for teaching at least one student; for example, in the overall 2007-2008 sample, 63% were general education classroom teachers, 10% were special education teachers, 9% were English for Speakers of Other Languages teachers, and 18% identified as other support staff.

For the present study, the sample was limited to general education teachers only; including specialists and support staff is likely to result in redundancy as children from general education classrooms often receive pull-out services from support staff, and the context of special education classrooms may vary based on the composition of students' needs and specific programs provided within each school. The sample was further restricted to 3rd-to-5th grade teachers, whose students' externalizing behavior tends to be viewed as more problematic than that of younger children. The resulting samples included 465 teachers for 2007-2008 and 430 teachers for 2008-2009 across the forty-five schools, with roughly 22 students per teacher and 13 3rd-to5th grade teachers per school (see Appendix A, Table 9).

The following teacher demographic information was included in the sample data: age in years, sex, self-reported ethnicity (American Indian, Asian American, Black, Hispanic, White, or Other), and years of teaching experience. Years of teaching experience, while shown in literature to be predictive of job satisfaction and attrition, was excluded as a variable due to its high correlation with age (r=.78 for 2007-2008, r=.76 for 2008-2009). Of the two predictors, age showed slightly higher zero-order correlations with satisfaction and intent to quit across all samples. In general, the samples'

composition of teacher ages resembled national norms (Aritomi & Coopersmith, 2009), but male teachers, Asian American teachers, and Hispanic teachers were underrepresented compared to national norms. Cohort characteristics are described in Appendix A, Table 8.

Measures

The Teacher Report on Student Behavior (TRSB) is a 45-item survey instrument primarily adapted from the Teacher Observation of Child Adaptation- Revised (TOCA-R) (Werthamer-Larsson, Kellam & Wheeler, 1991), the Teacher-Child Rating Scale (Perkins & Hightower, 2002), the Social Skills Rating System, (Gresham & Elliott, 1990), and the Teacher's Report Form (Achenbach, 1991). Contained within the TRSB is an 8-item Externalizing Behavioral Problems scale composed of items with four-point response scales ranging from "Never/Almost Never" to "Very Often". Internal consistencies for this scale ranged from .89 to .91. Items and scale reliabilities of the TRSB Externalizing Behavior scale are displayed in Appendix C, Tables 13-16.

The Teacher Self-Report (TSR) is a 100+ item questionnaire that measures teacher perceptions across dimensions of school and teacher practices and characteristics. Within the TRS is a Job Satisfaction scale (contains 4 items in the 2007-2008 survey, 7 items in the 2008-2009 survey) and seven Organizational Focus items from Gottfredson & Holland's larger Organizational Focus Scale (Gottfredson & Holland, 1996a). The Job Satisfaction scale is composed of five-point Likert-type items with responses ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree". Included in the expanded 2008-2009 Job Satisfaction scale is a single item regarding teacher intent to quit ("I intend to quit my job"), which was removed from that scale and used as a separate dependent variable. The

Organizational Focus scale contains four-point items with responses “False”, “Mostly False”, “Mostly True”, and “True”. This scale is designed to capture how clearly individuals feel the organization of which they are a member communicates it goals, priorities, and rules in a cohesive manner. Internal consistencies ranged from .92 to .93 for the Job Satisfaction scale and .89 to .90 for the Organization Focus scale. Items and scale reliabilities of these scales are included in Appendix C, Tables 17-20.

Data Analysis

Each response variable was represented as a two-level regression model, with teacher-specific covariates included at level one and school-wide influences at level two. I used Organizational Focus and Job Satisfaction ratings from the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 TSR data and Intent to Quit responses from the 2008-2009 TSR. An Organizational Focus score was measured for individual teachers by using the average of each teacher’s responses to items of the Organizational Focus scale. These teacher scores were aggregated to produce a school mean; such aggregated group response data are thought to differ in meaningful ways from individual-level data (Griffith, 2006). In this case, organizational focus is conceptualized as a characteristic of work environments, so while each teacher has his or her own perception of a school’s focus, it is the intragroup consensus across teachers that defines that school’s focus. Teachers’ Job Satisfaction scores were likewise derived by average item response per teacher.

Student externalizing behavior was measured in two ways; by averaging item endorsements of the TRSB Externalizing Behavior scale for each child in a teacher’s current classroom using the responses of the student’s teacher the previous year, and by using the current teacher’s student behavior ratings for the current year. The former

method makes teachers' satisfaction scores operationally independent of their students' behavior ratings, while the latter method assesses the relationship of teachers' own perceptions of student behavior (but is not independent of these teachers' reports of their job satisfaction and intent to quit). For this reason, I used TRSB data for 2nd, 3rd, and 4th-graders from the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 collection waves, as well as TRSB data for 3rd, 4th, and 5th-graders from the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 collection waves. Individual students' prior and current teacher ratings showed a strong positive correlation (r = .49 for 2007-2008 sample, r = .51 for 2008-2009 sample). Elementary school students, unlike middle and high school students, spend the bulk of their time in one classroom with one primary teacher. Therefore, the appraisals of elementary teachers can be interpreted as relatively stable throughout the workday, and therefore more reliable than teacher perceptions of older students (McCarthy et al, 2009).

Complete non-respondents, the teachers and students for whom no survey data were available, were removed from the sample. Teachers who completed either the TSR or the TRSB, but not both, were likewise excluded from the final samples. For analyses involving prior year student behavior ratings, current-year students who lacked prior-year ratings and those with prior-year ratings who were not associated with a teacher in the current year were also removed.

I used multiple imputation to generate values for the remaining missing items in the survey samples. This method assumes that these data are missing at random; since less than 1% of responses were missing within any survey, violation of this assumption is not likely to significantly bias the data, and the use of multiple imputation reduces bias relative to other missing data techniques (Baraldi & Enders, 2010). Response rates and

proportions of missing data for each year of the two surveys are reported in Appendix A, Table 10.

Based on prior literature and the available data within the TSR and TRSB, the following individual-level variables were assessed for inclusion in the individual model shown below: teacher age (*AGE*), self-reported sex (*SEX)*, and self-reported ethnicity (*ETHNICITY*). To assess the relationship between student externalizing behavior (*SEB*) and organizational focus (*ORGFOC*), respectively, and teacher job satisfaction (*JOBSAT*), I used the following equation:

$$JOBSAT_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}(SEB_{ij} - \overline{SEB}_{\bullet j}) + \beta_{2j}(ORGFOC_{ij} - \overline{ORGFOC_{\bullet j}}) + \beta_{3j}(AGE_{ij} - \overline{AGE_{\bullet j}}) + \beta_{4j}(SEX_{ij} - \overline{SEX_{\bullet j}}) + \beta_{5j}(ETHNICITY_{ij} - \overline{ETHNICITY_{\bullet j}}) + r_{ij} \quad \textbf{(1)}$$

where the intercept β_{0j} is the mean job satisfaction score for school *j* , β_{1j} is the regression coefficient for *SEB* in school *j*, β_{2j} is the regression coefficient for *ORGFOC* in school *j*, β_{3j} is the regression coefficient for *AGE* in school *j*, β_{4j} is the regression coefficient for *SEX* in school *j*, β_{5j} is the regression coefficient for *ETHNICITY* in school *j*, and r_{ij} is the residual for teacher *i* in school *j*. An identical model was used with the intent to quit item (*INTENT*) replacing *JOBSAT* as the dependent variable. In the above model, the job satisfaction score of a specific teacher at a specific school is a function of its correlation with both student externalizing behavior and organizational focus scores, controlling for individual demographic characteristics, in order to determine if these variables, individually, significantly predict job satisfaction and intent to quit. Classroom-level (i.e., teacher-level) student externalizing behavior, teacher perceptions of school focus, and individual teacher demographics are centered on school means (where each

variable is expressed as a deviation from its school mean) to get unbiased estimates of the within-school slopes (Enders & Tofighi, 2007).

Holding individual teacher characteristics constant, perceptions of organizational focus at the school level (*SCHFOC*) were expected to significantly increase covariate-adjusted teacher job satisfaction and decrease covariate-adjusted intent to quit. To assess this relationship, I used the following equation:

$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(SCHFOC_j) + u_j \quad \textbf{(2)}$$

in a variation of Equation 1 with covariates grand-mean centered, where β_{0j} is the covariate-adjusted mean satisfaction for school j**,** which is a function of the grand mean of teacher job satisfaction (γ_{00}), the estimated effect of School Organizational Focus on Job Satisfaction (γ_{01}) for school *j*, and the error for school *j* (u_j).

Of particular interest in the present study was the possible attenuating effect of organizational focus on the regression of job satisfaction on student externalizing behavior. To assess whether the slope of the regression of teacher job satisfaction and intent to quit on student externalizing behavior differs as a function of school-level organizational focus, I used the following equation:

$$\beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11}(SCHFOC_j) + u_{1j} \quad \textbf{(3)}$$

with school-mean centering as shown in Equation 1, where the regression coefficient for the school-centered classroom-level student externalizing behavior score is a function of the average within-school slope for student externalizing behavior (γ_{10}), the regression coefficient of school *j*'s focus (γ_1**)**, and the residual error for school *j*.

Prior to assessing the school-level equation, I calculated the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) to assess the proportion of the total variance in Job Satisfaction and Intent to Quit that could be attributed to between-school differences. This is done by comparing variance in the error terms of fully unconditional teacher-level and school-level models (shown below as r_{ij} and u_j, respectively).

Level one unconditional model

$$JOBSAT_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + r_{ij} \quad \textbf{(4)}$$

Level two unconditional model

$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_0 + u_j \quad \textbf{(5)}$$

Individual teacher job satisfaction in the unconditional model is a function of the mean school satisfaction score and individual variance, and the mean school satisfaction score is a function of the overall mean satisfaction score and school variance. The variance among teachers in school *j* is the within-group variance, represented as σ^2, and the variance among schools is the between-group variance, represented as τ. The ICC, represented by ρ, is calculated as follows:

$$\rho = \frac{\tau}{\tau + \sigma^2} \quad \textbf{(6)}$$

ICCs for each of the samples can be found in Table 7.

Chapter 4: Findings

Results

I tested six models, four with job satisfaction as the dependent variable and two with intent to quit as the dependent variable. The final fitted models and outcomes are described below. In the interest of brevity, each model listed will subsequently be referred to by the shorthand in its adjacent parentheses: teacher job satisfaction predicted by TSR responses from the 2007-2008 dataset paired with the 2006-2007 TRSB externalizing behavior ratings given their students by the students' prior year teachers (*2008 JOBSAT Prior*), job satisfaction predicted by responses from the 2007-2008 TSR matched with each teacher's 2007-2008 TRSB ratings of their current students (*2008 JOBSAT Current*), the same for the 2008-2009 teacher sample (*2009 JOBSAT Prior*) and (*2009 JOBSAT Current*), and the same for the 2008-2009 teacher sample with intent to quit serving as the outcome variable (*2009 INTENT Prior*), (*2009 INTENT Current*).

In building the regression models, job satisfaction and intent to quit were regressed on each covariate in the initial level-1 model individually (shown in Equation 1), to assess whether each covariate, by itself, was a significant predictor ($p \leq .05$) of $JOBSAT_{ij}$ or $INTENT_{ij}$. These zero-order correlations can be seen in Appendix B, Table 12. *SEX* and *ETHNICITY* were nonsignificant predictors across samples, so these were not retained in the models. *AGE* was also found to be nonsignificant and was excluded when *INTENT* served as the dependent variable (*2009 INTENT Prior*, $p = .63$; *2009 INTENT Current*, $p = .57$). The school-level residual for each level-1 covariate (u_{1j}, u_{2j}, and so on) was tested to assess whether there were significant between-school

differences in slopes for these covariates. In the 2008 *JOBSAT* samples, slope residuals for *SEB* and *ORGFOC* were significantly different from zero, but not in the 2009 *JOBSAT* samples. No significant slope residuals were found for *AGE*, so the residual parameter variance for *AGE* was set to zero in each sample. The regression coefficients and standard errors for the fitted models are presented in Tables 1-5.

Table 1

Coefficients in the Within-School Job Satisfaction as Outcome Models

Model and Criterion	SEB		ORGFOC		AGE	
	γ_{10}	SE_{γ}	γ_{20}	SE_{γ}	γ_{30}	SE_{γ}
2008 JOBSAT Prior	-0.54*	0.22	0.87**	0.07	0.002	0.002
2008 JOBSAT Current	-0.17	0.38	0.82**	0.08	0.003	0.002
2009 JOBSAT Prior	-0.57**	0.18	0.88**	0.05	-0.001	0.002
2009 JOBSAT Current	-0.38*	0.17	0.87**	0.06	-0.002	0.002

Note. Variables are centered on school means. SEB = Student Externalizing Behavior, ORGFOC = perceived Organizational Focus. 2008 JOBSAT Prior means that the criterion variable is teacher Job Satisfaction reported in 2008 with the average student Externalizing Behavior for the teacher based on reports of student behavior by the prior year's teachers of those students. JOBSAT Current means that average student Externalizing Behavior is based on the instant teacher's own ratings. 2009 means that Job Satisfaction is measured in 2009.
*****$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 2

Coefficients in the Within-School Intent to Quit as Outcome Models

Model and Criterion	SEB		ORGFOC	
	γ_{10}	SE_γ	γ_{20}	SE_γ
2009 INTENT Prior	0.54	0.33	-0.56**	0.07
2009 INTENT Current	0.20	0.23	-0.51**	0.08

Note. Variables are centered on school means. SEB = Student Externalizing Behavior, ORGFOC = perceived Organizational Focus. 2009 INTENT Prior means that the criterion variable is teacher Intent to Quit reported in 2009 with the average student Externalizing Behavior for the teacher based on reports of student behavior by the prior year's teachers of those students. INTENT Current means that average student Externalizing Behavior is based on the instant teacher's own ratings.
***p* < .05. ****p* < .01.

Table 3

Coefficients in the Between-School Job Satisfaction as Outcome Models

Model and Criterion	SEB		ORGFOC		Age		SCHFOC	
	γ_{10}	SE_γ	γ_{20}	SE_γ	γ_{30}	SE_γ	γ_{01}	SE_γ
2008 JOBSAT Prior	-0.68**	0.22	0.90**	0.07	0.001	0.002	0.30*	0.14
2008 JOBSAT Current	-0.23	0.18	0.87**	0.08	0.002	0.002	0.34*	0.14
2009 JOBSAT Prior	-0.49**	0.15	0.88**	0.05	-0.001	0.002	0.13	0.21
2009 JOBSAT Current	-0.36*	0.16	0.87**	0.06	-0.002	0.002	0.09	0.11

Note. *SCHFOC* is included at level two as a predictor of the level-one intercept. All variables are centered on grand means. SEB = Student Externalizing Behavior, ORGFOC = perceived Organizational Focus, SCHFOC=school-level Organizational Focus. 2008 JOBSAT Prior means that the criterion variable is teacher Job Satisfaction reported in 2008 with the average student Externalizing Behavior for the teacher based on reports of student behavior by the prior year's teachers of those students. JOBSAT Current means that average student Externalizing Behavior is based on the instant teacher's own ratings. 2009 means that Job Satisfaction is measured in 2009.
***p* < .05. ****p* < .01.

Table 4

Coefficients in the Between-School Intent to Quit as Outcome Models

Model and Criterion	SEB		ORGFOC		SCHFOC	
	γ_{10}	SE_{γ}	γ_{20}	SE_{γ}	γ_{01}	SE_{γ}
2009 INTENT Prior	0.43	0.26	-0.57**	0.07	-0.05	0.13
2009 INTENT Current	0.10	0.20	-0.53**	0.08	-0.03	0.13

Note. SCHFOC is included at level two as a predictor of the level-one intercept.
All variables are centered on grand means. SEB = Student Externalizing Behavior, ORGFOC = perceived Organizational Focus, SCHFOC=school-level Organizational Focus. 2009 INTENT Prior means that the criterion variable is teacher Intent to Quit reported in 2009 with the average student Externalizing Behavior for the teacher based on reports of student behavior by the prior year's teachers of those students. INTENT Current means that average student Externalizing Behavior is based on the instant teacher's own ratings.
**$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 5

Coefficients in the Student Externalizing Behavior Slope as Outcome Models

Model and Criterion	SEB		ORGFOC		AGE		SCHFOC	
	γ_{10}	SE_γ	γ_{20}	SE_γ	γ_{30}	SE_γ	γ_{11}	SE_γ
2008 JOBSAT Prior	-0.53*	.22	0.91**	0.07	0.002	0.002	0.31	0.56
2008 JOBSAT Current	-0.15	0.19	0.87**	0.08	0.003	0.002	-0.64	0.57
2009 JOBSAT Prior	-0.59**	0.17	0.87**	0.05	-0.0003	0.002	0.73	0.41
2009 JOBSAT Current	-0.29	0.19	0.78**	0.06	-0.0003	0.002	-0.79	0.73
2009 INTENT Prior	0.45	0.33	-0.61**	0.07	–	–	1.46	0.98
2009 INTENT Current	0.15	0.23	-0.54**	0.07	–	–	-0.88	0.47

Note. Level one variables (SEB, ORGFOC, and Age) are centered on school means. SCHFOC is included at level two as a predictor of the slope for SEB, and is grand-mean centered. SEB = Student Externalizing Behavior, ORGFOC = perceived Organizational Focus, SCHFOC=school-level Organizational Focus. 2008 JOBSAT Prior means that the criterion variable is teacher Job Satisfaction reported in 2008 with the average student Externalizing Behavior for the teacher based on reports of student behavior by the prior year's teachers of those students. JOBSAT Current means that average student Externalizing Behavior is based on the instant teacher's own ratings. 2009 means that Job Satisfaction is measured in 2009. INTENT means that teacher Intent to Quit is the criterion variable.

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

Table 6

Criterion Variance (σ^2) Associated with Level-One Covariates Individually and with the Full Level-One Model

Model and Criterion	SEB u_1	ORGFOC u_2	Age u_3	Full Level-One model
2008 JOBSAT Prior	2.66%	39.10%	2.50%	40.10%
2008 JOBSAT Current	3.54%	38.38%	2.19%	40.91%
2009 JOBSAT Prior	3.15%	45.27%	0.09%	45.72%
2009 JOBSAT Current	6.99%	35.66%	2.56%	44.29%
2009 INTENT Prior	6.78%	19.78%	–	24.73%
2009 INTENT Current	2.06%	12.17%	–	15.54%

Note. Proportion of σ^2 accounted for by each predictor = $(\sigma^2_{unconditional} - \sigma^2_{X_{..}}) / \sigma^2_{unconditional}$. Proportion of σ^2 accounted for by Level-1 Model = $(\sigma^2_{unconditional} - \sigma^2_{LevelOne}) / \sigma^2_{unconditional}$. SEB = Student Externalizing Behavior, ORGFOC = perceived Organizational Focus. 2008 JOBSAT Prior means that the criterion variable is teacher Job Satisfaction reported in 2008 with the average student Externalizing Behavior for the teacher based on reports of student behavior by the prior year's teachers of those students. JOBSAT Current means that average student Externalizing Behavior is based on the instant teacher's own ratings. 2009 means that Job Satisfaction is measured in 2009. INTENT means that teacher Intent to Quit is the criterion variable.

Table 7

Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ρ)of Job Satisfaction and Intent to Quit and Percent of Between-School Variance (τ) Explained by School-Level Organizational Focus

Model and Criterion	ICC	SCHFOC
2008 JOBSAT Prior	17.5%	68.8%
2008 JOBSAT Current	19.4%	66.7%
2009 JOBSAT Prior	19.3%	87.4%
2009 JOBSAT Current	18.5%	78.4%
2009 INTENT Prior	10.3%	74.4%
2009 INTENT Current	8.6%	67.8%

Note. $\rho = \tau / (\tau + \sigma^2)$. Proportion of τ explained = $(\tau_{LevelOne} - \tau_{Final}) / \tau_{LevelOne}$. SCHFOC=school-level Organizational Focus. 2008 JOBSAT Prior means that the criterion variable is teacher Job Satisfaction reported in 2008 with the average student Externalizing Behavior for the teacher based on reports of student behavior by the prior year's teachers of those students. JOBSAT Current means that average student Externalizing Behavior is based on the instant teacher's own ratings. 2009 means that Job Satisfaction is measured in 2009. INTENT means that teacher Intent to Quit is the criterion variable. ICC varies between same-year teacher samples because some participants lacked prior or current-year behavior ratings and were excluded.

Within-School Models

Table 1 shows that, as expected from prior literature, higher student externalizing behavior was consistently associated with lower job satisfaction, significantly so at the .05 level in three of the four within-school job satisfaction models (p=.38 for *2008 JOBSAT Current*). Student behavior was more related to job satisfaction when prior-year teacher ratings of student behavior were included than when current teacher ratings were included. *SEB* was also associated with increased teacher-reported intent to quit, though not significantly (p=.11 for prior teacher ratings, p=.37 for current teacher ratings, as seen in Table 2.) *ORGFOC*, the individual perception of a school's organizational focus, was the strongest predictor of increased *JOBSAT* and decreased *INTENT* across all samples (Tables 1 and 2). This relationship was highly

significant (p <.01) in each model. *AGE*, while a significant predictor of *JOBSAT* by itself in those four samples, it was no longer significant when included in the level-1 model with *SEB* and *ORGFOC*, with p values ranging from .19 to .69 (Table 1). *AGE* was not a significant predictor of *INTENT*, and was not included as a level-1 variable in those models. As shown in Table 6, the within-school model accounted for 40% to 46% of the total within-school variance in job satisfaction, with *ORGFOC* accounting for almost all of that variance. The within-school model predicted 25% of the variance in quitting intentions in the *2009 INTENT Prior* model and 16% of that variance in the *2009 INTENT Current* model (see Table 6).

School-Level Predictors

SCHFOC, in Tables 3 and 4, showed a significant positive relationship with mean school job satisfaction in the 2008 samples with level-1 covariates held constant about their grand means, but this result was not replicated in the 2009 sample, nor was there a significant relationship between *SCHFOC* and *INTENT*. The between-school variance in *ORGFOC* in the 2009 job satisfaction samples was nonsignificant (p>.50 for *2009 JOBSAT Prior*, p=.45 for *2009 JOBSAT Current*), so the lack of a between-school impact for *SCHFOC* is unsurprising. Whether significant or otherwise, the relationships did show the anticipated direction of the regression slopes; higher school-level focus was associated with increased job satisfaction and decreased intent to quit.

SCHFOC, in Table 5, showed no significant moderating effect on the regression slopes of *JOBSAT* and *INTENT* on *SEB* with level-1 covariates school-mean centered. When current teacher ratings of student behavior were used, the negative relationship between *JOBSAT* and *SEB* was attenuated by increased *SCHFOC*, but higher *SCHFOC* amplified that negative relationship when prior-year teacher ratings were used. A similar effect was observed with intent to quit as the dependent variable. As these moderating effects were nonsignificant across all models, these patterns do not warrant interpretation.

Chapter 5: Discussion

As proposed in Hypothesis 1, teachers' individual perceptions of their schools' focus correlated positively with their job satisfaction and negatively with their reported intent to quit (see Tables 1 and 2). These relationships were consistent across samples, with *p*-values showing significance at the .01 level in the anticipated direction for all *JOBSAT* and *INTENT* models. It is particularly noteworthy that *ORGFOC* was more predictive than *SEB* in every model for both criteria; student externalizing behavior has been found to be second only to the perception of low salary in the magnitude of its correlation with lower teacher job satisfaction and higher intent to quit (Ingersoll, 2004; NCTAF, 2007). Satisfaction with salary is not included in the TSR questionnaire, but clearly *ORGFOC* was the strongest predictor of all the variables included in these models.

Hypothesis 2 was partly supported, but not replicated across both years' samples. School-level organizational focus, with level-1 predictors controlled for through grand mean centering, significantly predicted an increase in *JOBSAT* for the 2008 samples, but showed no significant effect in the 2009 samples for *JOBSAT* or *INTENT* (see Tables 3 and 4). The between-group *JOBSAT* models differed between 2008 and 2009 samples because, unlike in the 2008 models, the residual terms for *ORGFOC* and *SEB* were nonsignificant at level 2 of the 2009 models and were excluded from the between-school models. As shown in Appendix B, Table 11, schools' focus scores were closely grouped across all samples, and between-school differences in aggregated *SCHFOC* were insufficient to observe group-level effects in the 2009 sample.

As shown in Table 5, Hypothesis 3, the proposed moderating effect of school-level focus on the regressions of teacher job satisfaction and intent to quit on student externalizing behavior, was not supported. With level-1 covariates centered on group means, the level-2 *SCHFOC* term (γ_{11}), as a predictor of *SEB*, only approached significance in the *2009 JOBSAT Prior* model (p=.08) and the *2009 INTENT Current* model (p=.07). Moderation was indicated in the *2009*

JOBSAT Current model, as the introduction of *SCHFOC* changed the *SEB* slope term from significant (p = .02) to nonsignificant (p = .13). The expected attenuation of the negative *JOBSAT/SEB* relationship was only observed (nonsignificantly) when current-year teacher ratings of student behavior were used in the models. This may imply that teachers' perceptions of school focus have a greater impact on job satisfaction related to their own perceptions of their students' behavior than on satisfaction linked to a more objective view of their students' behavior, though it might also be attributable to common error variance as an artifact of similar self-report measures (Spector, 1987). The potential for such self-report bias was the rationale for also including prior-year *SEB* ratings in the analyses, but no such adjustments were possible for the two TSR scales. While the level 2 terms were not consistently significant across samples, two-thirds or more of between-school variance in job satisfaction and intent to quit in each model was explained by the inclusion of *SCHFOC* as a predictor of the level-one intercept and the externalizing behavior slope in the final model used to assess the moderation hypothesis (see Table 7 for this calculation).

It can be reasonably expected that student behavior ratings were more homogenous within these sample schools than they might have been in a random sample of nationwide students and schools; such limited spread in a level-1 predictor increases the variability of the slope estimates, weakening power to detect effects when using slopes as model outcomes (Raudenbush & Byrk, 2002). Since externalizing behavior ratings were largely concentrated on the low end of the scale, the apparent influence of student behavior in the samples was likely restricted. For example, teacher item endorsements for the 2009 TRSB Externalizing Behavior scale, with responses of 0 ("Never/Almost Never") to 3 ("Very Often"), showed mean classroom-aggregated *SEB* scores of only .30, a standard deviation of .19, and ranged from .00 to 1.14; these figures closely resemble those of the other *JOBSAT* samples. Descriptive statistics for each scale are located in Appendix B, Table 11. High *SEB* ratings for some individual students were obscured in the aggregation of class-wide behavioral ratings; it may be that one or two students

with frequent behavior problems are enough to impact a teacher's satisfaction and intent to quit, but I did not address this possibility in my analyses.

Teacher endorsements of the Intent to Quit item were strongly skewed positive, with a mean of 1.46 on a scale of 1 ("Strongly Disagree") to 5 ("Strongly Agree"). The phrasing of the item "I intend to quit my job" may restrict teachers' interpretation and thus their response. Teachers who intend to retire, transfer, or take time off without intending to leave the profession, might not equate those decisions with quitting. Unfortunately, the intent to quit item was introduced during the final wave of data collection, so there is no follow-up information regarding which participants did indeed quit their present position. Participant attrition from the 2008 to the 2009 TSR can be inferred by identifying teachers who were included in the 2008 sample, but not 2009. However, the data do not indicate whether individuals left teaching altogether or transferred to a school outside the sample. *t*-tests found that participants who were in the TSR 2008 sample but not in the TSR 2009 sample demonstrated significantly lower job satisfaction ($p < 0.01$), lower individually perceived organizational focus ($p < 0.01$), and lower age ($p = .017$) than those in both years' samples. The consistency of these findings with the *INTENT* analyses implies that quitting intentions would relate to actual quitting behavior in this sample, but the nature of the data makes this a speculative inference.

There is an unequivocal link between job dissatisfaction and quitting intentions (Hom & Kinicki, 2001; Liu & Meyer, 2005), and turnover intentions, as one might expect, have been consistently found to be the single best predictor of turnover behavior (Mobley, 1977; Van Breukelen, Van Der Vlist, & Steensma, 2004; Richardson, Alexander, & Castleberry, 2008). In a meta-analysis of factors predicting turnover, Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner (2000) found that turnover intentions were the strongest predictor of turnover, and that of all job attitudes, satisfaction was the strongest predictor of turnover intentions. Results of the 1994-95 Teacher Follow-Up Survey showed that the largest proportion of teachers who left their jobs reported being motivated to leave by job dissatisfaction (Ingersoll, 2001). So while a teacher may plan to

leave their job for a number of circumstances, the present use of teacher job satisfaction data as part of a larger discussion of teacher turnover seems appropriate. Indeed, in the 2009 sample, job satisfaction showed a strong negative correlation with intent to quit in the sample (r = -.57 with prior year *SEB* ratings, r = -.61 with current year *SEB* ratings).

The correlations of teacher perceptions of organizational focus and the outcome variables were very high, ranging from .63 to .73 for job satisfaction and ranging from -.48 to -.42 for intent to quit. There are several possible explanations for such strong relationships. High job satisfaction can influence employees' responses regarding attitudes and perceptions of organizational characteristics (Staw, 1975), meaning that the relationship between those variables is bidirectional. Teachers who experience a lack of consistency and clarity in their school's priorities and goals may well be less satisfied as a result, and teachers who are dissatisfied with their jobs, for whatever reason, may be inclined to respond less favorably to items regarding school characteristics.

Survey design might also have played a role in the remarkably high correlation between *ORGFOC* and *JOBSAT* (and the intent to quit item of the Teacher Self-Report Job Satisfaction scale). The TSR contains nearly 100 items, not including demographic questions. Organizational Focus and Job Satisfaction scale items were presented consecutively, raising the possibility that teachers were primed by their responses to the former to respond relatedly to the latter. However, the items themselves measure constructs at different levels; job satisfaction items relate to individual attitudes and organizational focus items relate to perceptions of the school as a whole (scale items can be found in Appendix C, Tables 17-20). The Organizational Focus questions originate from a theory of work environments, and the items do not reference personal satisfaction (Gottfredson & Holland, 1996). Furthermore, these correlations mirror those found between the Organizational Focus Scale and a measure of teacher morale in an earlier study (r =.84; Gottfredson, 2000). As such, it seems unlikely that the layout of the present survey, even if it did contribute to the strength of the correlations, explains these significant results.

By assessing organizational focus as a moderator of the relationship between student behavior and job satisfaction, I have attempted to contextualize one way in which focus positively influences job satisfaction. However, there are other potentially important contexts that may limit that beneficial relationship. For example, when considering the value of having goals and expressing them consistently, it is important to also consider who determines the goals, how they determine the goals, and the amount of input given to those who are asked to pursue them. The American Federation of Teachers (1997) found that elementary school teachers who felt they had control over how their classroom met its goals expressed significantly higher levels of job satisfaction. Teachers who elect to transfer or quit often cite having too little professional autonomy as a motivation for their choices (Chapman & Hutcheson, 1982; Ingersoll, 2001; Boyd et al, 2011). While role clarity is important for the reasons discussed above, teachers also value dialogue with school administration in the formation of roles and goals (Richardson, Alexander, & Castleberry, 2008). It is important for workers to know what they should do be doing to meet goals and how their efforts fit into their organization's overall success, while also feeling independent to perform their duties in the ways they think best, if they are to be motivated and satisfied by their jobs (Hackman, et al., 1975). Finding an optimal balance, if it exists, would inform when and how hypothetical organization focus-oriented school interventions could be introduced and implemented.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

School work environments and community characteristics are likely to limit the generalizability of this study. Samples in this study come from a large randomized control trial investigating the efficacy of an extensive team-based academic and behavioral problem-solving program. Presumably, a school that self-selects into such a study has a relatively high level of structure and stability, or at least school leadership believes that to be the case. Present study data, while useful for these analyses, suggests that these schools are high-functioning; job satisfaction ratings were substantially concentrated at the high end of the possible range, as were

organizational focus ratings, and student problem behavior ratings were similarly concentrated at the low end (see Appendix B, Table 11). Meaningful between-school variance was found in the variables of interest, but the observed relationships between variables may be underestimated in this dataset, or may not be observed in schools with higher levels of conduct problems, less clarity and consistency regarding goals and expectations, or lower job satisfaction and retention.

The school system used in the survey sample lies within a relatively high-income county. The median household income for the county during the years of data collection was roughly ninety percent higher than the national average and fifty percent higher than the state average (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). While these figures do not account for the relative cost of living, they may portend a lack of generalizability to areas where turnover prevention would be most needed. On the whole, teachers tend to leave schools in lower income areas much more than they leave those in higher income areas (Hanushek, 2004; Loeb et al., 2005). It is unlikely that high county-wide income is evenly distributed between all areas and communities in which schools are located, and the inclusion of a community affluence variable at level 2 would have better informed the expectation of how the models might be similar or different across settings. Findings in the current study need to be replicated in communities with a different economic profile, or in a more nationally representative sample, if they are to be considered robust.

The comparison of two years' samples provided much more information than would have been found using only one. By replicating, or failing to replicate, the significant findings of each sample within the same large sample of schools, the limitation of low variance became more apparent. School-level focus did show the hypothesized positive relationship with teacher satisfaction in one year's sample, but there was too little difference between schools to expect a significant relationship in the other year's sample, which calls into question the likelihood that the significant findings from the one sample are sturdy enough to consider the question to have been authoritatively answered. Further research needs to include a broader array of school environments.

The most compelling results of this study were the very strong and consistent positive relationship between individual perceptions of organizational focus and job satisfaction and the very strong negative relationship between those perceptions and reported intent to quit. Individual perceptions of school focus were much more predictive of satisfaction than demographic characteristics or student problem behavior. Overall, results of this study reinforce preliminary findings linking increased school focus to increased teacher morale, evaluations of administrative leadership, classroom orderliness, and school safety (Gottfredson, 2000). However, little other literature presently exists regarding focus as a characteristic of schools. There are other characteristics of school environments (teacher collaboration, teacher mentoring relationships, and student academic achievement, to name a few) that could theoretically interact with organizational focus regarding teacher satisfaction and retention.

There is too little existing information to assert whether the development of formalized school focus interventions might lead to improvements in related teacher perceptions, teacher job satisfaction, or teacher retention. Analogous programs targeting clarity and consistency in student conduct expectations and consequences have been shown to effectively reduce classroom disorder (Gottfredson, 1987; Gottfredson, Gottfredon, & Hybl, 1993). School staff worked together through cooperative planning, problem-solving, and decision-making to establish regular rules and predictable responses to rule infractions or adherence. When well-implemented, students reported more orderly classrooms and teachers reported improved student behavior. It seems reasonable to expect that similarly cooperative efforts between teachers and administrators to establish clearly understood staff priorities and expectations could increase teacher morale and school functioning. Ultimately, any such programmatic interventions will need to be evaluated experimentally, beyond the correlational results reported so far, but in an era of numerous and often conflicting role demands for teachers, I imagine nearly any hypothetical increase in teacher-administration communication and agreement to be positive.

Contextualizing how and where efforts to increase organizational focus may be most effective is necessary if this study is to lead to practical applications. My intent was to investigate one possible relationship through which school focus leads to positive teacher outcomes; while the hypothesis that focus may buffer the deleterious effects of student problem behaviors on teacher job satisfaction was not supported in these samples, present findings on the whole suggest that school focus is an important and potentially beneficial topic for further investigation.

Appendices

Appendix A: Samples and Response Rates

Table 8

Teacher-Reported Demographic Data by Cohort

	AGE	SEX	ETHNICITY				
Teacher Sample	M Years (SD)	% Female (%Male)	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	%Asian American	%American Indian
2007-2008	39.14 (12.08)	89.2 (10.8)	88.0	8.2	2.4	0.9	0.2
2008-2009	39.98 (11.83)	88.0 (12.0)	83.3	9.8	3.0	1.2	0.2

Note. 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 refer to the school years during which teacher responses were collected.

Table 9

N Students per Teacher and N Teachers per School by Teacher Report on Student Behavior (TRSB) Cohort

Sample Cohort	Students per Teacher		Teachers per School	
	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD
TRSB 2007, Grades 2-4	22.33	3.46	13.39	3.42
TRSB 2008, Grades 2-4	22.09	4.06	13.51	3.63
TRSB 2008, Grades 3-5	22.81	4.09	12.89	3.66
TRSB 2009, Grades 3-5	23.30	3.68	12.50	3.81

Note. TRSB 2007, Grades 2-4 refers to student behavioral ratings for students in 2nd through 4th grade that were collected in the school year ending in 2007.

Table 10

Response Rates and Missing Item Percentages for Teacher Self-Report (TSR) and Teacher Report on Student Behavior (TRSB)

Scale	2006-2007		2007-2008		2008-2009	
	Response Rate	Missing Items	Response Rate	Missing Items	Response Rate	Missing Items
Teacher Self-Report (TSR)	—	—	88.4%	0.20%	83.9%	0.65%
Teacher Report on Student Behavior (TRSB)	95.8%	0.33%	92.9%	0.34%	92.9%	0.28%

Note. 2006-2007, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 refer to the school years during which teacher responses were collected.

Appendix B: Descriptive Statistics

Table 11

Descriptive Values for Outcome and Predictor Variables

Model and	JOBSAT/INTENT		SEB		ORGFOC		SCHFOC	
	MEAN (SD)	MAX (MIN)	MEAN (SD)	MAX (MIN)	MEAN (SD)	MAX (MIN)	MEAN (SD)	MAX (MIN)
2008 JOBSAT Prior	4.20 (0.85)	5.00 (1.00)	0.30 (0.15)	0.99 (0.03)	3.38 (0.55)	4.00 (1.29)	3.37 (0.25)	3.87 (2.71)
2008 JOBSAT Current	4.19 (0.85)	5.00 (1.25)	0.32 (0.20)	1.23 (0.02)	3.38 (0.55)	4.00 (1.29)	3.37 (0.25)	3.87 (2.71)
2009 JOBSAT Prior	4.22 (0.74)	5.00 (1.00)	0.32 (0.15)	0.87 (0.07)	3.35 (0.58)	4.00 (1.29)	3.35 (0.34)	3.90 (2.36)
2009 INTENT Prior	1.46 (0.78)	5.00 (1.00)	–	–	–	–	–	–
2009 JOBSAT Current	4.22 (0.73)	5.00 (1.33)	0.30 (0.19)	1.14 (0.00)	3.35 (0.56)	4.00 (1.57)	3.36 (0.33)	3.90 (2.46)
2009 INTENT Current	1.46 (0.76)	5.00 (1.00)	–	–	–	–	–	–

Note. SEB = Student Externalizing Behavior, ORGFOC = perceived Organizational Focus, SCHFOC=school-level Organizational Focus. 2008 JOBSAT Prior means that the criterion variable is teacher Job Satisfaction reported in 2008 with the average student Externalizing Behavior for the teacher based on reports of student behavior by the prior year's teachers of those students. JOBSAT Current means that average student Externalizing Behavior is based on the instant teacher's own ratings. 2009 means that Job Satisfaction is measured in 2009. INTENT means that teacher Intent to Quit is the criterion variable. Predictor values are identical for 2009 INTENT and 2009 JOBSAT samples, and do not appear in this table to avoid redundancy.

Table 12

Standardized Zero-Order Coefficients of Level-One Covariates with Job Satisfaction and Intent to Quit

Model and Criterion	SEB β_{1j}	ORGFOC β_{2j}	AGE β_{3j}
2008 JOBSAT Prior	-0.23**	0.64**	0.15**
2008 JOBSAT Current	-0.15**	0.63**	0.14**
2009 JOBSAT Prior	-0.12*	0.73**	0.12*
2009 JOBSAT Current	-0.26**	0.64**	0.12*
2009 INTENT Prior	0.10*	-0.48**	–
2009 INTENT Current	0.10*	-0.42**	–

Note. Level-one covariates were regressed on outcome variables one at a time to calculate zero-order coefficients. SEB = Student Externalizing Behavior, ORGFOC = perceived Organizational Focus. 2008 JOBSAT Prior means that the criterion variable is teacher Job Satisfaction reported in 2008 with the average student Externalizing Behavior for the teacher based on reports of student behavior by the prior year's teachers of those students. JOBSAT Current means that average student Externalizing Behavior is based on the instant teacher's own ratings. 2009 means that Job Satisfaction is measured in 2009. INTENT means that teacher Intent to Quit is the criterion variable.

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

Appendix C: Measures and Reliabilities

Prompts and example items are included for each scale, with all items included in the tables.

TEACHER REPORT ON STUDENT BEHAVIOR
EXTERNALIZING BEHAVIOR SCALE

Please describe the student whose name appears on the form by telling us how much each statement describes his or her usual behavior in your classroom in the **past month**.

	Never/ Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
Defies teacher or other school personnel	0	1	2	3

Table 13

Teacher Report on Student Behavior Externalizing Behavior Scale: Items and Reliability, 2006-2007, Grades 2-4

Item	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation (R^2)	Alpha if Item Deleted
Defies teacher or other school personnel	.73	.57	.87
Argues or quarrels with others	.74	.57	.87
Teases or taunts others	.78	.63	.87
Takes other's property without permission	.56	.33	.89
Is physically aggressive or fights with others	.58	.37	.89
Gossips or spreads rumors	.56	.40	.89
Is disruptive	.72	.59	.88
Breaks rules	.77	.65	.87

Note. Alpha = .893; *M* = .304; *SD* = .138

Table 14

Teacher Report on Student Behavior Externalizing Behavior Scale: Items and Reliability, 2007-2008, Grades 2-4

Item	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation (R^2)	Alpha if Item Deleted
Defies teacher or other school personnel	.74	.58	.89
Argues or quarrels with others	.75	.59	.89
Teases or taunts others	.80	.66	.88
Takes other's property without permission	.58	.36	.90
Is physically aggressive or fights with others	.65	.45	.90
Gossips or spreads rumors	.59	.43	.89
Is disruptive	.74	.61	.89
Breaks rules	.79	.68	.88

Note. Alpha = .903; *M* = .322; *SD* = .145

Table 15

Teacher Report on Student Behavior Externalizing Behavior Scale: Items and Reliability, 2007-2008, Grades 3-5

Item	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation (R^2)	Alpha if Item Deleted
Defies teacher or other school personnel	.76	.61	.89
Argues or quarrels with others	.75	.58	.89
Teases or taunts others	.80	.67	.89
Takes other's property without permission	.61	.40	.91
Is physically aggressive or fights with others	.66	.46	.90
Gossips or spreads rumors	.61	.44	.90
Is disruptive	.73	.61	.90
Breaks rules	.80	.68	.89

Note. Alpha = .907; *M* = .330; *SD* = *.141*

Table 16

Teacher Report on Student Behavior Externalizing Behavior Scale: Items and Reliability, 2008-2009, Grades 3-5

Item	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation (R^2)	Alpha if Item Deleted
Defies teacher or other school personnel	.73	.58	.88
Argues or quarrels with others	.74	.57	.88
Teases or taunts others	.78	.64	.88
Takes other's property without permission	.57	.36	.90
Is physically aggressive or fights with others	.60	.38	.90
Gossips or spreads rumors	.60	.44	.89
Is disruptive	.73	.59	.88
Breaks rules	.78	.65	.88

Note. Alpha = .898; *M* = .298; *SD* = .130

TEACHER SELF-REPORT SURVEY
ORGANIZATIONAL FOCUS SCALE

Please mark your answers by indicating how well each statement describes your school.

	False	Mostly False	Mostly True	True
Rules and procedures are often ignored in this school.	1	2	3	4

Table 17

Teacher Self-Report Survey Organizational Focus Scale: Items and Reliability, 2007-2008

Item	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation (R^2)	Alpha if Item Deleted
Rules and procedures are often ignored in this school.[a]	.55	.31	.90
Rules and operating procedures are clear and explicit in this school.	.67	.46	.88
My school has a clear focus.	.80	.83	.87
The goals of this school are clear.	.81	.84	.87
There are clear performance expectations for faculty and staff.	.81	.68	.87
Everyone in this school understands what behaviors will be rewarded.	.66	.44	.89
People have often said that it is difficult to decide what goals to work towards in this school.[a]	.64	.42	.89

Note. Alpha = .896; *M* = 3.363; *SD* = .122. [a] = Item is reverse scored.

Table 18

Teacher Self-Report Survey Organizational Focus Scale: Items and Reliability, 2008-2009

Item	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation (R^2)	Alpha if Item Deleted
Rules and procedures are often ignored in this school.[a]	.62	.39	.89
Rules and operating procedures are clear and explicit in this school.	.70	.52	.88
My school has a clear focus.	.80	.80	.87
The goals of this school are clear.	.79	.79	.87
There are clear performance expectations for faculty and staff.	.76	.61	.87
Everyone in this school understands what behaviors will be rewarded.	.70	.54	.88
People have often said that it is difficult to decide what goals to work towards in this school.[a]	.54	.30	.90

Note. Alpha = .89; M = 3.36; SD = .11; [a] = Item is reverse scored.

TEACHER SELF-REPORT SURVEY
JOB SATISFACTION SCALE

Please mark your answers by indicating how well each statement describes your school.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I like working in this school.	1	2	3	4	5

Table 19

Teacher Self-Report Survey Job Satisfaction Scale: Items and Reliability, 2007-2008

Item	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation (R^2)	Alpha if Item Deleted
I like working in this school.	.89	.79	.90
I would recommend this school to parents seeking a school for their child.	.82	.69	.92
I usually look forward to each day working in this school.	.81	.66	.92
I feel loyal to this school.	.84	.72	.91

Note. Alpha = .93; *M* = 4.15; *SD* = .11

Table 20

Teacher Self-Report Survey Job Satisfaction Scale: Items and Reliability, 2008-2009

Item	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation (R^2)	Alpha if Item Deleted
I like working in this school.	.83	.73	.89
I would recommend this school to parents seeking a school for their child.	.70	.56	.91
I usually look forward to each day working in this school.	.80	.72	.90
I feel loyal to this school.	.77	.64	.90
I love my job.	.79	.71	.90
My job provides a feeling of accomplishment.	.70	.50	.91
I intend to quit my job.[abc]	—	—	—

Note. Alpha = .92; *M* = 4.23; *SD* = .09. [a] = Item is reverse scored. [b] = Item removed for separated analysis. [c] Intent to quit: *M* = 1.45; *SD* = .77

Bibliography

Abramis, D. J. (1994). Work role ambiguity, job satisfaction, and job performance: Meta-analyses and review. *Psychological Reports, 75,* 1411-1433.

Achenbach, T.M. (1991). *Manual for the Child Behavior Checklist/4-18 and 1991 Profile.* Burlington: University of Vermont, Department of Psychiatry.

American Federation of Teachers. (1997). *Job satisfaction among America's teachers: Effects of workplace conditions, background characteristics, and teacher compensation.* Retrieved March 30, 2011 from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs97/97471.pdf.

Ajzen, I. 1991. The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50,* 179-211.

Aritomi, P. & Coopersmith, J. (2009). *Characteristics of public school districts in the United States: Results from the 2007-08 Schools and Staffing Survey* (NCES 2009-320, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Aud, S., Hussar, W., Johnson, F., Kena, G., Roth, E., Manning, E., Wang, X., and Zhang, J. (2012). *The Condition of Education 2012.* U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC. Retrieved March 25, 2013 from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch.

Baraldi, A. N., & Enders, C. K. (2010). An introduction to modern missing data analysis. *Journal of School Psychology, 48,* 5-37.

Bempah, E. O., Kaylen, M. S., Osburn, D. D., & Birkenholz, R. J. (1994). An econometric analysis of teacher mobility. *Economics of Education Review, 13,* 69-77.

Bierlein, L. A. 1993. *Controversial issues in education policy*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Borman, G. D., & Dowling, N. M. (2008). Teacher attrition and retention: a meta-analytic and narrative review of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 78,* 367-409.

Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Ing, M., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2011). The influence of school administrators on teacher retention decisions. *American Educational Research Journal, 48,* 303-333.

Boykin, A. W., Tyler, K. M., Watkins-Lewis, K. M., & Kizzie, K. (2006). Culture in the sanctioned classroom practices of elementary school teachers serving low-income African American students. *Journal of Education of Students Placed At-Risk, 11,* 161–173.

Breaugh, J. A. & Colihan, J. P. (1994). Measuring facets of job ambiguity: Construct validity evidence. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79,* 191-202.

Capps, R., Fix, M., Murray, J., Ost, J., Passel, J. S., & Herwantoro, S. (2005). *The New Demography of America's Schools: Immigration and the No Child Left Behind Act.* Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Chapman, D., & Hutcheson, S. (1982). Attrition from teaching careers: A discriminant analysis. *American Education Research Journal, 19,* 93-105.

Conley, S., & Woosley, S. (2000). Teacher role stress, higher order needs and work outcomes. *Journal of Educational Administration, 38,* 179-201.

Conley, S., & You, S. (2009). Teacher role stress, satisfaction, commitment, and intentions to leave: A structural model. *Psychological Reports, 105,* 771-786.

Enders, C.K., & Tofighi, D. (2007). Centering predictor variables in cross-sectional multilevel models: A new look at an old issue. *Psychological Methods, 12,* 121-138.

Farkas, G. (2003). Racial disparities and discrimination in education: What do we know, how do we know it, and what do we need to know? *Teachers College Record, 105,* 1119-1146.

Farkas, S., Johnson, J., & Foleno, T. (2000). *A sense of calling: Who teaches and why*. New York: Public Agenda. Retrieved August 19th, 2012 from http://www.publicagenda.org/files/pdf/sense_of_calling.pdf

Friedman, I. A. (1991). High- and Low-Burnout Schools: School Culture Aspects of Teacher Burnout. *Journal of Educational Research, 84,* 325-333.

Friedman, L. (1995). Student behavior patterns contributing to teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Research, 88,* 281-289.

Gottfredson, D. C. (1987). An evaluation of an organization development approach to reducing school disorder. *Evaluation Review, 11,* 739-763.

Gottfredson, D. C., Gottfredson, G. D., & Hybl, L. G. (1993). Managing adolescent behavior: A multiyear, multischool study. *American Educational Research Journal, 30,* 179-215.

Gottfredson, G. D., & Holland, J. L. (1996b). *Organizational focus questionnaire.* Ellicott City, MD: Gottfredson Associates, Inc.

Gottfredson, G. D. (2000, August). *Environmental Focus in a Large National Sample of Schools.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Gresham, F. M. & Elliott, S. N. (1990). *Social Skills Rating System Manual.* Circle Pines: American Guidance Service.

Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Updates, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management, 26,* 463-488.

Griffith, J. (2006). A compositional analysis of the organizational climate-performance relation: Public schools as organizations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36,* 1848-1880.

Grissmer, D. W., & Kirby, S. N. (1997). Teacher turnover and teacher quality. *Teachers College Record, 99,* 45–56.

Guarino, C. M, Santibañez, L., & Daley, G. A. (2006). Teacher recruitment and retention: A review of the recent empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research 76,* 173–208.

Guin, K. (2004, August 16). Chronic teacher turnover in urban elementary schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 12.* Retrieved September 21st, 2012 from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v12n42/.

Hackman, J. R., Oldham, G. R., Janson, R., & Purdy, K. (1975). A new strategy for job enrichment. *California Management Review, 17,* 57-71.

Hanushek, E. A., Kain, J. F., & Rivkin, S. G. (2004). Why public schools lose teachers. *Journal of Human Resources, 39,* 326-354.

Hargreaves, A. (2000). Four ages of professionalism and professional learning. *Teachers and Teaching: History and Practice, 6,* 151-182.

Harris, D. N., & Adams, S. (2007). Understanding the level and causes of teacher turnover: A comparison with other professions. *Economics of Education Review, 26,* 325–337.

Hastings, R. P., & Bham, M. S. (2003). The relationship between student behavior and patterns of teacher burnout. *School Psychology International, 24,* 115-127.

Hausknecht, J. P., Hiller, N.J., & Vance, R. J. (2008). Work-unit absenteeism: effects of satisfaction, commitment, labor market conditions, and time. *Academy of Management Journal, 50,* 953-968.

Hernandez, D. J. (2004). Demographic change and the life circumstances of immigrant families. *Future of Children, 14,* 17-47.

Holland, J. L. (1997). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments (3rd Ed.)*. Odessa, FL: PAR, Inc.

Hom, P. W. & Kinicki, A. J. (2001). Toward a greater understanding of how dissatisfaction drives employee turnover. *Academy of Management Journal, 44,* 975-987.

Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Van Keer, H. (2011). The relation between school leadership from a distributed perspective and teachers' organizational commitment: Examining the source of the leadership function. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 47,* 728-771.

Ingersoll, R. M. (1995a). *Teacher supply, teacher qualifications and teacher turnover*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: an organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal, 38,* 499-534.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2003). *Is there really a teacher shortage?* Seattle: University of Washington, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2004). Why do high-poverty schools have difficulty staffing their classrooms with qualified teachers? Retrieved June 13, 2012, from http://www.americanprogress.org/kf/ingersoll-final.pdf.

Ingersoll, R.M. and May, H. (2011). Recruitment, Retention and the Minority Teacher Shortage. Consortium for Policy Research in Education. CPRE Research Report #RR-69.

Judge, T. A. & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2012). Job attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology, 63,* 341-367.

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Kane, T. J., Rockoff, J. E., & Staiger, D. O. (2008). What does certification tell us about teacher effectiveness? Evidence from New York City. *Economics of Education Review, 27,* 615-631.

Kearney, J. E. (2008). Factors affecting satisfaction and retention of African America and European American teachers in an urban school district: Implications for building and maintaining teachers employed in school districts across the nation. *Education and Urban Society, 40,* 613-627.

Keigher, A. (2010). *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the 2008-09 Teacher Follow-Up Survey* (NCES 2010-353, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Kelly, S. (2004). An event history analysis of teacher attrition: Salary, teacher tracking, and socially disadvantaged schools. *Journal of Experimental Education, 72,* 195-220.

King, L. A. & King, D. W. (1990). Role conflict and role ambiguity: A critical assessment of construct validity. *Psychological Bulletin, 107,* 48-64.

Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher Stress: directions for future research. *Educational Review, 53,* 27-35.

Landers, E., Alter, P., & Servilio, K. (2008). Students' challenging behavior and teachers' job satisfaction. *Beyond Behavior, 18,* 26-33.

Leithwood, K., & McAdie, P. (2007). Teaching working conditions that matter. *Education Canada, 47,* 47-72.

Liu, X. X., & Meyer, J. P. (2005). Teachers' perspective of their jobs: A multilevel analysis of the Teacher Follow-Up Survey for 1994-95. *Teachers College Record, 107,* 985-1003.

Loeb, S., Darling-Hammond, L, & Luczak, J. (2005). How teaching conditions predict teacher turnover in California schools. *Peabody Journal of Education, 80,* 44-70.

Ma, X., & MacMillan, R. B. (1999). Influences of workplace conditions on teachers' job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Research, 93,* 39-47.

Marvel, J., Lyter, D. M., Peltola, P., Strizek, G. A., and Morton, B. A. (2006). *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the 2004–05 Teacher Follow-Up Survey* (NCES 2007–307, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics).Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

McCarthy, C. J., Lambert, R. G., O'Donnell, M., & Melendres, L. T. (2009). The relation of elementary teachers' experience, stress, and coping resources to burnout symptoms. *Elementary School Journal, 109,* 282-300.

Miller, J. (2006, August 27). School is out: Teacher turnover is costing schools a fortune and kids a good education, says Harvard professor Susan Moore Johnson. *The Boston Globe*, p.11.

Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 62,* 237-240.

Mobley, W. H., Horner, S. O., & Hollingsworth, A. T. (1978). An evaluation of precursors of hospital employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 62,* 237-240.

Montgomery, C. (2005). A Meta-Analysis for Exploring the Diverse Causes and Effects of Stress in Teachers. *Canadian Journal of Education, 28,* 458-486.

Murnane, R., Singer, J., Willett, J., Kemple, J., Olsen, R., (Eds.). (1991). *Who will teach? Policies that matter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2007). *The high cost of teacher turnover*. Washington, DC: Author.

Newmann, F., Rutter, R., & Smith, M. (1989). Organizational factors that affect school sense of efficacy, community and expectations. *Sociology of Education, 62,* 221-238.

Papastylianou, A., Kaila, M., Polychronopoulus, M. (2009). Teachers' burnout, depression, role ambiguity, and conflict. *Social Psychology of Education, 12,* 295-314.

Pascarella, P., and & Frohman, M. A. (1989). *The purpose-driven organization: Unleashing the power of direction and commitment.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Perdue, S. V., Reardon, R. C., & Peterson, G. W. (2007) Person-environment congruence, self-efficacy, and environmental identity in relation to job satisfaction: A career decision theory perspective. *Journal of Employment Counseling, 44,* 29-38.

Perkins, P. E., & Hightower, A. D. (2002). *T-CRS 2.1 Teacher-Child Rating scale: Examiner's Manual.* Rochester, NY: Children's Institute.

Perry, B., & Hayes, K. (2011). The effect of a new teacher induction program on new teacher program on new teachers' reported teacher goals for excellence, mobility, and retention rates. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 6,* 1-12.

Petersen, W. O. 1997, February. *Principals' values: Coming to shared purposes through a values-laden sense of identity?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Education Research Association, Hilton Head, SC.

Podgursky, M., Monroe, R., & Watson, D. (2004). The academic quality of public school teachers: An analysis of entry and exit behavior. *Economics of Education Review, 23,* 507-518.

Raudenbush, S. W., & Byrk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ravitch, D. (2010). *The death and life of the great American school system: How testing and choice are undermining education.* New York: Basic Books.

Reyes, P., & Imber, M. (1992). Teachers' perceptions of the fairness of their workload and their commitment, job satisfaction, and morale: Implications for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 5,* 291-301.

Richardson, B. K., Alexander, A., Castleberry, T. (2008). Examining teacher turnover in low-performing, multi-cultural schools: Relationships among emotional labor, communication symmetry, and intent to leave. *Communication Research Reports, 25,* 10-22.

Rivkin, E. A., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. *Econometrica, 73,* 417-458.

Sanders, W. L., & Rivers, J. C. (1996). *Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student academic achievement.* Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Center. Retrieved December 6, 2012, from http://www.cgp.upenn.edu/pdf/Sanders_Rivers-TVASS_teacher%20effects.pdf.

Schaufeli, W. B. & Buunk, B. P. (2003). Burnout: An overview of 25 years of research in theorizing. In M. J. Schabracq, J. A. M. Winnubst, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.). *The handbook of work and health psychology,* 383-425. Chichester: Wiley.

Sergiovanni, T. J. 1992. *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shen, J. (1997c). Teacher retention and attrition in public school: Evidence from SASS91. *Journal of Educational Research, 91,* 81-88.

Shen, J., Leslie, J. M., Spybrook, J. K., & Ma, X. (2012). Are principal background and school processes related to teacher job satisfaction? A multilevel study using Schools and Staffing Survey 2003-04. *American Educational Research Journal, 49,* 200-230.

Shields, P. M., Humphrey, D. C., Wechsler, M. E., Riel, L. M., Tiffany-Morales, J., Woodworth, K., Young, V. M., & Price, T. (2001). *The status of the teaching profession, 2001.* Santa Cruz, CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.

Shipp, V. H. (1999). Factors influencing the career choices of African American collegians: Implications for minority teacher recruitment. *The Journal of Negro Education, 68,* 343-351.

Smart, J. C., & Thompson, M. D. (2001). The environmental identity scale and differentiation among environmental models in Holland's theory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58,* 436-452.

Spector, P. E. (1987). Method variance as an artifact in self-reported affect and perceptions at work: Myth or significant problem? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72,* 438-443.

Staw, B. M. (1975). Attribution of the "causes" of performance: A new alternative interpretation of cross-sectional research on organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13,* 414-432.

Stinebrickner, T. R. (1998). An empirical investigation of teacher attrition. *Economics of Educational Review, 17,* 127-136.

Stinebrickner, T. R. (2002). An analysis of occupational change and departure from the labor force: Evidence of the reasons that teachers leave. *Journal of Human Resources, 37,* 192-216.

Stockard, J., & Lehman, M. (2004). Influences on the satisfaction and retention of 1st-year teachers: The importance of effective school management. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40,* 742-771.

Theobald, N. (1990). An examination of the influence of personal, professional and school district characteristics on public school teacher retention. *Economics of Education Review, 9,* 241-250.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2012, July 1). *State & county Quickfacts*. Retrieved January 25, 2013, from http://quickfacts.census.gov.

Vail, K. (2005). Create great school climate. *Education Digest, 71,* 4-11.

Valli, L. & Buese, D. (2007). The changing roles of teachers in an era of high-stakes accountability. *American Educational Research Journal, 44,* 519-558.

Van Breukelen, W., Van Der Vlist, R., & Steensma, H. (2004). Voluntary employee turnover: Combing variables from the 'traditional' turnover literature with the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25,* 893-914.

Weiss, E. (1999). Perceived workplace conditions and first-year teachers' morale, career choice commitment, and planned retention: A secondary analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 15,* 861-879.

Werthamer-Larsson, L., Kellam, S., & Wheeler, L. (1991). Effect of first-grade classroom environment on shy behavior, aggressive behavior, and concentration problems. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 19,* 585-602.