AN ANALYSIS OF JOB SATISFACTION FOR SPECIAL EDUCATORS WHO

INSTRUCT STUDENTS WITH EMOTIONAL/BEHAVIORAL DISORDERS:

HOW WORKING CONDITIONS IMPACT COMMITMENT

Beverly Adkins, BS, MEd

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

August 2009

APPROVED:

Lyndal M. Bullock, Major Professor
Jane B. Huffman, Minor Professor
Bertina Combes, Committee Member
Lloyd Kinnison, Committee Member
Jon Young, Interim Chair of the Department of
        Educational Psychology
Jerry Thomas, Dean of the College of
        Education
Michael Monticino, Dean of the Robert B.
        Toulouse School of Graduate Studies

Adkins, Beverly. <u>An analysis of job satisfaction for special educators who instruct students with emotional/behavioral disorders: How working conditions impact commitment</u>. Doctor of Philosophy (Special Education), August 2009, 73 pp., 12 tables, references, 146 titles.

Teachers of students with emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD) find that myriad concerns for effective teaching (e.g., salaries, increased paperwork, classroom management) challenge their ability to meet personal and professional needs. The push for certified teachers and limited training to work with students with special needs create stressors that can prohibit effective teaching in the workplace. Teacher moral drops and half of newly hired employees leave the profession. Equally important, student outcomes are affected. Demographic information, program practices, and commitment information from special education teachers across the country were examined in this study. These areas of study helped to determine the best indicators for teacher job satisfaction and barriers that threaten satisfactory working conditions. An online survey was designed to capture 29 areas to explore qualifications and working environments for these teachers. Of the 600 targeted teachers, 332 individuals participated in Likert-like scales to determine their degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction for working conditions, use of intervention strategies, and areas of commitment. Closed-ended and multiple-choice questions were used. Descriptive analyses and tables aided in understanding this study. The resulting factors indicated that, although some respondents pointed to job dissatisfaction within the subset of questions, participants who worked for more than 6 years were less likely to vacate their positions than teachers working for less than six years.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am thankful for everyone who encouraged me over the past few years. I, especially, owe a great debt to Dr. Lyndal M. Bullock, my major professor, for his patience and facilitatory efforts that made this study possible. I am indebted to my mother, Lena Aldridge, for her support, to my son, Stephen, for his inspiration, and to God, in Whom I place my trust.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Background

The American job market has undergone rapid changes across many professions. Much of the growth in tight and competitive organizations, however, has occurred at the expense of employee satisfaction (Anderson, 2000; Franco & Tortorici, 2002; Munn, 1996). Pinpointing what constitutes job satisfaction or dissatisfaction can be a daunting task. Theories abound as to which factors influence how we feel about our jobs. One popular theory that has been around for a long time purports that influences for liking and disliking a job work independent of each other (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Herzberg, 1966). For example, motivating factors like challenging work, recognition, and responsibility would be intrinsic conditions to create job satisfaction. Hygienic factors like job security, salary, and fringe benefits may not necessarily lend themselves to job satisfaction, but their absence could easily result in dissatisfaction. Another position suggests that job satisfaction has to do with one's attitude toward work and how it affects desirability in the total life experience (Kalleberg, 1997). Lambert, Hogan, and Barton (2001) look at the work environment, demographic characteristics, job satisfaction, and turnover intent as the core antecedents to job dissatisfaction and leaving the workplace. They believe, specifically, that the work environment is a greater factor for turnover intent than demographic characteristics and job satisfaction is seen as a much more salient precursor for turnover intent (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Wegge, Schmidt, Parkes, & van Dick, 2007; Saaii & Judge, 2004). Nevertheless, people choose to work or vacate their jobs for many reasons, which is why researchers continue to examine how we feel about our jobs.

Many employers rarely guarantee high job satisfaction for their working members. The

1

end result is behavior responses that are characterized by absenteeism, turnover, or dissent (Ekberg, 2002; Thomas & Au, 2002). Some workers exit by transferring to other positions or quitting altogether. Some voice their working issues to discuss existing problems, suggest solutions, or seek help. Still, other workers find that they can remain loyal to their jobs, in spite of working conditions, by waiting and hoping that things will change, or trusting that employers will make things right. These go on to be productive workers (Fisher, 2000). Too many employees, unfortunately, will demonstrate a lack of interest in their jobs and neglect their positions (Thomas & Au, 2002).

A discussion of how other organizations have allowed their careerists to become at-risk for professional failure will help to understand the importance of job satisfaction for special educators who instruct students with emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD). The information that follows briefly reviews how the quickening pace of work operations has progressed in tandem with new and increased demands contributing to increased job dissatisfaction. As more and more Americans find their jobs not providing the satisfaction they once experienced, the vital energy once used for living is traded for the salaries they receive (Ekberg, 2002; Munn, 1996). This chapter, therefore, will attempt to provide an understanding of the elusive nature of job satisfaction across America's working society, beginning with a brief look at the business world and information systems organizations, the field of medicine, and other public and civic organizations to better understand what is happening to levels of job satisfaction for teachers of students with E/BD in the field of special education.

American Business and Information Systems Organizations

Job satisfaction in the business world continues to decline across many levels of the American workplace. An emerging body of evidence indicates that the amount of prestige that is

assigned to a job has a correlation to the amount of satisfaction or dissatisfaction that an employee experiences. According to the August 2004 Harris Poll cited in Del Jones' (2005) *USA Today* article, many professionals have experienced a slippage in prestige. Since 1977, lawyers were dropped in the prestige polls from 36% to 17%, priests and ministers from 41% to 32%, engineers from 34% to 29%, athletes from 26% to 21%, and journalists from 17% to 14%. Prestige, notwithstanding, employees find that bonuses, health, and pension plans are less satisfying. Both the Conference Board, Inc. and Taylor Nelson Sofres (TNS) are global information leaders in market research. They report that corporate scandals and outsourcing practices have caused employees to reflect long and hard about poor wages and job training programs (AllBusiness, 2005). Technological changes and unstable employee expectations produce an inability to connect with employers and business goals and objectives to the extent that employees find themselves dreading to go to work for the wages they earn.

Among information systems organizations, job satisfaction is declining for employees who feel left out of the corporate vision. Increased workloads, fewer career opportunities, and less training are some of the issues responsible for a corporate learning curb that spill over into negative employee attitudes (*Computerworld*, 2002; Wilde, 1994). Workers and managers, alike, report that they are missing the benefits of a healthy economy. In salaries ranging from less than $30,000 to more than $100,000 a year, job satisfaction is least found in the following areas: benefits, connecting pay to performance, telecommuting options, the physical work environment, opportunities for advancement, ability to influence decisions, use of new technologies, and access to company-sponsored training and seminars, to name a few. Not many employees are saying that they give their work every effort. Instead, they report having to struggle with more for less and having vague corporate mandates, as downsizing and

reorganization continue to increase job-related stress and lower morale (*Computerworld*, 2002; Wilde, 1994). Computer workers can easily miss the perks of a healthy economy because opportunities are not available or, at the very least, unclear. Additionally, stress reduction workshops have done little to address the problem of extended workloads, outdated skills, and training concerns. The overall stability of employment is threatened by those having the critical edge for organizational success and the backbone of competitive service (Anderson, 2000; Munn, 1996).

One recent study (Ling-Hsiu, 2008) found that jobs high in characteristics like task identity, professionalism, feedback, autonomy, and significance had high job satisfaction. Job dimensions for computer workers included self-actualization and, when given job-related feedback, job satisfaction increased. Not many computer workers, however, are experiencing jobs high in these characteristics, and similar reports are found in other professions.

Medical, Public, and Civic Organizations

Job retention and satisfaction have always been important issues for members of the medical profession. Because few medical practices have tried to understand the significance of making job satisfaction a top priority, high levels of absenteeism and how staff turnover affects temporary workers are on-going issues (Sibbald, Bojke, & Gravelle, 2003). Every aspect of the medical practice, including overall productivity, is affected by employee satisfaction. Aging and minority doctors intending to leave direct patient care rose 7% from 1998 to 2001 due to job dissatisfaction. Higher staff turnover, unhappy patients, and lower care quality were attributed to grumpy clinicians (Huff, 1997; Sibbald et al., 2003; Syptak, Marsland, & Ulmer, 1999). The Physician's Practice released the news in September 2007 that 60% of primary care physicians responding to a survey indicated that they would choose another field of employment if they

4

could do their careers over (Association of periOperative Registered Nurses, 2008). More specifically, 40% would stay in primary care, 39% would venture in more specialized fields, and 22% would not choose a medical career altogether.

The *Internal Medicine News* (Anderson, 2008) reported that some primary care physicians plan to reduce the number of patients they see or stop practicing entirely over the next three years. For 94% of these practitioners, time devoted to non-clinical paperwork has increased; 63% report that paperwork caused them to spend less time with their patients; and, 78% acknowledge that, although there is a shortage of doctors in the United States today, the field of medicine is either less or no longer rewarding. Finally, the number of graduate students enrolled in primary medical care programs is down by 1700 from 1995 to 2007, according to the U.S. Government Accountability Office (Krisberg, 2008).

As employees in the helping professions evaluate their competitive marketplace and reduced costs, experiencing job satisfaction has not been high on their list of priorities. This can be detrimental since nursing care is the closest form of medical service to patients, giving them ample opportunities to pass their concerns along to affect how many view their hospital stay. Overwhelmed feelings, sicker patients, and leaner staffs impede any organizational effort to boost job satisfaction. Longer working hours and difficulties in adjusting to large scale reorganization, new technologies, and an overall global discontent with the changing role of care professionals in our society contribute to unfulfilled areas of employment (Sibbald et al., 2003).

Newscasters and government employees are included among the many Americans who have experienced a continuous decline in job satisfaction. A quiet crisis has managed to undermine respective employees' abilities to respond to many public needs (Stone, 2002; Ting, 1997). One third of news respondents said that salaries were inadequate and half did not see

themselves advancing in their present stations. Among government workers, job satisfaction is divided between three characteristics: (a) the kind of task performed by the employee (job characteristics); (b) where the job is performed (organizational characteristics); and, (c) who performs the job (individual characteristics). Under these categories, Ting (1997) argues that job dissatisfaction for government workers can range from myriad factors including, but not limited to, a lack of perception that the work contributes to the organizational mission, lacking the desire to serve the public, more education leading to less satisfaction, and female and minority employees becoming more dissatisfied than their male and white counterparts.

Another report from TNS (Taylor Nelson Sufras, 2006) confirmed that, because civil servants did not feel valued, had poor salaries and perceptions of unfair treatment, they had lower levels of job commitment than their private sector counterparts. Many civil servants did not feel they had many development opportunities; and, although their work was interesting and socially important, some employees did not feel appreciated, which left them skeptical about the future.

Generally speaking, job satisfaction is a complex interplay of what is happening in both the personal and business life. Job satisfaction has an elusive role in understanding the nature of work longevity (Hochgraf, 1998), even though individual employees have the ultimate responsibility for their own level of satisfaction. As respondents tend to focus on different things (e.g., achievement for young employees, stability and protecting what they already have established for middle age employees, finding meaningful work and making a difference in the world for older employees) it generally appears that, at the beginning of employment, everything seems perfect. During the middle of employment, workers expand their knowledge to learn the system; and, toward the end of employment, the challenge is gone and its time to move on

(Hochgraf, 1998). The inability to maintain a happy workforce has culminated in a crisis for public and civil service in many organizational structures, including the facilitation of a public education for students with special needs.

Special Education in Public Service

The need to facilitate the needs of children and youth with disabilities through the inclusionary practices mandated by the 1990, revised 1997 and 2004 Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA Data, 2004) has exponentially expanded the roles of special and general education practitioners. Many teachers are being stretched to the limit in order to address the myriad social issues that enter into their classrooms (Lumsden, 1998). As one of many important groups in the American labor market, teachers demonstrate an increasingly professional expertise; thus, it is discomforting to discover that many teachers are dissatisfied with their jobs.

Even as complicated as job satisfaction is, gratification for educators is critical in many areas of teaching, learning, and school administration (e.g., motivation, retention, commitment, school effectiveness, school quality, student outcomes) (Bishay, 1996; Shann, 1998; Yee, 1990). It is necessary, therefore, that these areas be examined again to ascertain what is satisfying or dissatisfying to teachers who are challenged to assist students with learning differences, as well as how to manage their own behaviors.

<div align="center">Purpose</div>

The purpose of this study was to (a) conduct a review of special educators who work with students with E/BD, (b) compare and contrast their demographics (e.g., age, gender, years of service, educational background, training, personal health) against the realities of working conditions experienced in the field, (c) identify the barriers to teacher job satisfaction, and, (d)

<div align="center">7</div>

examine correlates attributed to attrition, teaching out-of-field, and retention of the teaching

workforce to gain a clearer understanding of the conditions that lead to satisfaction,

dissatisfaction, commitment, or a desire to leave the profession. Career intentions and the

relationship of the organizational structure of the school setting (e.g., type of delivery service,

adequacy of support, time available to develop curriculum, complete paperwork) were examined

to see how they were linked to teacher motivation and commitment to working conditions

(George, George, Gersten, & Grosenick, 1995). Additionally, the validity of concerns gleaned

from the existing body of literature was established.

Problem Statement

Half of special educators who instruct students with E/BD are leaving the classroom

within the first six years of their teaching assignments. Administrators and policymakers will

need to seek ways in which to improve working conditions that will retain newly recruited

professionals.

Research Questions

Fifty percent of new teachers drop out of the profession within the first five years of

practice (Croasmun, Hampton, & Herrmann, 2003; National Association of State Directors of

Special Education, 2001; Woods & Weasmer, 2002). It has become necessary, therefore, to

improve teacher job satisfaction. To this end, several research questions emerged to guide this

study. They were:

1. What are the best indicators for teacher job satisfaction?

2. What are the most commonly reported barriers to teacher job satisfaction?

3. What are special educators experiencing in their teaching assignments for which they
   are not prepared?

4. What factors encourage teachers to stay in the classroom?

5. To what extent does support play in teacher job satisfaction?

Significance

Information derived from this study may prove helpful by adding to the growing body of literature that has connected stress to the educational workplace and how teachers are affected (e.g., Borg & Riding, 1991a,1991b; Brownell, 1997; Gaziel, 1993; Greene, Beszterczey, Katzenstein, Park, & Goring, 2002; Harden, 1999; Kyriacou, 2001; Kyriacou & Harriman, 1993; Moriarty, Edmonds, Blatchford, & Martin, 2001; Pithers & Soden, 1999; Wisniewski & Gargiulo, 1997; Wrobel, 1993). This study may be able to provide qualitative and quantitative information that could benefit policymakers, administrative personnel, and interested stakeholders. Findings may, also, prove helpful to parents and teachers of students with special needs. And, since only a limited amount of research has, to-date, taken the opportunity to understand the extent to which job satisfaction impacts teacher performance and outcomes for students with special educational needs, it is hoped that this study will inspire additional research on the subject of teacher job satisfaction.

Assumption

One assumption was made from the beginning of the study. It was expected that the respondents would provide honest, forthright, and helpful answers pertinent to the study that would further qualitative and quantitative information toward the pursuit of job satisfaction in the field of special education.

Limitations

One limitation of this study was that the sample was selected from members of the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (CCBD), a division of the Council for

Exceptional Children (CEC), realizing that not all teachers of the targeted population are members of this international organization.

Delimitations

This study focused on a random selection of special education teachers who are members of the Council for Exceptional Children's Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders and were willing to participate in the study.

Definition of Terms

Some terms have been deemed necessary to the understanding of this study. Researchers have described these as:

- Attrition – a reduction in personnel resulting from teachers leaving the classroom; a component of teacher turnover from year to year (Grissmer & Kirby, 1997; National Association of State Directors of Special Education, 2001; U.S. Department of Education, 2001).

- Aversive training – stimulus that decreases the rate of probability of behavior when presented as a consequence; as such, it is a type of punishment (Goldstein, 1999; National Fair Access Coalition on Testing, 2005).

- Burnout – a work-related syndrome derived from the perception of discrepancy between effort and reward; it involves a subtle but progressive erosion of behavior, attitude, health, and spirit that interferes with the ability to function effectively at work (Berg, 1994; Friedman, 1995).

- Emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD) – exhibiting one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked degree that adversely affects educational performance: (a) an inability to learn which cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors; (b) an inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal

relationships with peers and teachers; (c) inappropriate types of behaviors or feelings under normal circumstances; (d) a general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression; or (e) a tendency to develop physical symptoms of fears associated with personal or school problems (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 1997).

- Evaluation procedures – the ongoing process of monitoring and developing a program's process toward its stated goals (George et al., 1995).

- Exit procedures – policies and procedures used to determine at what point a child is no longer in need of existing special education services (George et al., 1995).

- Individualized education program (IEP) – a blueprint for instruction and specifies the goals, procedures, and related services for an individual or eligible student (Salvia & Ysseldyke, 1998).

- In-service – refers to staff development occurring during professional practice (National Committee on Teaching and America's Future, 2003).

- Learning disabilities – a general term that refers to a heterogeneous group of disorders manifested by significant difficulties in the acquisition and use of listening, speaking, reading, writing, reasoning, or mathematical abilities; intrinsic to the individual; presumed to be due to central nervous system dysfunction; and, may occur across the life span (National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities, 1988, p.1).

- Life-space interview – a psychoeducational intervention to manage behavior in the classroom and change the behavior patterns of students, with the belief that the student is most receptive to ideas for change when she or he is in crisis (Long & Morse, 1996).

- Out-of-field teaching – when teachers are assigned to positions that do not match their training or education (Ingersoll, 2002).

- Pre-service – refers to personnel training occurring before practice in the field (CEC Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice, 1999).

- Psychotherapy – attempts to get at the unconscious sources of problems to reveal and work through inner impulses and environments (Freudian) or emphasize conscious capabilities in client-centered therapy (Rogers) (Nye, 1996).

- Resource room – an instructional support arrangement whereby eligible students receive specialized instruction or services from a special education teacher (Salvia & Ysseldyke, 1998).

- Retention – the extent to which schools organized for success can keep quality teachers in the classroom (National Commission in Teaching and America's Future, 2003).

- Self-contained classroom – full-time instruction in a special education classroom, without integration into mainstream education with non-disabled peers (Salvia & Ysseldyke, 1998).

- Stress – the experience of unpleasant, negative emotions (e.g., anger, anxiety, tension, frustration, depression) resulting from some aspects of the working environment (Kyriacou & Harriman, 1993).

- Support – divided between parental support and four dimensions of administrative support (e.g., emotional, instrumental, informational, appraisal) that let teachers know they are esteemed as professionals, are provided with necessary resources, information, training to improve classroom practices, and receive frequent and constructive feedback (Littrell, Billingsley, & Cross, 1994).

- Teacher quality – the use of knowledge and skills to carry out the best instructional practices (Council of the Great City of Colleges of Education, 2002; Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002).

- Teaching quality – the extent to which teacher quality is directly associated with

interactions to enhance student achievement (Council of the Great City of Colleges of Education, 2002; Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002).

Organization of Study

A perusal of job satisfaction studies indicates that there is an issue in many professions, including special education. The introduction of this study led to the review of literature of underlying themes, like teacher qualifications, best practices, health, staffing, and working conditions. These themes guided the purpose, research questions, and methodological segments for the study. The analyses of the data collected were intended to add to the body of existing literature as to why teachers of students with E/BD remain at risk for abandoning the field of special education.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The first step in conducting this research study was to examine the existing body of literature on the subject of teacher job satisfaction. The focus of this review was to examine job satisfaction for teachers in special education and those, especially, who instruct students with emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD). The examination of qualifications, preparation, staffing issues, and working conditions was expected to ascertain what it is that representative teachers find satisfying or dissatisfying in their jobs. To that end, the literature base for this study was selected from eLibrary.com, the Educational Research Information Center (ERIC), the National Center for Education Statistics, the University of North Texas (UNT) library and Dallas Systems Center, the U.S. Department of Education, Dissertation Abstracts International, the personal files of Dr. Lyndal M. Bullock at UNT, and the lead article from George, George, Gersten, & Grosenick (1995).

Any information drawn from this review of literature must be treated cautiously, as job dissatisfaction and intentions to quit may not translate into action to leave the classroom. Still, there was a strong correlation between job dissatisfaction, intentions to leave the classroom, and actually quitting. If only half of the respondents desiring to leave, actually do so, there should still be a cause for concern given the existing teacher shortages in special education. Also of concern was the expected low rate of response to studies. Those who did respond were expected to be more dissatisfied with their jobs than non-respondents, which could lead to exaggerated estimates of job dissatisfaction and intentions to leave the profession. These concerns, however, do not override the need for quality teachers and quality teaching.

Quality Teachers and Quality Teaching

Because advocates to improve student achievement recommend that all classroom vacancies be filled with quality teachers (e.g., Council of the Great City of Colleges of Education, 2002; No Child Left Behind Act, 2001), as quality teaching would do more to meet the needs of students with disabilities than strategies to reduce teacher-student ratios (Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002), benchmarks have been established to develop a code of ethics, standards for policies, and procedures related to the improvement of special education. The CEC Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice (1999) addresses accreditation, licensure, professional practices, and growth as an important step toward quality teacher preparation and practice. The standards that are addressed include knowledge in (a) terminology and definition of students with special needs, (b) definition and etiologies related to medical, psychological, behavioral, and educational perspectives, (c) varying mental health, religious, legal, and social welfare perspectives, (d) foundation in historical, philosophical, theoretical, and classical orientations, (e) legal systems that facilitate the need of individuals with disabilities, (f) a continuum of placement and services, and, (g) laws, regulations, and policies on specialized health care. The CEC has new performance-based standards (2003) for the preparation and licensure of special educators under new divisions. Noticeably, the Special Education Content Standards will no longer accept course syllabi as an indication that assessment standards are taught. Instead, a comprehensive assessment system is recommended to address all ten new content standards that encompass, but are not limited to, foundations, learner characteristics and differences, instructional strategies, assessment, ethics, and collaboration.

Special educators are still expected to address issues, trends, and factors that influence the overrepresentation of students from diverse backgrounds in special programs, as well as

distinguish between general and least restrictive learning ecologies. Unfortunately, familiarity with these guidelines, alone, has not been enough to prepare teachers for the realities of the classroom or, even, keep them there. The 2001 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, No Child Left Behind, did, in fact, expand the role of the federal government in classroom education (Education Week, 2004). However, proficiencies required for special education teachers were not listed among the many measures designed to drive student achievement (Hardman & Mulder, 2004), despite the obvious connection between teacher characteristics and outcomes for students with special needs, as well as the attention needed to retain good teachers and reform workplace conditions (Bullock & Gable, 2004). As it stands, area expertise has had to function against the backdrop of classroom realities, occupational stress, staffing issues, student discipline, and other working conditions.

<center>Relevance and Realities in Teacher Preparation and Practice</center>

Without a doubt, teacher quality has the greatest impact on student achievement than any other educational component. As one of the greatest important factors in student learning, the federal statue did specify that, by the school year 2005-2006, all special educators must be highly qualified and demonstrate an extensive range of competencies to teach students with E/BD (American Federation of Teachers, 2007; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Mueller & Burdette, 2007; Podesta, 2007; Rice, 2003; Rosenberg, Sendlelar, & Hardeman, 2004). No Child Left Behind created a national expectation that public school teachers have a bachelor's degree, full certification or licensure, and content competency. The fact that teacher salaries and benefits represent the largest educational expenditure is an indication that policymakers are aware that good teachers do make a full year's difference in student learning and, therefore, are the most critical resource in student academic achievement (Podesta, 2007). Yet, Podesta goes on to

explain that schools are hard to staff, quality teachers are hard to recruit and retain, and some leaders fail to value them as necessary commodities for student success. This lack of recognition may be, in part, because many teachers, at one time, were not required to be highly qualified.

At one time parents assumed that special education teachers had the appropriate training and skills to meet their child's specific needs, when, in truth, many practitioners had never taken a course in special education (Schmitz & Lee, 2001). Instead, teachers with a regular education certificate were allowed to take an examination in order to receive an additional certificate in special education. Without any training, student teaching, or supervised internship, general educators needed only to demonstrate content knowledge to qualify for the additional certification. All students, however, do not learn the same way and skills to educate students with special needs are not the same as those needed to teach students without special needs. So, if qualifications can be arbitrarily changed, it means that special education skills and training are not unique for working with students who present educational challenges. This sends the message that students do not need teachers with special training to help them learn, which violates the spirit of federal mandates and decades of work in the field for those who bare the title of special educator (Schmitz & Lee, 2001).

Surprisingly, in some situations, the realities of teacher preparation in special education are equally unfavorable. Darling-Hammond and Youngs (2002) admit that having a good grasp of one's subject area is not always a sufficient condition for effective teaching. In reality, what many first year special educators experience is a perfunctory overview of school procedures, after a limited preparation program to teach students with disabilities. Frequently, these programs emphasize a consultative and collaborative ethic for newly hired teachers who have little or no experience in the field (Halford, 1998; Kauffman, 1999). Ill-prepared teachers of difficult

students find that they are poorly supported by the school's infrastructure and do little direct, intensive instruction that best practices have to offer. They attempt, Kauffman (1999) continues, to mimic popular teaching and learning approaches (e.g., direct, discovery-oriented, constructivist teaching), for which they are evaluated and are likely to be unsuccessful with students who have learning and behavioral difficulties.

Now, with more attention given to quality teachers as an asset to student learning, many states are having to examine their own practices. They are acknowledging the fact that education, licensing, hiring, and professional development make a difference in the qualification and capacities that teachers bring to their work (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Thus, some states have taken a systems-wide approach to hold all teachers accountable to the same standards; while, other states have taken a piecemeal approach to align their special education teachers with the same licensure requirements of general education teachers and knowledge of their content (Muller & Burdette, 2007).

Teacher preparation issues, notwithstanding, new teachers eagerly enter into the classroom confident that they can motivate their students to learn. Unfortunately, nearly 50% of inexperienced teachers have their enthusiasm squelched by poor working conditions and the troublesome issues associated with teaching students with disabilities. The lack of myriad supports during the beginning of their careers fails to provide new fledglings with the working experience needed to bolster their professional competence (Woods & Weasmer, 2002). As a consequence, many teachers leave the profession, which significantly disrupts educational programming, creates a decrease in student achievement, and reduces school effectiveness (Croasmun et al., 2003). Occupational stress, they report, impedes their efforts to be effective and committed professionals.

Occupational Stress, Burnout, and Health

Teacher stress has been defined as the experience of unpleasant, negative emotions triggered by the perception that the workplace is a threat to the individual's self-esteem or well-being (Kyriacou, 2001; Kyriacou & Harriman, 1993). Both endemic and cross-cultural in nature, chronic stress interferes with professional performance and the overall educational process (Borg & Riding, 1991a). Teacher burnout, on the other hand, is a multidimensional (Abel & Sewell, 1999; Borg & Riding, 1991a) and complex construct. One difficulty with the use of the term burnout is that it implies a weakness inherent in the individual when, in fact, myriad external and debilitating factors contribute to its occurrence. Weld (1998) and Berg (1994) contend that burnout or the boil over effect is merely a convenient label to remove the responsibility of parents, administrators, and other contributors to what erodes the behavior, attitude, health, and spirit of good teachers. Semantics set aside, burnout in teachers is defined as a subtle, progressive deterioration of human elements that lead to an inability to effectively function on the job (Berg, 1994). When this work-related syndrome (Friedman, 1995) is combined with continued stress in the environment, it becomes the major contributing factor to attrition, school staffing problems, poor educational quality, and the unmet social and academic needs of students with disabilities (Wisniewski & Gargiulo, 1997). Thus, young and ill-prepared teachers experience higher burnout than their older counterparts, secondary teachers more than elementary teachers, and male teachers more than female teachers (Berg, 1994).

Teaching children and youth is both exciting and demanding. Years of training are spent in preparation for what some consider to be the first-day-of-school anxiety (Surpuriya & Jordan, 1997). But, with exceptional fortitude and commitment to face work demands, teachers have found it difficult to cope when it comes to their own physical and mental health (Teacher

Support Network, 2009). Having sampled 3,679 teachers and 1817 non-teachers in a cross-sectional survey, researchers Kovess-Mastety,Sevilla-Dedieu, Rios-Serdel, Nerriere, and Chee (2006) believe that teachers suffer from a higher rate of mental health problems. They report that male teachers experience a lifetime of anxiety disorders, while female teachers suffer from specific illnesses like bronchitis, dermatitis, and varicose veins. No different from anyone else in our society teachers, too, are affected by common problems like bereavement, divorce, and financial difficulties. Mental problems ensue when fear of losing employment causes at-risk educators to put off getting help. As a result, one forth of American teachers are sleep deprived (Health Day News, 2008), which impairs classroom instruction and places teachers at risk for more health problems. The Health Day News study revealed that 43% of teachers sleep from four to six hours each night; 64% say they are drowsy the next day; and, only 33% get a good night's sleep most of the time. Additionally, the prevalence of sleep disturbances among females was attributed to long work days due to grading papers and preparing classroom assignments.

Another health problem that has emerged among teachers is autoimmune disease. Environmental and other factors in a person's makeup can trigger an onset wherein the body's own immune system attacks internal organs. For teachers, autoimmune disease is two times more prevalent than for individuals in other professions. Delisio (2008) reports in *Education World* that the mortality rate from autoimmune diseases is 12% higher for high school teachers than for elementary school teachers. Teachers who have been diagnosed with inflammation (e.g., multiple sclerosis, lupus, rheumatoid arthritis) between 25 and 30 years of age can have complications that lead to death within fifteen years. This new data will require that engineers closely scrutinize school construction for indoor air quality due to the number of infections found in poorly ventilated buildings. As it stands, new teachers will become at-risk for autoimmune

diseases once they enter the classroom.

As teachers face the effect of task demands in the performance of their duties, they continue to be confronted with many stressors from contemporary living. Trying to conform to the pressures of long hours, large student enrollment, limited income, resources, and autonomy have an adverse effect on teacher performance and student achievement. Teachers who once felt the satisfaction of working in the classroom begin to feel that their efforts are impeded by external educational initiatives and policies contrary to their own pedagogical goals (Harden, 1999; Moriarty, et al., 2001). Some program changes even caused teachers to reassess the effectiveness of recommended interventions, their self-image, and professional commitment (Kyriacou, 2001). Prolonged exposure to stress resulted in burnout, poor health (Harden, 1999; Webber, 1994), and attrition (Weld, 1998). Unable to continue to inspire their students, many teachers experienced increased feelings of exhaustion, cynicism, negative self-assessments, and lack of personal accomplishment, Harden (1999) continues. They become at-risk for physical and psychological illnesses and, ultimately, professional failure. The cumulative effect is the reduction of a commitment to remain in the classroom.

Physical fatigue, loss of sleep, hypertension, rashes, and ulcers (Gaziel, 1993) result from on-going stress. Headaches, nervous tension, high anxiety, depression (Pithers & Soden, 1999), and anger and frustration (Kyriacou & Harriman, 1993) are other conditions reported by teachers. Performance deteriorates, job satisfaction and self-esteem are reduced, and teachers begin to demonstrate poor decision-making and bad judgment. Some teachers learn to "cope," which is not the same as teaching (Bryne, 1998). Ultimately, students and parents are led to question whether or not at-risk teachers should stay in the classroom or if they are able to provide effective special needs instruction.

Teacher Attrition and Related Staffing Issues

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) reports that over $7 billion are spent annually to recruit, hire, process, and train new teachers due to the number of teachers leaving the profession (Barnes, 2007). The cost lost to students, needless to say, when highly qualified teachers leave is immeasurable. Since teachers are a valuable human resource (Darling-Hammond, 2000), why new teachers leave the field has caused perplexed policymakers to re-examine teacher qualifications, working conditions, and commitment for new careerists (Nickson, Kritsonis, and Herrington, 2006); as well as, take a hard look at what factors cause other teachers to stay (Star, 2007).

Those who leave report that teaching in high poverty schools is difficult. These according to Starr (2007) cite critical and corrective supervisors, salary concerns, unmanageable kids, and parental support and resources in short supply. Five surveys from 1988 to 2005 suggested that teachers who leave vary by teacher characteristics (National Center for Education Statistics, 2008). These data suggest that 34% of leavers were due to retirement; 21% and 18% were dissatisfied with school or teaching assignments and teaching as a career, respectively; 14% left due to school staffing action; and, 9% sought a career outside of education. Still, another study from the University of Florida (2008) cited three causes for teacher turnover. They were exit attrition (teacher leaving the field entirely), school attrition (teacher changing schools and school districts), and teacher area transfers (from special education to general education). From this study 25% of respondents left to escape unbearable teaching environments, 9% left for professional development or job action, 29% for personal or family reasons, and 37% retired.

Although attrition rates are low for teachers who work in the private sector, those who do leave to work in public schools say they are motivated by an increase in benefits and believe

public school salaries are higher (Gruber, Wiley, Broughmer, Strizik, & Burian-Fitzgerald, 2002; Luekenes, Lytes, & Fox, 2004). Additionally, private school teachers with state certificates in their subject areas are more likely to become public school teachers than their peers without certifications. Finally, minority teachers (along with new teachers) have been deemed highly susceptible for attrition (Futrell, 1999; Kane & Orsini, 2003; Shen, Wegenke, & Cooley, 2003; Slater, 1997). These teachers find that accountability demands, lack of preparation and resources, and student behaviors can be overwhelming. For new and minority teachers who are male, researchers find that they have more expanding career options than their female counterparts and may even be less committed to teaching.

New special educators are, frequently, given the most difficult teaching assignments and, having limited experience, they are given full teaching responsibilities with the need to attend on-going classes in their spare time under limited expert supervision (Croasmun et al., 2003; Wong & Wong, 2003). Some leave after a short stay to create one of the most troublesome issues facing the public school system. Teachers exit the classroom as the number of school-age children needing special education increases and the number of college graduates in special education declines (Billingsley, 2004; National Association of State Directors of Special Education, 2001; U.S. Department of Education, 2001). Retirement-eligible teachers, highest in attrition, are the most critical variable determining the time of the demand for new teachers (Grissmer & Kirby, 1997). Again, as Croasmun and his associates (2003) point out, turnover is particularly disruptive to educational programming and school effectiveness.

Reportedly, almost half of the staff teaching students with troubling behaviors are fully certified, while another 25% hold emergency certifications through alternative route programs (AP) (Goldhaber & Brewer, 2000; Kauffman, 1999; Rosenberg, 2004; National Center

23

for Education Statistics, 1999). Principals and program directors who have difficulty filling

special education positions fail to address the high levels of discontent that teachers experience,

even though their attrition level is twice that for teachers in other positions. Instead, practices to

circumvent the impact of attrition reflect hiring less qualified teachers or assigning existing

teachers to practice in areas outside their field of expertise (Association for Supervision and

Curriculum Development, 2003; Ingersoll, 2002). The irony to assigning less than qualified

personnel, teachers outside their area of expertise, and substitute teachers is that they are more

likely to leave the profession to create additional shortages (Billingsley, 2004). What this

practice suggests is that this kind of staffing is more of a convenience than a necessity for public

schools (Ingersoll, 2002). Alternative and emergency licensure that have become commonplace

in many states to fill the void in teachers leaving the field have brought many individuals into

teaching positions with less stringent requirements in difficult to fill positions (Occupational

Outlook, 1998). This, according to Kauffman (1999), is nothing short of scandalous. Ultimately,

minority, high poverty, and students with E/BD are the most affected by poorly prepared

teachers, teachers who are dissatisfied with their careers, and those who exit their classroom

appointments.

<div align="center">Teaching Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders</div>

The presumption of inclusion in public schools is to welcome all students into the

classroom. Included are students affected by poverty, disease, transience, and other

environmental elements (e.g., teen sexuality, HIV/AIDS, drug abuse, homelessness) in the life

cycle of disadvantaged children (World Bank, 2005). Still, no other demographic shift has

demanded more of educational professionals as children and youth with aggressive and violent

behaviors (Thorsen-Spano, 1996; Van Acker, 1993). Their achievement is so adversely affected

by inappropriate behaviors (Wehby, Lane, & Falk, 2003) that their interactions significantly depart from the expectation of others (CEC, 2006-2007). The bulk of these students are placed in classrooms with teachers who are new or ill-prepared to handle students relying on aggression to navigate through life. And, because no one can argue that aggression-related problems in school are a precursor to anti-social behaviors later in life (Gable, Bullock, & Harader, 1995), it is reasonable to conclude with these researchers that schools are the most logical place to implement prevention and intervention strategies. Wehby, Lane, and Falk (2003), however, remind us that much of the focus has been on the behaviors of these students, with little attention to their educational needs, or the retention of good teachers.

Again, due to personnel shortages in special education, unqualified personnel used to fill special education teaching positions has negative implications for students with disabilities. Students are caught up in this most critical area where teacher attrition rates are highest (Kauffman, 1999; Singh & Billingsley, 1996). Since, students with E/BD are the most difficult to teach, they impair many student-teacher relationships (Farrell, Smith, & Brownell, 1998; Gable et al., 1995; Greene et al., 2002). Their unresponsiveness to classroom management procedures, frequently, evokes punitive and rejection responses from teachers and peers, alike. Teachers become less trusting of their students and more skeptical of their own abilities when intervention strategies seem to fail (Cook, 1994; Solomon, Battistich, & Hom, 1996). Teacher morale becomes low and, as Schiff (2002) points out, student achievement drops and teachers leave the profession.

Because academic difficulties accompany social disorders, teachers will need to demonstrate that they can maintain psychologically sound and appropriate behaviors themselves (Webber, 1994) in order to teach impressionable students. The burnout that frequently occurs in

educators who work closely with troubled or needy students is exacerbated by many school-induced practices that trigger student aggression. Improper curriculum and placement, inferior teaching, inconsistent classroom management, and a distant school administration all contribute to aggression in students and stressful working conditions for teachers (Friedman, 1995; Gable et al., 1995).

<div align="center">Working Conditions in the Teaching Environment</div>

It takes a special kind of teacher to take on the challenges of working with students with disabilities. The emotional and physical drain that is placed on teachers who persevere at establishing meaningful relationships with these students is exacerbated by heavy workloads, administrative tasks, and threats of litigation (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2008-2009). Special interest surrounds the work that special educators do and the CEC continues to tract for what is called crisis conditions in special education (Sack, 2000). Conditions are tougher than ever before as teachers struggle to do jobs laden with complex regulations and unfunded procedural requirements (Pardini, 2002). As general education teachers receive limited training to work with students who enter their classrooms through inclusive promotions, it is questionable that the limited understanding that policymakers have about classroom realities can expect to get true compliance (Pardini, 2002).

Studies have linked teachers' commitment to remaining in the classroom with conditions of the working environment (Billingsley, 2004; Loeb, 2002). One study conducted by Elaine Carlson of Westat, linked working conditions to attrition rates in special education (CEC, 2006-2007). When 8,000 educators participated in the Department of Education's evaluation of IDEA, national attention was drawn to the need to improve working conditions for special education teachers. Seventeen percent of participating teachers said they could not manage their workload;

14% were not fully certified; 76% thought there was a conflict between teaching and the paperwork they had to do; and, 42% worked with students who had four or more disabilities (SPeNSE, 2009). Although aspects of teacher characteristics are shaped by workplace traditions, which contribute to the ability to meet professional goals, gain recognition, enhance feelings of efficacy, and intentions to stay in the classroom, the absence of favorable working conditions, on the other hand, has a profound effect on student outcomes as a result of teacher disaffectation, alienation, and decisions to leave the classroom (George et al., 1995; Tye & O'Brien, 2002).

Early on, aspiring teachers develop vivid mental images of the kind of teachers they want to be. Expecting to make a difference in the lives of the students they teach, dreams of the future for teachers of students with special needs immediately begin to fade. Perceptions of the working environment change into role conflicts and difficulties with how to prioritize diverse responsibilities (Gersten, 1995; Robertson, 2002; Seitz, 1994). Challenges on the job become characterized by role overload and resource shortages. Reduced autonomy creates a sense of poor judgment that magnifies difficulties in developing a collaborative ethic within the school culture.

The work that special educators do is both physically and emotionally draining. Again, heavy caseloads, administrative mandates, an overwhelming amount of paperwork, litigation concerns, lack of administrative support, and feelings of isolation contribute to teacher ineffectiveness (Occupational Outlook, 1998). In some cases, non-supportive principals cause teachers to feel frustrated and unimportant (Littrell et al., 1994). Isolation, however relative, creates an atmosphere of ill-will and helplessness. And, the extent to which teachers experience job satisfaction or dissatisfaction determines whether they will be affectively connected to the school, merely cope or ritualistically comply with directives, or leave the classroom altogether

(Ma & MacMillan, 1999). These decisions hinge on teachers' feelings of competence, the amount of control exercised by the administration, and the overall organizational culture.

Finally, the feelings that an individual has toward work are derived from reinforcers dispensed by the organizational system that connect to teacher performance. The beliefs, attitudes, and gratification that teachers experience are shaped, in part, by the structure, policies, and traditions of the workplace, although these can be changed through communication with others in the environment (Bradford, 1999; George et al., 1995; Taylor & Tashakkori, 1995). Most teachers are satisfied with the core aspects of teaching, like facilitating student learning; however, others become dissatisfied with the image of teaching that is frequently characterized by isolation, stress, eroded idealism, and an over-reliance on student responsiveness to gain a sense of success (Liston, 2000; Lumsden, 1998; Scott, Cox, & Dunham, 1998). Indeed, the face of education has changed. As teachers recognize the need for interventions to combat disruptive student behaviors and the distance management practiced by some school administrators, they become overwhelmed by the pressures of the job. Limited resources, large class sizes, increased duties, and the lowest salaries paid to an educated personnel (American Federation of Teachers, 2005; Economic Policy Institute, 2005) are among many organizational pressures found in this literature review.

Conclusion

Teacher supply and teacher quality are related issues and, because these shortages have a negative impact on students with disabilities, the implications suggest a continuation of reduced and inadequate services for targeted students (Ingersoll, 2002; Singh & Billingsley, 1996). Younger, ill-prepared teachers report higher burnout levels than do older, experienced teachers, secondary teachers more than elementary colleagues, and male teachers more than female

teachers (Berg, 1994). Medical problems, sleeplessness, and autoimmune diseases are health concerns that teachers are facing today.

As pre-teaching ideals fade against the realities of everyday classroom experiences, 50% of beginning teachers leave the classroom within the first five to seven years of their careers (Croasmun et al., 2003; National Association of State Directors of Special Education, 2001; Woods & Weasmer, 2002). Members of the remaining 50% learn to cope, which Bryne (1998) reminds us is not the same thing as teaching. Conditions that fail to create a working environment to draw enthusiastic and committed teachers to the classroom will undermine the power and effectiveness of the public school system (Tye & O'Brien, 2002). The acquisition of effective behavior supports and stronger mentoring programs (Starr, 2007) will, not only ensure rigorous adherence to academic standards, but enable practitioners to remain in the field when sufficiently prepared for the demands of the job (Council of the Great City of Colleges of Education, 2002; No Child Left Behind Act, 2001). Without improvements, this nation will fail to build the requisite workforce needed to ensure that all students have an equal opportunity to succeed. And, unless administrators and legislators address the issues of attrition and retention effectively (Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement, 2007-2008), good teachers will continue to quit and take with them their energy, ambition, and self-respect to other professions.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the methodology of the study. It is organized by the purpose, research questions, subject selection, instrumentation, procedures, and data analysis.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to (a) conduct a review of special educators who work with students with emotional/behavioral disorders, (b) compare and contrast their demographics (e.g., age, gender, years of service, educational background, training, personal health) against the realities of working conditions experienced in the field, (c) identify the barriers to teacher job satisfaction, and, (d) examine correlates attributed to attrition, teaching out-of-field, and retention of the teaching workforce to gain a clearer understanding of the conditions that lead to satisfaction, dissatisfaction, commitment, or a desire to leave the profession. Career intentions and the relationship of the organizational structure of the school setting (e.g., type of delivery service, adequacy of support, time available to develop curriculum, complete paperwork) were examined to see how they are linked to teacher motivation and commitment to working conditions (George, George, Gersten, & Grosenick, 1995), as well as establish the validity of concerns gleaned from the existing body of literature.

Problem Statement

Half of special educators who instruct students with emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD) are leaving the classroom within the first six years of their teaching assignments. Administrators and policymakers will need to seek ways in which to improve working conditions that will retain newly recruited professionals.

Research Questions

The review of literature revealed a need to address teacher satisfaction and shortages in special education. Research questions were designed to address this area of concern, as well as the researcher's personal concern regarding teachers of students with emotional/behavioral disorders. The questions that guided this study were:

1. What are the best indicators for teacher job satisfaction?

2. What are the most commonly reported barriers to teacher job satisfaction?

3. What are special educators experiencing in their teaching assignments for which they were not prepared?

4. What factors encourage teachers to stay in the classroom?

5. To what extent does support play in teacher job satisfaction?

Subject Selection

The research participants for this study were drawn from a nation-wide sample consisting of approximately 600 individuals whose demographics indicate they are teaching students with emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD). The list was obtained from a cross-examination of members from the biographical directory of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) and a division membership list from the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (CCBD).

Instrumentation

Instrumentation consisted of an online survey composed of 29 areas edited from published surveys developed by George et al. (1995), Bishay (1996), and Yee (1990). The design of the survey instrument utilized suggestions by Fink (1995) (see Appendix A).

The researcher sought to establish the validity of the instrument (Litwin, 1995) through the use of two pilot studies (see Appendix B). Initially, face validity was established by

presenting the instrument to a small group of teachers in a large high school in north central

Texas. Resulting changes to the survey were minimal. They included increasing the age category

for teachers to 70, using current categorical descriptions like "early childhood -12 (EC-12)," and

adding "other" to categories to provide respondents with more options. Later, content validity

was established by submitting the instrument to a group of thirty teachers from neighboring high

schools. Twenty teachers responded and indicated that the research questions were clear, relevant

to the study, and the response options were deemed appropriate. Pilot testing verified the face

and content validity of the survey instrument.

The survey questions were designed to elicit information about (a) teacher's certification,

background, and experience, (b) programmatic and instructional practices, (c) current working

conditions, and (d) job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Background information included

information on past training, certification, length of experience in special education and with

students having E/BD. Programmatic and instructional practices included estimates of time

allotted for subject content, types of instructional methods, behavioral interventions used, teacher

roles and responsibilities, student exit criteria, and program evaluation procedures. The working

conditions section explored service options, caseload size, type of student disabilities, and the

use of Likert-like scales to assess supervisory support, parent support, teacher satisfaction, and

intentions to stay or leave the teaching profession, as well as the adequacy of resources in the

educational environment, the degree to which intervention strategies are used, satisfaction with

instruction methods, and obstacles to instruction.

Survey items were closed-ended questions, presented in multiple-choice or yes/no format.

Many sections offered an "other: specify_____" choice selection for responses not anticipated

by the researcher. Finally, commitment information was designed to pinpoint specific areas of contentment or discontent with teaching troubled or troubling students in special education.

Procedures

An introductory letter was sent to selected teachers explaining the nature of the research study and eliciting their participation in the study (see Appendix C). They were given instruction for accessing the web page containing the survey. Willing participants were, then, directed to enter their responses by clicking on the appropriate buttons. When finished, respondents clicked on a submit button to electronically add their responses to a designated database.

Data Analyses

Participant responses were collected electronically. The information was compiled within a database created for that purpose. Once collected, the data were exported to a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet for analysis. These data are presented in tabular form (see Chapter 4) to include frequencies, and those coded "other: specify" responses.

Tables reflect response frequencies. Relationships between survey variables were weighed against the future of intentions of teachers in the field to see if they significantly affect field placement, perceptions of competence, and preparation for situations encountered in the classroom. Descriptive analyses aid in understanding the results of the study.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of Research Data

Six hundred letters were sent to teachers of students with emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD) and who were members of the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (CCBD), a division of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC). This letter introduced perspective participants across the country to the online survey examining teacher job satisfaction. Eighty-nine (15%) of the letters were returned as undeliverable. Of respondents, 102 (20%) responded to only a few of the questions (which may have skewed some conclusions), 77 (15%) did not respond, leaving 332 (65%) who fully participated in the study. The outcomes, therefore, are based on the responses from 332 participants and reported by the subcategories within the survey.

Demographic Information

Detailed demographic information for the survey participants are represented in Tables 1 and 2. Most of the survey participants were in their 40s ($n = 100$; 30%) and 50s ($n = 100$; 30%); all respondents were white, not Hispanic.

Table 1

Age and Gender Demography

Age Group	Male		Female	
	n	%	*n*	%
20 – 29	8	2	7	2
30 – 39	8	2	60	18
40 – 49	22	7	65	20
50 – 59	22	7	95	29
60 – 69	16	5	22	7
70 – 80	7	2	-	-
Totals	83	25	249	75

More than half ($n = 183$; 55%) were certified in behavioral disorders, 66 (20%) in learning disabilities, and 46 (14%) in generic special education. The largest groups had taught between 11-15 years ($n = 159$; 48%) and 6-10 years ($n = 66$; 20%).

Table 2

Ethnicity, Grade Level, and Degree Demography

Group	White (non-Hispanic)		Hispanic		African American		Hawaiian	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Ethnicity	309	93	12	4	10	3	1	0.3
Elementary	40	12	3	1	10	3	1	0.3
Secondary	269	81	9	3				
Bachelor's	27	8	3	1				
Master's	275	83	9	3	10	3	1	0.3
Doctoral	7	2						

Although 203 (61%) stated that they were in generally good health, Table 3 is a reflection of many concomitant illnesses.

Table 3

Illnesses Reported by Responding Teachers

Description	*n*	%
Frequent headaches	73	22
Depression	65	20
Fatigue	65	20
Exhaustion	57	17
Frustration	45	14
High blood pressure	28	8
Anger	12	4
Diabetes	12	4

(table continues)

Table 3 *(continued)*.

Description	n	%
High anxiety	8	2
Arm muscle spasm	8	2
Back pain	8	2
Rashes	8	2
Sleeplessness	8	2

Organizational and Programming Practice Information

Self-contained classrooms were the most frequently cited educational settings in which the respondents worked. Some teachers distinguished themselves between urban local environments ($n = 66$; 20%) and rural local areas ($n = 53$; 16%). Forty-three (13%) of the participants taught in elementary schools, with 289 participants teaching on the secondary level, as depicted in Table 2. Ninety-seven percent of all participants, however, indicated that they taught at every grade level, and the number of students for whom they provided services ranged from 4-60 on a weekly basis.

In a typical work week, the percentage of time that respondents spent on consulting with general educators ranged from 2.5 - 95%, whereas, 10 - 75% of their time was involved in direct-teaching or remediation of basic academic skills. Several participants ($n = 229$; 69%) indicated that they spent little, if any time, administering screening or diagnostic tests, developing individual education programs (IEP), and planning, doing paperwork or writing reports. The survey was limited to how teaching arrangements compensated for these services.

In the area of adequate resources in the classroom, 262 (79%) of the survey participants felt that school facilities were adequate, 239 (72%) received adequate materials and supplies, and 212 (64%) were pleased with the staff development they received. Overall, 256 (77%), however, indicated that they did not have sufficient time to consult with general educators; 229 (69%) did

not have sufficient time for completing paperwork, IEP preparation, and testing; and, 229 (69%) did not have time for developing and modifying the curriculum. Moreover, 179 (54%) of respondents were not aware of written curriculum guidelines for their students with E/BD. (See Tables 4 and 5).

Table 4

Educators Report on the Sufficiency of Classroom Accommodations

Category	*n*	%
School Facilities	262	79
Materials and Supplies	239	72
Staff Development	212	64

Table 5

Educators Report on Insufficient Support, Time, and Awareness

Category	*n*	%
Conference/Consultations	256	77
IEP Preparation/Testing	229	69
Curriculum Development	229	69
Curriculum Guidelines and District Awareness	179	54

Participants reported that they followed a variety of intervention strategies. As provided in Table 6, teachers indicated the frequency of selected strategies. Both modeling and positive reinforcement were the intervention strategies of choice. Social skills, self-control, and generalization training were frequently used to facilitate classroom and environmental management, as well as to prevent crisis situations. Participating teachers were less familiar with psychotherapy and life space interview strategies; however, they sometimes used physical restraint, suspension, and time-out measures.

Table 6

Interventions Used

Strategy	Frequency of Use							
	Never		Sometimes		Frequently		Always	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Counseling	-		96	29	-		-	
Crisis management	-		-		123	37	-	
Environment management	-		-		133	40	-	
Generalization training	-		-		120	36	-	
Life space interviewing	143	43	-		-		-	
Modeling	-		-		-		149	45
Peer group processes	-		143	43	-		-	
Physical restraint	-		183	55	-		-	
Positive reinforcement	-		-		-		226	68
Psychotherapy	183	55	-		-		-	
Self-control strategies	-		-		133	40	-	
Social skills training	-		-		139	42	-	
Suspension	-		176	53	-		-	
Time-out	-		149	45	-		-	
Use of aversives	-		146	44	-		-	
Use of medication	-		110	33	-		-	

The time allotted per week for independent seatwork instruction ranged from 5 – 75% of teachers' time, one-on-one instruction and tutoring took up 10 – 80% of teachers' time, teacher-directed small group instruction took 5 – 40% of teachers' time, and teacher-directed whole group instruction took 0 – 60% of teachers' time. Time allotted for subject content areas is represented in Table 7.

Table 7

Time Allotted Per Week for Subject Content Areas

Subject	% of time per week	Grade level
Reading/language arts	10 – 75	all grade levels
Math	5 – 50	all grade levels
Behavioral/social	10 – 25	all grade levels

(table continues)

Table 7 *(continued)*.

Subject	% of time per week	Grade level
Science/social studies	5 – 50	all grade levels
Vocational/career	no response	
Non-academic (PE, art, music)	20	elementary level

Still more participants (*n* = 216; 65%) were satisfied with the instructional methods of

their E/BD programs than not. Only half of them were satisfied with the curriculum students

received in their districts, and the remaining half felt the curriculum did not prepare students to

successfully mainstream to general education classes and curricula.

Exit Procedures and Evaluation Procedures

Although 179 (54%) of respondents indicated that they were not aware that their districts

had exit procedures for students who no longer needed special education services, 279 (84%)

stated that their students had the opportunity to enter or re-enter the general education classes.

The remaining 53 (16%) reported that reluctant administrators and teachers were the persons

who interfered with inclusive practices into general education classes. Lacking consistent criteria

for exit procedures and the lack of support services to successfully reintegrate their students into

the mainstream offered even more obstacles. Two hundred seventy-two (82%) of targeted

teachers were not aware of their district's plan for evaluating their E/BD programs, so it is not

surprising that more than half (*n* = 179; 54%) were not satisfied with their district's evaluation

efforts.

Commitment Information

Two hundred eighty-six teachers (86%) indicated that they were satisfied with their

occupation and thought that they performed a vital function in society. The remaining 46 (14%),

who were less than satisfied with their jobs, were those who selected the neutral response.

Neutral respondents consisted of 31 teachers who had both bachelor's and master's degrees,

while 15 teachers with master's degrees were not at all satisfied with their jobs. However, most teachers indicated that they would be pleased if their own children became teachers, placed top priority on student academic performance, and had the freedom to teach their curriculum the way they wanted, as reflected in Table 8. These same teachers thought that they taught too many classes and students ($n = 226$; 68%), and were not satisfied with their income ($n = 236$; 71%). Finally, 209 (63%) of survey participants said they intended to stay in the field of special education. It is, however, noteworthy that 206 participants (62%) who reported that they wanted to exit the field were comprised of those who were interested in other areas of education (e.g., counselor, principalship, district-level administrator).

Analysis of Research Questions

Research Question 1: What are the best indicators for teacher job satisfaction?

Respondents who were satisfied with their jobs attributed their success and longevity to the priority they placed on student achievement. They indicated that education was important to them and they were allowed sufficient autonomy to teach their subject matter. Additionally, these participants were satisfied with their pay incentives and had experienced favorable faculty relationships. As represented in Table 8, reinforcers dispensed by the organizational system are shaped, in part, by the structure, policies, and traditions of the workforce (Bradford, 1999; George et al., 1995; Taylor & Tashakkori, 1995).

Table 8

Indicators for Teacher Job Satisfaction

Satisfaction Attributes	Grade Level	Bachelor's		Master's		Doctoral	
		n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Priority placed on student achievement	all	6	60	277	72	7	100
Education has importance	all	10	100	277	88	no response	
Allowed enough autonomy to teach subject matter	all	6	62	236	75	7	100

(table continues)

40

Table 8 *(continued)*.

Satisfaction Attributes	Grade Level	Bachelor's		Master's		Doctoral	
		n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Pay incentives were satisfying	all	4	40	158	50	no response	
Favorable staff experiences	all	10	100	287	91	no response	

Research Question 2: What are the most commonly reported barriers to teacher job satisfaction?

Teachers of targeted students expressed that campus administrators and lack of support services were easily identifiable barriers to job satisfaction. Not having a clearly defined curriculum and evaluation procedures, as well as excessive paperwork further exacerbated effective teaching. Friedman (1995) and Gable et al. (1995) confirm that an improper curriculum, inferior teaching, and a distant school administration create stressful working conditions (see Table 9).

Table 9

Commonly Reported Barriers to Teacher Job Satisfaction

Barriers	Grade Level	Bachelor's		Master's	
		n	%	*n*	%
Campus administrators	elementary	0	0	16	5
	middle	5	17	189	60
Lack of support services	elementary	0	0	0	0
	middle	5	17	91	29
No clearly defined curriculum	elementary	2	07	16	5
	middle	3	10	189	60
No clearly defined evaluation procedures	elementary	5	17	16	5
	middle	5	17	145	46
Excessive paperwork	elementary	2	07	16	5
	middle	3	10	135	43

Research Question 3: What are special educators experiencing in their teaching assignments for which they were not prepared?

Teachers indicated that their college/university coursework had not necessarily prepared them for the classes they taught. Behavior management for recalcitrant students and feelings of inadequacy in content knowledge were critical areas for feelings of incompetence, but did not point to intentions to leave their place of employment. Not having sufficient time for curriculum development and completing paperwork were other areas for which they were not prepared. Data in Table 10 indicate that the lack of resources and support from colleagues, like other special education teachers, teaching assistants, and general education teachers were unexpected experiences for which new practitioners had to make adjustments. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (2008-2009) and the CEC (Sack, 2000) continue to address these crisis conditions to prepare special educators for the classroom.

Table 10

Experiences for Which Teachers were Unprepared

Unprepared Experiences	Grade Level	Bachelor's		Master's	
		n	%	*n*	%
Lack of resources	elementary	0	0	0	0
	middle	0	0	93	28
Limited time for curriculum development	elementary	2	07	16	5
	middle	3	10	189	60
Feelings of inadequacy in content knowledge	elementary	0	0	16	5
	middle	0	0	189	60
Limited time for completing paperwork	elementary	2	07	16	5
	middle	3	10	135	43
Lack of support from colleagues	elementary	0	0	0	0
	middle	5	17	91	29
Behavior management for problem students	elementary	0	0	0	0
	middle			79	25

Research Question 4: What factors encourage teachers to stay in the classroom?

Participating teachers who reported that they wanted to stay in the classroom indicated that they were intrinsically motivated to do so. They had feelings of performing a vital function in society and thought that educating children and youth was an important job. They had good relations with other faculty members and auxiliary staff. However, teachers who indicated that they wanted to branch off into other related areas of education or, at the very least, teach students with less severe disabilities were unlikely to do so. Data in Table 11 are a reflection of what encourages some teachers to stay in the classroom.

Table 11

 Factors that Encourage Teachers to Stay in the Classroom

Encouraging Factors	Grade Level	Bachelor's		Master's		Doctoral	
		n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Feelings of performing a vital function in society	All	3	3	306	97	7	100
Thoughts that educating children was a important job	All	10	100	277	88	no response	
Good relations with other faculty and auxiliary staff	All	10	100	287	91	no response	
The option to branch off into other work areas	All	3	3	306	97	7	100

Research Question 5: To what extent does support play in teacher job satisfaction?

Support for classroom teachers come from many resource areas (see Table 12). It could be in the form of social skills training, educational psychologists, social workers on staff, and other parental and community commitments. Teacher stress, however, can result from difficulties inherent in most educational systems, like too much paperwork or the behavioral problems that students present. It would be helpful if proactive collaboration between staff and other

43

committed members could relieve the teacher boil over effect and help students navigate through academic and behavioral difficulties. Reflections from respondents suggested that the lack of support services made job performance difficult. The attitude and reluctance on the part of administrators to facilitate inclusive processes negatively impacted what made their jobs satisfying.

Table 12

Ways that Lack of Support Services Interfere with Teacher Job Satisfaction

Lack of Support*	Grade Level	Bachelor's		Master's	
		n	%	*n*	%
Lack of support services made job difficult	All	8	75	57	18
Administrators who are reluctant to facilitate inclusive practices	All	8	75	57	18

*Most participants did not respond to this category of questions.

Summary of Results

This study examined the responses from a selected number of special educators who taught students with E/BD. Their demographics were compared and contrasted against the realities of their working conditions in order to identify correlates for staying in the field and delineate barriers to job satisfaction. Although responses pointed to job dissatisfaction within the subset of questions that examined obstacles in the profession, teachers who worked for more than six years in special education were less inclined to leave the profession.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes study findings and present some discussion of and solutions to study results. Recommendations for further study are, also, provided.

Summary of Findings

After examining the survey responses of 332 teachers of students with emotional/ behavioral disorders (E/BD) across the United States, it was found that, despite barriers to satisfying working conditions, few respondents planned to leave the profession. When teachers had worked for 6 years or more, the data suggest that chronic health problems, large teacher-student ratios, excessive paperwork, the lack of supports, exit and evaluation guidelines were not causal factors for teachers to leave the field of special education. As noted in previous studies (Bishay, 1996; George et al., 1995; Yee, 1990), teacher response rates were expected to be low with exaggerating estimates of job dissatisfaction. Of the 600 letters that were mailed, 268 (45%) proposed participants either did not respond or submitted incomplete responses. More teachers (*n*=225, 68%) including those who worked for more than six years would find that paperwork, stress levels, and the need to align instruction with federal guidelines led to job dissatisfaction. However, it appears that teachers who worked longer had the experience necessary to deal with increased challenges within the workplace.

Based on the findings in this study, several summary statements are appropriate:

- Most participants were between the ages of 40 and 60

- White (non-Hispanic) women dominated the field

- Over half of the participants perceived that they were in generally good health, even with varying concomitant illnesses

- Most teachers had master's degrees that included a combination of categorical and non-categorical coursework

- More than half of the respondents were certified in behavioral disorders

- Most respondents had taught between 6-16 years in self-contained classrooms in a wide range of grade levels

- Satisfied respondents consulted with general educators and spent most of their time involved in direct-teaching or remediation of basic academic skills

- School facilities, materials, and supplies were thought to be adequate

- General consensus indicated that there was insufficient time for paperwork, IEP preparation, and developing or modifying the curriculum

- Written curriculum guidelines were rarely available

- A variety of intervention strategies were used

- Instructional times for subject areas varied across the country

- Most districts did not provide exit or evaluation procedures for students with emotional/behavioral disorders or their programs

- Job satisfaction came from intrinsic values and autonomy

- Most respondents opted not to leave their jobs, and some sought other positions available in their districts

The implications drawn from this study indicate that student achievement, salaries, and favorable support from faculty relationships are predictors for teacher job satisfaction. And despite the commonly reported barriers for which teachers were not prepared for in their teaching assignments, like limitations on time, excessive paperwork, and the need for intervention strategies, teachers who survive the first six years in special education are more likely to remain in the field or seek other education-related areas of employment. People of color, however, are less likely to pursue a career that teaches students with E/BD. Researchers have found this group of new teachers highly susceptible for attrition (Futrell, 1999; Kane & Orsini, 2003: Shen, Wegenke, & Cooley, 2003; Slater, 1997), with overwhelming accountability demands, lack of preparation, resources, and difficult student behaviors.

Discussion

Job satisfaction continues to be a misunderstood concept. The factors that contribute to working conditions are myriad. Fisher (2002) adds to its complex nature by stating that unhappy employees can be productive and not quit their jobs. As daily events influence how we feel about the workplace, both positive and negative attitudes affect fellow workers. Job dissatisfaction can manifest in other working behaviors, like organizational citizenship (Organ & Ryan, 1995), absenteeism, (Wegge, Schmidt, Parkes, & van Dick, 2007), and turnover (Saaii & Judge, 2004).

The demand for quality teachers and attrition issues has caused districts to liberalize certification requirements and use substitute teachers. Although this practice alleviates shortages it, also, builds a workforce of unqualified teachers for students who need the best teachers in the field. What we know is that much of the difference in student academic achievement is attributable to teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Podesta, 2007); yet, African-American students are twice as likely to be assigned to ineffective teachers and only half may be assigned to effective teachers.

Overwhelmed teachers, effective or otherwise, cannot perform their duties every day if they are tired, frustrated, or feel hopeless. When feelings associated with self-esteem and well-being are threatened, interpersonal relationships are ruptured to the extent that different types of burnout will emerge. Work that was once enjoyable becomes less satisfying and teachers have to drag themselves to the workplace. They become bitter and non-work relationships are affected by long periods of stress. Energy levels drop, depression sets in, and teachers care less and less about their jobs. Wood and McCarthy (2000) add that resources are not adequate or, at the very least, stressors outweigh the resources that are available. Then we find teachers leaving a

particular school, subject, or grade level. They may move to higher education, or leave the field of teaching altogether.

Attrition has no boundaries. Teachers in every subject level are leaving. When teachers are framed as incompetent, they leave. When teachers become disenchanted, they leave. This diminution in the workplace creates gaps in teaching areas with the most need. Without the necessary resources to be victorious, teachers become vulnerable for inadequate coping skills. Suppressed problems, crying, and indirect strategies to deal with classroom conflicts drive them away. A kind of powerlessness develops (Brownell, 1995), the teaching spirit dies, and teachers leave the profession.

<div align="center">Solutions</div>

As dismal as prospects appear for teachers, there are some new innovative ideas that school leaders can find to overhaul current special education programs. Podesta (2007) is hopeful that collecting reliable, value-added data will facilitate decisions about competitive compensations for quality teachers and supervisors. Policymakers who are well informed about working conditions and financial rewards as important motivating factors will want to use teachers as the greatest valuable resource they have.

The American Federation of Teachers (2000) knows that providing greater resources will recruit and retain well-trained teachers. Practical research can be used as a powerful tool to maintain high, rigorous, and relevant standards for what teachers should know and do. Their solution, then, is to combine intensive assistance with a competitive base pay for all teachers. Adding to that, Starr (2007) agrees that an expansion in mentoring programs will improve teacher education. If teaching is viewed as an attractive and respectful profession, the image of teachers will improve and more individuals will enter into the field. Equally important, principals

should be reminded of the impact that they have on a teacher's determination to leave or stay in the classroom. And, it goes without saying that the CEC is committed to improving academic and social outcomes for children and youth with disabilities, especially in the areas of high quality teachers, addressing the paperwork burden, and streamlining individualized education programs (IEPs).

Other solutions might include a thorough examination of new teacher placements to ensure that they are not all placed in low-achieving schools. Public schools must work with teacher preparation institutions for training and professionalization that goes beyond the one semester university requirement. This will give student-teachers longer assignments to prepare them to work with a wide range of students. Teacher induction programs and mentoring resources should be strengthened in high attrition schools; but, again, administrators should avoid assigning student-teachers to their most troublesome classes.

Teachers who take the initiative to continue their education should be reimbursed for tuition and fees, and paid on a step-plan commensurate to their education. We know that increased pay holds the most promise in reducing attrition, so signing bonuses for full certification will encourage new teachers to get the requisite credentials, which is an important pay-off for retaining minority teachers.

As high quality beginning teachers are recruited at commensurate pay scales into at-risk schools, districts can move other teachers from high performing schools into at-risk schools with pay incentives. If No Child Left Behind can be amended to hold districts and school administrators more accountable for attrition, it would encourage districts to tract teacher and school characteristics, patterns, and relationships for retention purposes. Data measured over time will provide a comprehensive snapshot of where to invest resources, how much to invest,

and what the impact is from their investments (Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention, and

Advancement, 2007-2008).

Recommendations for Further Research

This study was limited in its scope of teacher selection for targeted students. Further study

should be done to better define the barriers to job satisfaction for educators who teach the first

six years of their careers. Some questions to explore might include:

- Why people of color are not attracted to the field?

- How are certification programs addressing time management for paperwork and IEP development in conjunction with efforts from the CEC?

- Are certification programs teaching special educators how to expose students to their state's curriculum mandates, given that No Child Left Behind (2001) is bringing alternative assessments to an end?

- How are special educators becoming "highly qualified" (HQ status) for the content they teach, and not just mere custodians of students who behave badly? Are they undergoing the system-wide or piecemeal approach?

- How can special educators use the Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) process the way it is intended when districts do not have written exit procedures from E/BD programs?

- Why are campus administrators and general practitioners reluctant to mainstream or receive students with E/BD?

- How have successful teachers balanced declining health, limited supports, and challenging student behavior with limited incentives and increasing qualification requirements?

Summation

Students with E/BD are the most difficult to teach. This study has been a testament to

how physically and emotionally worn targeted teachers can become very early in their careers.

One of the things that teachers need to realize is that parents do not think the worst of their

children. They send us their best for instruction. Stakeholders must, therefore, be committed to

50

changing practices that facilitate learning and the need to provide all students with a value-added education.

Instruction should come from the assessment-driven state mandates that are available, so that placement of students with E/BD alongside normative peers will ensure their academic and social success. This will provide the curriculum acceleration these students require and allow them to move toward the demonstration of critical thinking skills that new assessments require. As working conditions improve for teachers of students with E/BD, the drive toward the appropriate curricula will have the rigor and relevance of higher level instruction. To this end, policymakers will need to better understand the importance of addressing the barriers to teacher job satisfaction for quality instruction that leaves no child behind.

APPENDIX A

TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

Demographic Information. Please check all that apply.

1. What is your age category?

____20s   ____30s

____40s   ____50s

____60s   ____70s

2. What is your gender?

____Female   ____Male

3. What is your ethnic background?

____White (not Hispanic)   ____Asian/Pacific Islander
____Black/African American   ____Native Hawaiian
____Native American   ____Hispanic (White)
____Native Alaska/Eskimo/Aleut   ____other: Specify

4. How do you evaluate your personal health? **Check all that apply.**

____Anger   ____Fatigue   ____Sleeplessness
____Depression   ____Frequent Headaches
____Diabetes   ____Frustration
____Exhaustion   ____Generally good health
____Fair health   ____High anxiety
____Fatigue   ____High blood pressure
____Nervous tension   ____Poor health
____Other: specify   ____Rashes

5. What is the <u>highest </u>degree held?

____Associate Degree   ____Master's Degree
____Bachelor's Degree   ____Doctoral Degree

6. Which <u>one</u> of the following statements best characterizes your college/university training in special education? **Please check only one.**

____Categorical training (most courses were category specific, e.g., LD, E/BD, MR)
____Non-categorical (most courses were generic, e.g., "mildly handicapped")
____Combination of categorical and non-categorical coursework
____Mainstreaming/inclusion in special education as part of ongoing (in-service)
    staff development
____other: Alternative Certification

7. What certification (endorsement or registry area) do you hold?

____Early childhood – 12 (EC-12)   ____Behavioral disorder
____Learning disabilities   ____Mental retardation
____Generic Special education   ____Mild/Moderate disabilities
____Severe disabilities   ____Other: specify

8. To what grade level(s) does your certification(s) apply? **Check all that apply.**

____Elementary School   ____Middle School
____Secondary School   ____All levels
____Other: (Please specify)

9. How many years of teaching experience in special education?

____Less than three years   ____3-5 years
____6-10 years   ____11-15 years
____16-20 years   ____more than 20 years

<u>Organizational and Programming Practice</u>

10. Indicate the type of special education setting in which you are currently working:

____Residential   ____Urban local
____Rural local   ____Other: specify

11. To what grade level are you currently assigned?

____Elementary   ____Middle school/junior high
____High school   ____other: specify

12. Number of students on your class roll? _____

13. Number of students to whom you provide service during a week? _____

14. In a typical week, estimate the percentage of time you allocate to each of the following activities. The total should be 100%.

____% Direct teaching/remediation of basic academic skills
____% Modifying inappropriate behaviors/developing social skills
____% Consulting with general educators
____% Administer screening/diagnostic tests
____% IEP development
____% Planning/paperwork/reports

____Other: specify _____

100% Total

15. Rate of adequacy of the following resources in your classroom setting: **Circle the appropriate response.**

	Completely Inadequate									Completely Adequate
Physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Materials/supplies	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Staff development	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Time for consultation with										
Regular education staff	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Time for paperwork (IEP)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Time for developing and										
Modifying curriculum	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

16. Are you aware of a written curriculum or guideline adopted by your district to assist you in programming for students with E/BD? Y___   N____.

If not who develops the curriculum?_____

17. To what degree is each of the following intervention strategies used for students with E/BD?

	Never Used	Sometimes Used	Frequent Use	Always Used
Psychotherapy	0	1	2	3
Counseling	0	1	2	3
Life Space Interviewing	0	1	2	3
Crisis Management	0	1	2	3
Use of Medication	0	1	2	3
Peer Group Processes	0	1	2	3
Generalization Training	0	1	2	3
Environment Management	0	1	2	3
Use of Aversives	0	1	2	3
Suspension	0	1	2	3
Positive Reinforcement	0	1	2	3

Modeling	0	1	2	3
Physical Restraint	0	1	2	3
Social Skills Training	0	1	2	3
Self-control Strategies	0	1	2	3
Time-out	0	1	2	3

18. On a typical day, estimate the percentage of time you allocate to various types of instruction. Total should equal 100%.

____% Independent seatwork
____% One-on-one instruction/tutoring
____% Teacher-directed small group instruction
____% Teacher-directed whole group instruction
____% Other: specify_____

100% Total

19. Estimate the time you allocate to each of the following subject areas:

____% Reading/language arts
____% Math
____% Behavioral/social
____% Science/social studies
____% Vocational/career
____% Non-academic (PE, art, music)
____% Other: specify_____

20. To what degree are you satisfied with the instructional methods in your E/BD program?

Not at all   Completely
Satisfied   Satisfied

   0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

21. To what degree are you satisfied that the curriculum the students receive in your district's E/BD program directly prepares them for success in the mainstream?

Not at all   Completely
Satisfied   Satisfied

   0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

Exit Procedures (refers to policies and procedures used to determine at what point a child is no longer in need of existing special education services).

22. Does your district have a written set of exit procedures to assist you in integrating students with E/BD? Y_____ N_____.

23. Do students with E/BD have the opportunity to exit into general education from your classroom or caseload? Y_____ N_____.

24. If no, to what degree does each of the following factors represent obstacles?

	Never Interferes					Always Interferes
Attitudes/reluctance of administrators	0	1	2	3	4	5
Attitudes/reluctance of teachers	0	1	2	3	4	5
Attitudes/reluctance of parents	0	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of clear criteria against which to measure readiness to exit	0	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of clear procedures for reintegration	0	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of support services	0	1	2	3	4	5
Other: (specify)_____	0	1	2	3	4	5

Evaluation Procedures (refers to the ongoing process of monitoring and documenting a program's process toward its stated goals; it involves assessing student progress and appraising other program components, including personnel).

25. Are you aware of a written plan for evaluating your district's E/BD program? Y___ N___.

26. To what degree are you satisfied with your district's E/BD program evaluation efforts?

Not at All Satisfied									Completely Satisfied
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

27. <u>Commitment Information</u>

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5= strongly agree

I am satisfied with my occupation.	1	2	3	4	5
I perform a vital function in society.	1	2	3	4	5
I dislike giving tests.	1	2	3	4	5
I teach too many classes/students.	1	2	3	4	5
I am satisfied with my income.	1	2	3	4	5
I would be pleased if my child became a teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
I place top priority on student academic performance.	1	2	3	4	5
Educating the young is important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
I would be more satisfied with less paperwork.	1	2	3	4	5
I have enough freedom to teach.	1	2	3	4	5
I find marking papers a burden.	1	2	3	4	5
Pay incentives would improve teacher morale.	1	2	3	4	5
I have good relations with most of the faculty.	1	2	3	4	5

28. Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

I intend to stay in my current field of special education.	1	2	3	4	5
I intend to exit my current field of special education.	1	2	3	4	5

29. If you intend to **stay** in the field of education in the next five years, how likely is it that you will apply for the following positions?

	Very Unlikely	Somewhat Unlikely	Don't Know	Somewhat Likely	Very Likely
Counselor	0	1	2	3	4
Resource Teacher	0	1	2	3	4
Curriculum Developer	0	1	2	3	4
Mentor/teacher/trainer	0	1	2	3	4
Department Chair	0	1	2	3	4
Principal/assistant principal	0	1	2	3	4
District-level administrator	0	1	2	3	4

30. If you are interested in the results of this survey, please enter your name and address before submitting your answers:

APPENDIX B

PILOT STUDY

The original survey was pilot-tested by special education teachers who taught high school students with emotional/behavioral disorders in resource classroom settings. Prior to actual data collection, the pilot study was intended to determine the clarity of the instrument.

Notable responses helped to tailor the changes made to the final survey. Some participants indicated that they took an alternative route toward certification. Thus, "other: specify_____" was added to the list of qualifications and many other areas, including ethnic background. Additionally, these participants indicated that they were in fair to good health, but checked numerous ill effects, like sleeplessness, anxiety, depression, and high blood pressure. Marital status, on the other hand, proved not to be a valuable component and was eliminated from the survey. Finally, other areas of the survey were (a) extended to include teachers over the age of 70 and address an increasingly diverse ethnicity, or (b) shortened to reduce the length of the survey and time needed to answer all questions.

A second pilot test was conducted with the new changes among thirty special education teachers in neighboring high schools. Responses to the second pilot test confirmed that questions were clear and appropriate.

APPENDIX C

REQUEST FOR RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

Project Title: An Analysis of Job Satisfaction for Special Educators Who
        Instruct Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders: How
        Working Conditions Impact Commitment

Lead Investigator: Beverly Adkins

Research Advisor: Dr. Lyndal M. Bullock, Regents Professor
        College of Education, Programs in Special Education
        University of North Texas, Denton, Texas

Dear Fellow Teachers,

   I am a graduate student in Leadership Programs in Severe Behavioral Disorders at the University of North Texas. My dissertation study is referenced above. I know special educators are very busy; however, I hope you will give the survey I have placed online a few minutes of your time. With your help, we can glean more information about the preparation for and working conditions of special programs in public schools through the questions designed in this investigation. It should require about 20 minutes of your time. Simply log on to_____. Click on the link to "Teacher Job Satisfaction" and key in your ID code _____.

   The survey will use this identification code for retrieval purposes only. The number will be used to verify submitted surveys and your name will never be placed on the study or associated with any of the study's results. All information will be kept confidential and incorporated into group data.

   Participation is voluntary. If you decide not to participate, please pass this letter on to another special educator. **Completion of the survey will indicate consent to participate in the study.** If you have any concerns about your selection or treatment as a research participant, please respond at the bottom of the survey.

Respectfully,

Beverly Adkins

REFERENCES

Abel, M. H., & Sewell, J. (1999). Stress and burnout in rural and urban secondary school teachers. *Journal of Educational Research, 92*(5), 287-291.

Alberto, P. A., & Troutman, A. C. (1995). *Applied behavior analysis for teachers* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

AllBusiness. (2005). *U.S. job satisfaction keeps falling*. Retrieved March 26, 2009, from http://www.allbusiness.com/human-resources/employee-development/397 371-1.html

American Federation of Teachers. (2005). *AFT salary surveys*. Retrieved December 19, 2005 from http://www.aft.org/salary/

American Federation of Teachers. (2007). *Teacher quality-staffing hard-to-staff schools*. Retrieved March 30, 2009, from http://www.aft.org/topics/teacher -quality/recruit.htm

Anderson, J. (2008). *Primary care physicians lack job satisfaction*. (Practice trends). *Internal Medicine News*. December 15, 2008. Retrieved March 31, 2009, from http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G1-191853433.html

Anderson, P. (2000). *'Job satisfaction': Oxymoron?* Retrieved August 22, 2003, from http://www.cnn.com.careertrends

Association of PeriOperative Registered Nurses. (2008). *Most primary care physicians would choose another field.* AORN Journal. January 1, 2008. Retrieved March 31, 2009, from http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G1-173643459.html

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (2003). *Teaching out-of-field: An overlooked factor in underqualified teaching*. Research brief. Retrieved March 31, 2009, from http://www.ascd.org/publications/researchbrief/v1n05/toc.aspx

Barnes, G., Crowe, E., & Schaefer, B. (2007). *The cost of teacher turnover in five school districts: A pilot study*. National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF). Retrieved March 30, 2009, from http://www.nctaf.org/resources/demonstration_projects/turnover/documents/CTTFull Report.pdf

Berg, B. D. (1994). Educator burnout revisited: Voices from the staff room. *Clearing House, 67*(4), 185-189.

Billingsley, B. S. (2004). Special education teacher retention and attrition: A critical analysis of the research literature. *Journal of Special Education, 38.* Retrieved January 17, 2005, from http://www.highbeam.com/library

Bishay, A. (1996). Teacher motivation and job satisfaction: A study employing the experience sampling model. *Journal of Undergraduate Sciences, 3,* 147-154.

Borg, M. G., & Riding, R. J. (1991a). Occupational stress and satisfaction in teaching. *British Educational Research Journal, 17*(3), 263-282.

Borg, M. G., & Riding, R. J. (1991b). Stress in teaching: A study of occupational stress and its determinants, job satisfaction and career commitment among primary school teachers. *Educational Psychology, 11*(1), 59-76.

Bradford, J. J. (1999). How to stay in teaching (when you really feel like crying). *Educational Leadership, 56*(8), 67-68.

Brownell, M., Smith, S., McNellis, J., & Lenk, L. (1995). Career decisions in special education: Current and former teacher's personal views. *Exceptionality*, *5*, 83-102.

Brownell, M. (1997). *Coping with stress in the special education classroom: Can individual teachers more effectively manage stress?* Reston, VA: ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education. ED 414659.

Bryne, J. J. (1998). Teacher as hunger artist: Burnout: Its causes, effects, and remedies. *Contemporary Education, 69*(2), 86-72.

Bullock, L.M., & Gable, R. A. (Eds.). (2004). *Quality personnel preparation in emotional/ behavioral disorders: Current perspectives and future directions.* Denton, TX: Institute for Behavioral and Learning Differences, University of North Texas.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2008-2009). *Special education teacher working conditions.* Retrieved April 15, 2009, from http://www.allthingspolitical.org/careers/Special_Education_Teachers_Working_Conditions

Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement (CERRA). (2007-2008). *Teaching quality.* Retrieved online http://www.coloradoteachercadet.com

Computerworld. (2002). *2002 job satisfaction survey chart*. Retrieved August 22, 2003, from http://www.computerworld.com/careertopics/career/story/0.10801,76080,00.html

Cook, J. (1994). Are you on the cutting edge? *Teaching PreK-8, 24*(7), 28-30.

Council for Exceptional Children. (1999). Professional standards. In *Council for Exceptional children code of ethics and standards of practice*. Retrieved October 17, 2003, from www.cec.sped.org/ps/code.html

Council for Exceptional Children. (1999). *What every special educator must know: The international standards for the preparation and licensure of special educators* (3rd ed.). Reston, VA. Retrieved October 17, 2003, from www.cec.sped.org/ps/code.html

Council for Exceptional Children. (2006-2007). *Behavior disorders/emotional disturbances*. Retrieved April 4, 2009, from http://www.cec.sped.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section_Behavior_Disorder_Emotional_Disturbances

Council of the Great City Colleges of Education. (2002). *The urban teacher challenge. Teacher demand and supply in the great city schools. Recruiting new teachers.* Retrieved October 17, 2003, from www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal?recordDetails/detail.jsp

Croasmun, J., Hampton, D., & Herrman, S. (2003). *Teacher attrition: Is time running out?* Retrieved January 30, 2003, from Horizon Site http://horizon,unc.edu/projects/issues/papers/Hampton.asp

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archive, 8*(1). Retrieved April 4, 2009, from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8nl/

Darling-Hammond, L., & Youngs, P. (2002). Defining "highly qualified teachers": What does "scientifically-based research" actually tell us? *Educational Researcher, 31*(9), 13-25.

Delisio, E. R. (2008). Autoimmune diseases hit teachers hard. *Education World*. Retrieved April 9, 2009 from http://www.education-world.com/9_issues/issues/227.shtml

Economic Policy Institute. (2005). *Economic snapshots*. Retrieved December 19, 2005, from http://www.epinet.org/content.cfm?id=1870

Education Week. (2004). *No Child Left Behind*. Retrieved June 11, 2004, from http://www.edweek.org/context/topics/issuespage.cfm?id+59

Ekberg, S. (2002). *Job satisfaction quiz*. Retrieved August 22, 2003, from http://www.careerfocus+/.com/quiz.html

Farrell, D. T., Smith, S. W., & Brownell, M. T. (1998). Teacher perceptions of level system effectiveness on the behavior of students with emotional or behavioral disorders. *Journal of Special Education, 32.* Retrieved January 17, 2005 from http://ask.elibrary.com.

Fink, A. (1995). *How to design surveys.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Fisher, D. (2000). Mood and emotions while working: Missing pieces of job satisfaction? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21,* 185-202.

Franco, L., & Tortorici, F. (2002). *Job satisfaction on the decline*. Retrieved August 22, 2003, from http://www.conference-board.org/utilities/pressDetail.ctm?press_ID=1707

Friedman, I. A. (1995). Student behavior patterns contributing to teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Research, 88*(5), 281-290.

Futrell, M. H. (1999). Recruiting minority teachers. *Educational Leadership*, *56*, 30-33.

Gable, R. A., Bullock, L. M., & Harader, D. L. (1995). Schools in transition. *Preventing School Failure, 39,* 29.

Gaziel, H. H. (1993). Coping with occupational stress among teachers: A cross-cultural study. *Comparative Education, 29*(1), 67-80.

George, N. L., George, M. P., Gersten, R., & Grosenick, J. K. (1995). To leave or to stay? An exploratory study of teachers of students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Remedial & Special Education, 16,* 227-236.

Gersten, R. (1995). *Working conditions: Job design*. Working Paper #4. From the National Dissimulation Forum on Issues Relating to Special Education Teacher Satisfaction, Retention and Attrition. Washington, D.C., May 25-26, 1995. EC304434.

Goldhaber, D., & Brewer, D. J. (2000). Does teacher certification matter? High school certification status and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 22*(2), 129-145.

Goldstein, A. P. (1999). *The prepare curriculum: Teaching prosocial competencies.* Champaign, IL: Research.

Greene, R. W., Beszterczey, S. K., Katzenstein, T., Park, K., & Goring, J. (2002). Are students with ADHD more stressful to teach? *Journal of Emotional & Behavioral Disorders, 10*(2), 11-14.

Grissmer, D., & Kirby, S. N. (1997). Teacher turnover and teacher quality. *Teachers College Record, 99*(1), 45-56.

Gruber, K. J., Wiley, S. D., Broughman, S. P. Strizek, G. A., & Burian-Fitzgerald, M. (2002). *Schools and staffing survey: Overview of the data for public, private, public charter, and Bureau of Indian Affairs elementary and secondary schools*. NCES 2002-313. U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Halford, J. M. (1998). Strengthening the teaching profession. *Educational Leadership.* January. Retrieved April 19, 2002, from http://ask.elibrary.com

Harden, R. M. (1999). Stress, pressure and burnout in teachers: Is the swan exhausted? *Medical Teacher, 21*(3), 245-248.

Hardman, M., & Mulder, M. (2004). Critical issues in public education and their impact on students with disabilities. In L. Bullock, & R. Gable (Eds.), *Quality personnel preparation in emotional/behavioral disorders: Current perspectives and future directions*, (pp. 12-36). Denton, TX: Institute for Behavioral and Learning Differences, University of North Texas.

Health Day News. (2008). *Nation's teachers battle sleep problems*. Retrieved April 19, 2009, from
http://health.usnews.com/articles/health/healthday/2008/10/15nations_teachers_battle_sleep

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work.* New York: John Wiley.

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland: World Publishing.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1998). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Hochgraf, L. (1998). Boosting job satisfaction by defining and pursuing worklife happiness. *Electronic Design, 46,* 1.

Huff, C. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Why your job isn't a bowl of cherries*. Retrieved August 22, 2003, from http://www.nurseweek.com/features/97-10/jobsatis.html

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. (IDEA) (1997). Public Law 101-476. Retrieved July 7, 2005, from http://www.kidsource.com/NICHCY/emotionaldisab.k12.2.html

Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) Data. (2004). Retrieved June, 11, 2004, from http://www.ideadata.org

Ingersoll, R. M. (2002). *Out-of-field teaching educational inequity and the organization of schools: An exploratory analysis.* University of Washington: Center of the Study of Teaching and Policy. Retrieved January 30, 2003, from http://dept.Washington.edu/ctp.mail/PDFs/OutOfField-RI-01-2002.pdf

Jones, D. (2005). *Are you proud of your job? USA Today*. May 23, 2005. Retrieved April 14, 2009, from http://www.usatoday/com/money/economy/employment/2005-05.23-prestige.usat_x.htm

Kallaste, E. & Roosaar, L. (2007). *Low levels of job commitment among civil servants*. Retrieved March 31, 2009, from http://www.eurofound.europa/eu/ewco/2007/05EE0706019I.htm

Kalleberg, A. L. (1997). Work values and job reward: A theory of job satisfaction. *American Sociological Review, 42* (February), 124-143.

Kane, P. R., & Orsini, A. J. (2003). Findings from a national survey of teachers of color and from analysis of the NAIS database. In P. R. Kane & A. J. Orsini (Eds.), *The color of excellence: Hiring and keeping teachers of color in independent schools* (pp.56-67). New York: Teachers College.

Kauffman, J. M. (1999). Commentary: Today's special education and its messages for tomorrow. *Journal of Special Education, 32*. Retrieved April 19, 2002, from http://ask.elibrary.com

Kovess-Masfety, V. Sevilla-Dedieu, C., Rios-Seidel, C., Nerriere, E. & Chee, C.C., (2006). *Do teachers have more health problems?* Retrieved April 9, 2009, from http://www.biomedcenter.com/147/-2458/6/101

Kozleski, E. B., Sands, D. J., & French, N. (1993). Preparing special education teachers urban settings. *Teacher Education and Special Education. 16,*(1), 14-22.

Krisberg, K. (2008). *Shortage of doctors in primary care may harm health of nation. (More U.S. physicians educated overseas).* Retrieved March 31, 2009, from http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G1-179457581.html

Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher stress: Directions for future research. *Educational Review, 53*(1), 27-36.

Kyriacou, C., & Harriman, P. (1993). Teacher stress and school merger. *School Organization, 13*(3), 297-305.

Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Barton, S. M. (2001). The impact of job satisfaction on turnover intent: A test of a structural measurement model using a national sample of workers. *Social Science Journal, 38* (2), 233-250.

Ling-Hsiu, C. (2008). Job satisfaction among information system (IS) personnel. *Computers in Human Behavior, 24* (1), 105-118.

Liston, D. P. (2000). Love and despair in teaching. *Educational Theory, 50*(1), 81-103.

Littrell, P. C., Billingsley, B. S., & Cross, L. H. (1994). The effects of principal support on special and general educators' stress, job satisfaction, school commitment, health, and intent to stay in teaching. *Remedial & Special Education, 15*(5), 297-311.

Litwin, M. S. (1995). *How to measure survey reliability and validity.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Loeb, R. C. (2002). Differences in job satisfaction between general education and special education teachers: Implications for retention. *Remedial and Special Education.* Retrieved January 17, 2005, from http://www.highbeam.com/library

Long, N. J., & Morse, W. C. (1996). *Conflict in the classroom: The education of at-risk and troubled students.* Austin, TX: Pro-ed.

Luekens, M.T., Lyter, D. M., & Fox, E. E. (2004). *Teacher attrition and mobility. Results from the teacher follow-up survey, 2000-01*. (NCES 2004-301). US Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Lumsden, L. (1998). *Teacher morale*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.

Ma, X., & MacMillan, R. B. (1999). Influences of workplace conditions on teachers' job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Research, 93*(1), 39-48.

May, D., Kundert, D., & Akpan, C. (1994). Are we preparing special educators for the issues facing schools in the 1990's? *Teacher Education and Special Education, 17*(3), 192-199.

Milian-Perrone, M., & Farrell, K. A. (1993). Preparing early childhood special educators for urban settings. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 16*(1), 83-90.

Moriarty, V., Edmonds, S., Blatchford, P., & Martin, C. (2001). Teaching young children: Perceived satisfaction and stress. *Educational Research, 43*(1), 33-47.

Muller, E., & Burdette, P. (2007). *Highly qualified teachers and special education: Several data approaches*. Retrieved April 4, 2009, from http://www.projectforum.org

Munn, R. W. (1996). Job satisfaction challenge. *H. R. Magazine, 41,* 36-40.

National Association of School Psychologists. (2005). *Grade retention and promotion.* Retrieved July 3, 2005, from http://www.nasponline.org/information/pospaper_sebd.html

National Association of State Directors of Special Education. (2001). Special education faces a mounting crisis: How to recruit, train, and hold on to qualified teachers and related services personnel. Washington, D.C.: *Liaison Bulletin*. Retrieved April 4, 2009, from http://www.ncrel.org/policy/pubs/html/strategy/index.html

National Center for Education Statistics. (1999). *School and Staffing Survey.* Retrieved July 3, 2005, from http://www.ed.gov/searchResults.jhtml

National Center for Education Statistics. (2008). *Attrition of public school mathematics and science teachers*. NCES 2008-077. US Department of Education.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2003). *No dream denied: A pledge to America's children*. Summary Report. Washington, D.C.

National Fair Access Coalition on Testing. (2005). *CEC Standards for Professional Practice*. Retrieved July 3, 2005, from http://www.fairaccess.org/cec_standards.htm

National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities. (1998). *Letter to NJCLD member organization*. Retrieved July 3, 2005, from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal

Nickson, L. M., Kritsonis, W. A., & Herrington, D. (2006). Retaining special education teachers in public schools: A national crisis. *Lamar University Electronic Journal of Student Research, 3* (Spring), 1-5.

No Child Left Behind Act. (2001). Retrieved June 11, 2004, from http://www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml

Nye, R. D. (1996). *Three psychologies: Perspectives from Freud, Skinner, and Roger* (5th ed).
Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Occupational Outlook Handbook. (1998). *Professional and technical occupations: Special
education teachers*. Retrieved May 14, 2003, from http://ask.elibrary

Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional
prediction of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, *48*, 775-802.

Pardini, P. (2002). Special education: Promises and problems. *Rethinking Schools, 16* (3).
Retrieved April 4, 2009, from http://www.rethinkingschools.org/archive/16_03/163.shtml

Pithers, R. T., & Soden, R. (1999). Person-environment fit and teacher stress. *Educational
Research, 41*(1), 51-62.

Podesta, J. (2007). *Quality teachers, quality schools.* Testimony to the House Education and
Labor Committee. Center for American Progress. Retrieved from
http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2007/05/podesta_testimony.html/print.html

Rice, J. K. (2003). *Teacher quality: Understanding the effectiveness of teacher attributes.*
Retrieved March 26, 2009,from
http://www.epi.org/publications/entrybooks_teacher_quality_execsum_intro/

Robertson, H. (2002). Tales from the jungle. *Phi Delta Kappan, 84*(3), 252-255.

Rosenberg, M. S. (2004). Preparing highly qualified teachers for students with emotional and
behavioral disorders in a fast-track world of alternatives. In L. Bullock, & R. Gable
(Eds.), *Quality personnel preparation in emotional/behavioral disorders: Current
perspectives and future directions* (pp. 94-99). Denton, TX: Institute for Behavioral and
Learning Differences, University of North Texas.

Rosenberg, M. S., Sindelar, P. T., & Hardman, M. L. (2004). Preparing highly qualified teachers
for students with emotional or behavioral disorders: The impact of NCLB and IDEA.
Behavioral Disorders, 29(3), 266-278.

Saari, L. M., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resource
Management, 43*, 395-407.

Sack, J. (2000). *CEC report tracks 'crisis' conditions in special education*. Retrieved April 15,
2009, from
http://www.edweek.org/login.html?source=http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2000/10/2

Salvia, J., & Ysseldyke, J. E. (1998). *Assessment* (7th ed.), Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Schiff, T. W. (2002). Teacher quality: Making it work for all students. The Teacher
Advancement Program: Attitudes of the Teacher. 3rd Annual TAP Conference.

Schmitz, C. D., & Lee, G. (2001). Tests won't help teach students with special needs. *St. Louis Post-Dispatch,* 04-03-2001, p. B7.

Scott, C., Cox, S., & Dinham, S. (1998). *An English study of teacher satisfaction, motivation, and health*. Retrieved June 12, 2003, from http://www.edrs.com/members/sp.cfm?AN=ED419797

Seitz, J. A. (1994). Seeing through the isolation: A study of first-year teachers of the visually impaired. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness, 88*(4), 299-310.

Shann, M. H. (1998). Professional commitment and satisfaction among teachers in urban middle schools. *The Journal of Educational Research, 92*(2), 67-73.

Shen, J., Wegenke, G. L., & Cooley, V. E. (2003). Has the public teaching force become more diversified? National longitudinal perspective on gender, race, and ethnicity. *Educational Horizons,* 81, 112-118.

Sibbald, B., Bojke, C., & Gravelle, H. (2003). *National survey of job satisfaction and retirement intentions among general practitioners in England*. National Primary Care Research and Development Center, Center for Health Economics, University of New York, York YO105DD.

Singh, K., & Billingsley, B. S. (1996). Intent to stay in teaching. *Remedial and Special Education, 17,* 37.

Slater, D. J. (1997). An analysis of minority teacher induction and its effects on attrition and retention in Connecticut's school districts. *Boston College,* 195 pages, AAT9725147. Retrieved May 11, 2009, from http://progrrestiumi.com/pqdlink?Ver=1+Esp=05-01-2014&FMT=7&DID=739772251

Solomon, D., Battistich, V., & Hom, A. (1996). Teacher beliefs and practices in schools service communities that differ in socioeconomic levels. *Journal of Experimental Education, 64,* 327.

SPeNSE (Study of Personal Needs in Special Education). *Recruiting and retaining high quality teachers.* US Department of Education. Retrieved May 8, 2009, from http://-ferdig.coe.ufl.edu/spense/

Starr, L. (2007). It's the principal of the thing! *Education World*. Retrieved online April 4, 2009, from http://www.education-world.com/9_issues/issues/347.shtml

Stone, V. (2002). *Job satisfaction in radio news*. Retrieved August 22, 2003, from http://www.missouri.edu/~jourvs/rasatis.html

Surpuriya, T., & Jordan, M. (1997). *Teacher burnout*. Retrieved April 9, 2009, from http://weeklywire.com/ww10-27-97/memphis_cvr.html

Syptak, J. M., Marsland, D. W., & Ulmer, D. (1999). Job satisfaction: Putting theory into practice. Family practice management. *The Satisfaction Report, 3*. South Bend, Ind: Press, Ganey Associates.

Taylor, D. L., & Tashakkori, A. (1995). Decision participation and school climate as predictors of job satisfaction and teachers' sense of efficacy. *Journal of Experimental Education, 63,* 217.

Taylor Nelson Sufras (TNS). (2006). *Low levels of job commitment among civil servants.* Retrieved March 26, 2009, from http://www.allbusiness.com/human-resources/employee-development/397371-1.html

Teacher Support Network. (2009). *Common mental health problems: Supporting school staff by taking positive action*. Retrieved April 9, 2009 from http://tsn.custhelp.com/cgi-bin/tns.cfg/php/enduse/print_adp.php?p_faqid=2084&p_created

Thomas, D. C., & Au, K. (2002). The effect of cultural differences on behavioral responses to low job satisfaction. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 309.

Thorsen-Spano, L. (1996). A school conflict resolution program: Relationships among teacher attitude, program implementation, and job satisfaction. *School Counselor, 44*(1), 19-28.

Ting, Y. (1997). Determinants of job satisfaction of federal government employees. *Public Personnel Management, 26,* 313-335.

Tye, B. B., & O'Brien, L. (2002). Why are experienced teachers leaving the profession? *Phi Delta Kappan, 84*(1), 24-33.

U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *Twenty-third annual report to Congress on the implementation of Public Law 94-142: The education for all handicapped children act.* Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office.

University of Florida. (2008). *Retention downplayed as teacher-shortage solution.* First talk of COE's distinguished speaker series. Retrieved April 4, 2009 from http://www.ufl.edu

Van Acker, R. (1993). Dealing with conflict and aggression in the classroom: What skills do teachers need? *Teacher Education and Special Education, 16*(1), 23-33.

Webber, J. (1994). Psychological immunization: Resisting depression, neurosis, and physical illness in a strenuous profession. *Preventing School Failure, 38*(4), 16-22.

Wegge, J., Schmidt, K., Parkes, C., & van Dick, K. (2007). 'Taking a sickie': Job satisfaction and job involvement as interactive predictors of absenteeism in a public organization. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *80*, 77-89.

Wehby, J. H., Lane, K. L., & Falk, K. B. (2003). Academic instruction for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders,* 11,

2003. Retrieved April 4, 2009, from
http://www.questia.com/googleScholar.qst:jsess.onid=JX1SyQzdmNxChTFLlyCp0qGqR

Weld, J. (1998). Attracting and retaining high-quality professions in science education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 79*(7), 536-540.

Wilde, C. (1994). Downward spiral. *Computerworld, 81*.

Wisniewski, L., & Gargiulo, R. M. (1997). Occupational stress and burnout among special educators: A review of the literature. *Journal of Special Education, 31*(3), 325-347.

Wong, H., & Wong, R. (2003). *Effective teaching*. Retrieved April, 15, 2003, from
http://teachers.net/gazette/FEB03/wong.html

Wood, T., & McCarthy, C. (2000). *Understanding and preventing teacher burnout.* Retrieved April 9, 2009, from http://www.ericdigests.org/2004-1burnout.htm

Woods, A. M., & Weasmer, J. (2002). Maintaining job satisfaction: Engaging professionals as active participants. *Clearing House, 75*(4), 186-189.

World Bank Group. (2005). *Children and youth: Life-cycle approach.* Retrieved July 3, 2005, from http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAT/TOPICS/

Wrobel, G. (1993). Preventing school failure for teachers: Training for a lifelong career in EBD. *Preventing School Failure, 37*(2), 16-20.

Yee, S. M. (1990). *Careers in the classroom: When teaching is more than a job.* New York: Teachers College Press.