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ABSTRACT

William A. Royal: SCHOOL WIDE POSITIVE BEHAVIOR SUPPORT PROGRAMS AFFECT TEACHER MORALE

This study investigated the effect of the implementation of a School Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) Program on teacher morale. This quantitative study used the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire (PTO) to survey the faculties for two rural, Title I middle schools in Tennessee. Middle School 1 implemented the SWPBS program. Middle School 2 was the control group. The surveys were given to each school’s faculty before implementation and after implementation at Middle School 1. The study examined the changes in the opinions of the two faculties for each of seven factors, rapport with the principal, satisfaction with teaching, salary, teaching load, curriculum issues, teacher status, and community support. Each question’s responses on each administration of the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire were recorded. The differences in the mean responses for each question on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire questions by each faculty were calculated. The results of the survey showed several factors’ responses were skewed or had a small number of questions on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire. An independent sample t-test was used for the statistical analyses. Overall, protected results show that we failed to reject the hypothesis on five of the research questions: satisfaction, salary, educational support, rapport with the principal and teaching load. Therefore, the study deduced that the teachers’ opinions on their curriculum issues and status were affected by the implementation of the SWPBS.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Daniel Griffiths (1954) noted that groups efficiently achieve goals through cohesiveness, respect for leadership, and confidence in equipment (Miller, 1981). These factors reflect high morale in relationship to working towards group goals. School faculties demonstrate high morale when teachers look forward to reporting for work in the morning, do not stampede for the door after school, actively participate in school functions, extend contributions to the school’s overall efforts, and actively engage in the improvement of the school (Miller, 1981). The present quantitative study explored whether the implementation of the School Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) program in one of two middle schools in the state of Tennessee significantly affected teacher morale levels by surveying such factors such as community pressures, facilities status, rapport with the principal, and satisfaction with the job.

Background of the Problem

Early research on teacher morale by Hand (1948) showed factors affecting teacher morale. The most important factor contributing to boosting morale was compensation. Secondary to compensation were teachers’ feelings of a sense of belonging and importance. Survey results indicated that teachers tended to have high morale when they belonged to a group of respected faculty members and felt they were needed. Administrative actions and support may affect teacher morale. Later research by Coughlin (1970) noted the underlying issues of teacher morale in research on teachers’ perceptions of the work environment’s sources that lead to satisfaction with jobs. These two works illustrate a subject that has received less attention than other areas of research in education.
Nias (1981) reflected Herzberg’s two-factor hypothesis on work satisfaction when reviewing the work issues of affective satisfaction, personal competence, and the extension of teachers’ skills. Herzberg’s two factor hypothesis on work satisfaction involves the balancing of satisfying and dissatisfying influences. Nias noted the reconciliation between Herzberg’s factors by distinguishing between the absence of expected satisfaction or negative satisfiers, and the presence of dissatisfaction or dissatisfiers. Other factors causing dissatisfaction included perceived inadequacy in teaching, and institutional factors that presented barriers to teaching. These two opposing factors balance the teacher’s perspectives on the indicators of teacher morale.

After Nias’ investigations, gaps in the knowledge about rural teacher’s morale levels are evident in the literature. Sargent and Hannum (2005) reviewed job satisfaction under dynamic job market conditions similar to those presented under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2001) and Tennessee’s First to the Top (FTTT). The current flux of changes within Tennessee’s rural school’s funding issues, loss of collective bargaining, and tenure review has presented teachers in rural schools in Tennessee with personal and professional challenges to their perceptions of belonging and value. Greenfield (2003) cited differences in funding between rural and urban schools. These differences related to higher teacher morale in urban schools.

Rural school settings present teachers with particular issues. The current issues relate to student preparedness for formal education, parent education levels, value of education, lower socioeconomic standings, diminishing job markets within the rural communities, and changing definitions of family units. Additional factors affecting teacher morale within the rural community include the instability of teacher’s sense of
purpose, self-efficacy, motivation, commitment, job satisfaction and effectiveness.

Administrators must focus on connecting with teachers on both cognitive and emotional levels within rural schools. These connections enhance stability within the attitudinal and behavioral aspects of the teachers’ roles. These aspects vary greatly with the tenure of the faculty within the school.

Teacher’s perceptions of their value within a rural community contribute to their morale. Morale in rural schools is affected by the school climate and culture. Teacher morale often determines the level of commitment to the school (Gunbayi, 2007). Administrators are able to lead the school climate and culture development by addressing issues that affect teachers’ perceptions. These issues include organizational clarity, teacher autonomy, and team commitment (Gunbayi, 2007). Further attention to school issues under the control of the school administration provides an opportunity for rural schools to address more strongly issues that impinge on teacher morale and motivation.

Rural schools often face challenges regarding professional development, school technology, and site development. These challenges are further emphasized under the benchmarks for Adequate-Yearly-Progress under NCLB and Tennessee’s First to the Top, community support, funding, and teacher retention. NCLB provides ever increasing benchmarks for schools to remain safe schools. FTTT limits the scope for which funds may be allocated. These two initiatives were perceived as saviors of schools, particularly rural schools; however, the reality within the rural school setting tends to bring a somber reality. Rural schools must address socioeconomic dynamics within their communities where students arrive at school with a very different perspective of and preparation for
academia than that held by politicians and teachers. These differences present rural schools with challenges that affect teacher morale (Klassen & Anderson, 2009).

The rural education mission and setting changed dramatically from 1962 to 1970. These changes include community support, curriculum design, teacher load, teacher status, and school facilities and services (Rempel & Bentley, 1970). These areas directly affect teacher morale. Teacher perceptions of these factors affect the attrition and retention rates for teachers in rural schools. The perceptions could be affected by teacher’s backgrounds, demographics, and motivations (Hargrove, B., Inman, A., & Crane, R., 2005). Administrators’ capacity to address these issues in situ determines how these factors affect teacher morale.

Administrators’ efforts to establish the character of the school have historically been a major factor in determining the level of teacher morale and were examined by Ellenberg (1973). Student behavior incidences affect teachers’ abilities to build self-efficacy and academic momentum during the flux of the other issues facing rural schools under NCLB and First to the Top. The role of the school administration in building a track record of positive experiences for teachers will determine how teachers perceive factors that affect their morale. School climate and culture establishes these perceptions through the evidence built on student achievement and behavior. The application of the School Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) program in a rural school district is the topic of the study. SWPBS is intended to improve morale and provides an initiative with which to address many school climate and culture perceptions related to morale through an inclusive approach to establishing expectations, rewards, and consequences for both positive and negative behaviors within the school setting.
Statement of the Problem

The brief review of the literature in the previous section establishes morale as a significant problem in rural schools. School organizational climate affects teacher morale through the internal psychological characteristics of each school (Pan, X., & Qin, Q. (2007). Administration, teaching, academics, and interpersonal climate within a school result in teachers’ emotional perceptions of their working environment. Several models have been constructed to examine these structures and their influencing factors. These models include Vroom’s seven-factor theory, Friedlander’s three-factor theory, and Smith, Asndal, and Hulin’s five-factor theory (Xiaofu & Qiwen, 2007). A common thread through each of these theories is the measurement of teacher job satisfaction as a function of the nature of the work, work conditions, administration, compensation, and interpersonal relationships. Most of the results of the study by Xiaofu and Qiwan (2007) of these theories include a significant positive correlation between the different dimensions of teacher job satisfaction and teacher morale.

The implementation of a SWPBS program within a school requires a commitment and recognition from the administration, the faculty, and the school community. Efforts to address the job structure and influencing environmental factors through the SWPBS program integrate common threads of the two, three, and five factor models through the social learning theory application outlined within the tenets of the SWPBS program (Bolin, 2007). The intervention approach reflects a more reactionary approach to problem behaviors that interfere with academic success (Shogren, Faggella-Luby, Bae, & Wehmeyer, 2004).

The research within the SWPBS movement regarding the effect of the implementation of a SWPBS programs in rural schools tends to focus on the linkages
with academic achievement and behavioral incidences. Horner and Sugai (in press) have conducted some research that examined other factors within a school, such as the effects on student achievement, on task behavior, and the trends within the tracked behaviors. An example of the research which reflects an interest within the teacher efficacy realm would include Saracalogu and Yenice’s (2009) work on Turkish science and elementary teachers. Many of these efficacy studies examine the gender, seniority, contact hours, and branch of service, but failed to review the effects of student behavioral issues and their effects under the implementation of a SWPBS program.

**Purpose of the Study**

The study was an effort to examine the effects of the integration of a SWPBS program on teacher morale and its aspects of teacher efficacy and stress within two similar Title 1 middle schools in rural east Tennessee. The study was designed to explore whether the implementation of a SWPBS program within one of these schools would positively affect teacher morale levels through examination of several factors of morale such as community pressures, facilities status, rapport with the principal, and satisfaction with the job. Through the use of the Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire, teacher responses were examined with iterations of independent sample t-tests to explore the relationship between the two schools’ faculty responses to the survey. There are two factors measured by the Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire that were not included within this study. The factors of facilities and community pressures were not included within this study as these two factors are not within the scope of the SWPBS program. The remaining seven factors, rapport with the principal, satisfaction with teaching, salary, teaching load, curriculum issues, status, and community support, are factors measured within the scope of the
SWPBS program. Rapport with the principal, satisfaction, and load satisfy the requirements for implementing a one sample t-test. The remaining factors of salary, curriculum issues, educational support and community pressure did not meet the prerequisites of the t-test, thus the Wilcoxon Signed Rank test, a nonparametric test, was applied. The fidelity of the implementation of the SWPBS program was tracked through the School Wide Information System (SWIS) for the treatment school to ensure the SWPBS program was being fully implemented with fidelity. The SWIS program tracks the SWPBS program by recording behavior incidences for data analysis and discussions with which to track and address behavior trends. The SWIS and SWPBS programs are monitored annually through a School Effectiveness Test (SET) Report (See Middle School 1 Set Report in Appendix E). The SET Report is independently administered by qualified SWPBS trained reviewers. This report verifies fidelity of the school’s SWPBS program for continuance of the program and subscription to the SWIS program. Program fidelity must remain above 80% over a three year window to maintain the School Wide Information System and SWPBS program subscriptions. The treatment school maintains a performance above the 77% fidelity mark.

**Theoretical Framework**

The social behavioral work within the positive behavior support field has grown out of Horner and Sugai’s efforts over the past decade (Horner, 2000). Horner suggested that SWPBS is a very real and practical system with which to address problem behaviors within schools. The foundation of social behaviorism relies on the social processing of behaviors within a society. In this case, the society is the school community where behavioral expectations are developed and implemented through an instructional process
and supported through the SWPBS program. The SWPBS program is an effort to reduce problem behaviors and increase social, personal, and professional qualities. The analysis of behaviors creates an opportunity to blend the values of the school community into the learning process. The inclusive approach within the SWPBS movement addresses the learning environment rather than correcting the people within the environment. These corrections of the environment directly relate to the factors being investigated within the study as problem behaviors become irrelevant, inefficient, and ineffective for the teacher and the learner.

**Research Questions and Hypothesis**

Based on the previous sections, the primary research question and related hypotheses were as follows:

**Research Questions**

The following subordinate research questions will provide the framework for the inquiry.

**RQ1:** Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their rapport with the Principal be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The rapport with the principal were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 2, 3, 5, 7, 12, 33, 38, 41, 43, 44, 61, 62, 70, 72, 73, 74, 92, 93, and 95 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire.

**Ho1:** There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their rapport with the Principal on the Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.
RQ2: Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their satisfaction with teaching be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The teacher opinions of their satisfaction with teaching were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 19, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 46, 47, 50, 51, 56, 58, 60, 76, 78, 82, 83, 86, 89, and 100 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.

Ho2: There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their satisfaction with teaching on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

RQ3: Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their salary be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The teacher opinions of their salary were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 4, 9, 32, 36, 39, 65, and 75 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.

Ho3: There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their salary on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

RQ4: Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their teaching load be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The teacher opinions of their teaching load were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 1, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, 31, 34, 40, 42, and 45 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.
**Ho4:** There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their teaching load on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

**RQ5:** Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their curriculum issues be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The teacher opinions of their curriculum issues were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 17, 20, 25, 79, and 88 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.

**Ho5:** There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their curriculum issues on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

**RQ6.** Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their status be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The teacher opinions of their status were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 13, 15, 35, 37, 63, 64, 68, and 71 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.

**Ho6:** There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their status on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

**RQ7:** Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their community support be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The teacher opinions of their community support
were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 66, 67, 94, 96, and 97 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.

**Ho7:** There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their community support on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

**Significance of the Study**

Results of the present study contribute to the larger body of research on SWPBS. The contribution will help defray the lack of studies in rural middle schools that address the factors affecting teacher morale. Rural schools are facing many challenges as the local climates and cultures are quickly evolving in response to developments within the world’s business and economic arenas. Rural middle schools are striving to meet the requirements of rural high schools where students must prepare to enter a world that is dynamic and evolving. Results could lead to a broader implementation of SWPBS in rural schools nationwide, while also providing opportunities to conduct further research within the SWPBS program’s refinement to address issues measured by and reflected within the results from the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire. Additionally, results add to the information within the SWPBS efforts of some schools who value the teacher morale within their school or even within their district.

**Nature of the Study Variables**

For the purposes of anonymity, the two schools that are the subject of the study were identified as Middle School 1 and Middle School 2. Middle School 1 was the middle school chosen for the introduction of the SWPBS program. Middle School 2 was the control group that did not introduce the SWPBS program. The instrument used during the study was the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire, which is discussed in detail in
Chapter 3. The factors of teacher morale were related to teacher’s opinions. These factors of morale included the rapport with the principal. Rapport involves the teacher’s relationship with the principal and how teachers viewed the principal’s execution of the leadership and management of the school and its operations. The teachers’ opinions of the curriculum reflected their opinions of the adequacy of the curriculum to address the student learning needs and objectives. The facilities aspect related to the physical and technological infrastructure of the school. The satisfaction measurement demonstrated the teacher opinions of job satisfaction. The teaching load factors showed whether the teachers believed the distribution of the teaching duties were equitable in their view. The community issues identified the teacher opinions of the strength of the community expectations for education as a reflection of the value placed on education within the school community. The support for education within the school community related to the strength of involvement and support by the community for the school’s efforts and programs.

Research Plan

Two schools were chosen for their similarity in conditions, demographics, and settings. The treatment school was subjected to the SWPBS Set Report to ensure program fidelity. The Set Report was used to collect information from the program participants to gauge the adherence and progress of the SWPBS efforts within the school. This information was collected through interviews with administrators, faculty, community members, parents, and students, as well as documentation within the school of implementation such as behavioral data recorded in the School Wide Information System (SWIS) data base, office referral data, and teacher records. A minimum score of
80% on the Set Report was necessary for the school to be deemed to be fully implementing the program with fidelity. If the treatment school should not obtain a passing score on the Set Report, the issues for program infidelity were discussed in relation to teacher morale factors to determine whether the study remained viable.

**Assumptions**

Leedy and Ormrod (2005) argued that research assumptions are self-evident truths; thus, it was assumed that the professional educators participating in the study had the appropriate licensure as defined under the NCLB Act (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). Bruyn (1966) noted that the validity of a study will be predicated on the assumption that participants will answer the survey questions accurately and truthfully based on their “personal experiences” (p. 91). It was also assumed that the professional experiences of the participants in this study could positively contribute to the leadership decisions in dealing with the introduction and integration of a SWPBS program into the school climate and culture with fidelity.

It was assumed that all participants would respond with integrity and to best of their individual abilities. The present study was not about the individual educators, but was instead about the perceptions of the participants as they contemplated the factors they deemed important about the introduction and integration of a SWPBS program. The researcher was unbiased. This is discussed further in Chapter 4 when type I and type II errors are address. It was also assumed that the participants would reveal a common area of knowledge and that these educators would perceive the nature and significance of the present study. The assumption was made that the surveys would be conducted in a consistent method so as to present an accurate record of the views of the participants. The survey methods are discussed further in Chapter 3.
Scope

The study took place in two rural Tennessee middle schools. Each school had similar demographic parameters such as the number and profile of instructional faculty, student population characteristics, school leadership, and Title I status. The researcher explored the perceptions of the participants regarding the factors that affect teacher morale. The educators were surveyed using the Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire. Survey protocol was consistent across each administration of the Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire.

Creswell (2009) indicated that limitations of a study determine inherent exceptions, reservations, and qualifications of the research. Such limitations identify potential weaknesses of a study (Creswell, 2009; Triol, 2006). The data from the study may not be characteristic of all schools statewide or nationwide. Research biases and perceptual misrepresentations are potential limitations in a quantitative study (Yin, 2003). Data resulting from the surveys was analyzed using quantitative methods, which may be subject to other interpretations.

Delimitations are limitations on the research design imposed deliberately by the researcher (Creswell, 2009). The focus of the study was on exploring and gaining a deeper understanding of the perceptions and rationales of the factors that affect teacher morale in the subject rural Tennessee middle schools after the introduction of a SWPBS with fidelity. The study was confined to the surveys and all responses remained anonymous and confidential in a secure location with the researcher for 3 years, after which they will be destroyed.

Definition of Terms

The following terms and their definitions are presented for clarification. The
general subject of the present study was the morale of teachers in rural schools. The specific subject was the morale of teachers in two rural schools in Tennessee and whether implementation of the SWPBS program was effective in improving morale, efficacy, and reducing stress.

**Assessment**

Assessment is an on-going process aimed at understanding and improving student learning. It involves making our expectations clear to students and setting appropriate outcomes for learning. It helps determine how well student performance matches those outcomes. It uses the resulting information to improve student learning.

**Curriculum**

A curriculum is a set of decision-making processes and products that focuses on the preparation, and assessment of general plans to influence student behaviors and insights (Hewitt, 2006). Teachers’ perceptions of the curriculum and its appropriateness could become a factor in their morale.

**Efficacy**

Efficacy generally relates to the ability to produce effects. Within the educational setting, self-efficacy refers to the belief that the individual is capable of performing tasks to attain goals or levels of job performance. Under Bandura’s social learning theory, self-efficacy underscores a belief in one’s ability to succeed within certain situations to successfully achieve an established goal or overcome challenges. Efficacy develops through the mastery of experiences, social models, social persuasion, and stress reduction (Bandura, 1994).
**Enrollment Data**

This term refers to the overall number of students attending the school (Fike & Fike, 2007). The enrollment data review ensures that the two schools participating within this study are of similar demographics.

**Instruction**

This consists of interactions among teachers and students around content (Fullan, Hill, & Crevola, 2006). The instructional practices and styles may affect teachers’ perceptions of the factors that affect their morale.

**Morale**

Morale is an intangible characteristic often used to describe the ability of people to believe in an institution’s goals and practices. Morale is susceptible to change when individuals are subjected to stress or controversy. The value judgments of will power and self-discipline within a group faced with challenges reflect the individual’s belief in the group’s collective benefits to be earned through the sacrifice by individual members of the group (Coughlin, 1970).

**Rapport with Principal**

The factor of teacher rapport with the Principal dealt with the teacher’s feelings about the principal regarding his/her competency, interest in teachers and their work, ability to communicate, and skills in human relations (Rempel & Bentley, 1970).

**School Performance Score (SPS)**

The SPS measures the performance of the school using attendance, drop-out rate, standardized test scores, and percentage of highly qualified personnel (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). The SPS indicates whether the two schools are similar and the
continuity of the conditions under which the SWPBS program was implemented are similar to those existing within the control school.

**Stress**

Stress is caused by external and internal influencers (Lewis, 2004). Factors external to the individual include the physical environment, job demands, relationships with others, domestic challenges, and all the daily situations, challenges, difficulties, and expectations faced by individuals. Internal factors causing stress include one’s emotional and physical health status (Lewis, 2004). Factors affecting teacher morale are affected by the level of teacher stress.

**Summary**

Chapter 1 was a presentation of the problem of a lack of research about implementation of the School Wide Positive Behavior Support program in rural middle schools and its effect on teacher morale, efficacy, and stress levels. The developments within the SWPBS trends provide opportunities to create a pro-active approach to addressing the changes within the rural community value system in response to an environment of change. The social cognitive theories of Bandura and Herzberg’s Motivational theory provide a conceptual framework for this research on the SWPBS program’s effects within two Tennessee schools. This quantitative research effects existing research results through the contribution regarding the effects on teacher morale, efficacy, and stress levels as the middle school level often neglected throughout the research on the SWPBS movement.

The purpose of the study and the primary research question were cited. The theoretical foundation of the methodology was summarized. Chapter 2 reflects a thorough review of the existing literature on teacher morale and its factors. The intent of
the literature review was to provide a background and theoretical foundation for the present study. The research design was outlined in Chapter 1 and will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3. Chapter 3 is intended to provide the experienced investigator with enough data to replicate the study. The research approach and design are detailed, and the setting and participants are identified. The procedures for the collection and analysis of data are described. As well, ethical considerations and internal and external validity are discussed.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter provides a background of the School Wide Positive Behavior Support efforts through an overview of the theory and literature that led to the development and implementation of SWPBS programs within schools to address achievement and behavioral issues. The review of the literature on teacher morale, its factors, and the effects of the implementation of these programs on faculty morale are discussed through the literature. The supporting theories are discussed to address what is known and what is unknown within the area of research. This discussion of the theories is followed by a review of the contributions of this study to expand the current areas of study within the field.

Documentation

Scholarly books, seminal journal articles and research documents were reviewed through Liberty University’s library. Additional databases searched included EBSCOhost, Academic OneFile, JSTOR, LexisNexis Academic, ProQuest, Science Direct, and the Association of Christian Schools International Publications. Also, Education Research Complete, Mental Measurements Yearbook with Tests in Print, and Digital Dissertations were also reviewed through this same library. The online databases of Google and Google Scholars provided information for the search of pertinent literature. Bibliographic and reference listings were accessed from appropriate titles discovered within the review process. Approximately 300 current scholarly articles pertaining to morale, No Child Left Behind, Race to the Top, rural education, SWPBS, teacher efficacy, teacher morale, and teacher welfare, as well as school climate, culture, leadership, and management were reviewed.
Overview of Teacher Morale

Morale, as a factor in job performance, is becoming a more important issue for leaders. Research on worker morale in general, but not specifically on educators, initially focused on physical factors relating to the work environment. Later research introduced other environmental factors affecting workers, such as contextual issues, group dynamics, social interactions, and other community factors (Argent, 2008). Several theories emerged to address the social learning aspects of these additional factors. Bandura and Walters (1963) introduced motivation as one of the four factors within his social learning theory to address modeling of behaviors. Bandura’s theories are related to Vygotsky’s Social Development Theory within the social connections and shared experiences between people as a source of learning, modeling, and motivation. These connections and experiences involve reciprocal interactions that are influenced by behavioral, cognitive, and environmental factors.

Morale is an intangible aspect within a group that reflects individual commitment to the group’s overall mission and objectives. These individual commitments to the group’s efforts are influenced by these same factors and the balance created by the reciprocity within these interactions (Peterson, 2008). These factors include aspects of the work environment relating to the affective and physical domains. Affective influencers include the positive environment factors of worker appreciation, establishment of standards, and social interactions. The physical and environmental factors include items such as a safe working environment, adequate lighting, air quality, and noise levels.
School Leadership and Morale

Leaders are able to manage some of these factors through practices that establish expectations for the affective and physical environmental factors while setting a tone for other factors (Cheung & Chan 2010). The expectations set by the leader are a foundation on which individuals are able to build a commitment to the organization through the acquisition of a base level of emotional and physical security. The leadership style adopted by the higher echelons within an organization sets an overall tone with which to address the remaining factors. This style establishes the relationships between leaders and followers as well as the horizontal relationships within an organization. These relationships define the social interaction patterns and inevitably the morale within the group and its community. These social interactions and the morale which follows build social capital within a group (Cheung & Chan, 2010).

The level and quality of the social interactions predict the quality of the morale within a group (Cheung & Chan, 2010). The more positive the social interactions people experience within the work environment, the more social capital the leaders build. Teachers have these interactions with their students, fellow teachers, the various levels of administration within a school and its district, and the wider school community stakeholders. These daily interactions, both positive and negative interactions, reach a balance that may influence teacher morale on a long term basis. School leaders are able to nurture teachers and an environment which is able to affect the faculty’s number and type of experiences and episodes.

School leaders must address contextual issues facing the faculty and the school community (Argent, 2008). These issues include factors that affect teacher morale. Such
factors include the preparedness of students for the level of academic work, the value
placed on education and the faculty by the larger school community, and the school
community pressures. The larger school community includes key stakeholder groups,
such as parents, business and professional communities, feeder schools, fed schools, and
others citizens groups.

School leaders within rural areas face different circumstances and community
values than those in other settings (Argent, 2008). The resources and values within these
communities establish different expectations for the school and its faculty than those
within more developed areas. Many of these rural schools face economic pressures with
declining populations and resources. These pressures require the development of ideas
and strategies to address faculty concerns and to build community and organizational
support for the school through a wider community involvement to balance the support for
student achievement with the factors that affect teacher morale (Argent, 2008).

The development of a collaborative working relationship with the faculty and the
school community while also addressing the developing accountability within the current
trend of NCLB and the Race to the Top (RTTT) federal programs requires school leaders
not only to be conscientious of the factors of teacher morale, but also to deal with
everyone within a respectful relationship while requiring all stakeholders to strive for
excellence.

Similar situations have been confronted within the medical profession by doctors
in rural areas. These doctors often face similar challenges in building their practices’
businesses and relationships with their patients’ communities (McKinstry, Porter, Wrate,
Elton, & Shaw, 2004). Factors health care professionals must contemplate within their
general practices include the level of control of one’s work, the balance between work and home, not feeling valued by colleagues, possessing little support from home, and reconsidering the chosen profession (McKinstry et al., 2004). Within rural community settings, the seeking of outside help is too often viewed as a weakness or a sign of failure which may alter the community’s perspective of the practicing professional. These factors provide sources of stress and indicate the level of morale under the Morale Assessment in General Practice Index (MAGPI) instrument developed to measure the levels of distress within the everyday lives of rural general practitioners. The MAGPI identifies the critical sources of the stress through its simplistic approach and layout that provides the subject with the opportunity to self score and to reflect on the results. This ability to self score provides immediate feedback on sources of stress such as the level of control of the work, the balance between home and work, the perceptions of the effectiveness of the professional practitioner, and the overall health and happiness of the individual (McKinstry et al., 2004).

The Morale Assessment in General Practice Index results noted the difficulty in balancing the workload within the perceived isolation of the rural context as a distressing contribution for the subjects. (McKinstry et al., 2004). This isolation parallels that of a teacher within his or her own classroom and the solitude of school leaders within rural communities. The results of the study also noted the low perceived value of the practitioner by colleagues and patients. The balancing of the work and home demands when combined with the perceived lower valuation of the professional practitioner leads to the resulting higher level of distress and a higher level of unhappiness about the chosen career for those subjects living and working in more deprived rural contextual settings
As a result of the MAGPI study, programs, routines, and services were introduced to address the challenges highlighted within the results. These items included distance learning programs and procedures to ensure participants had access to professional development and interactions with other colleagues on a personal and professional level, an ongoing public relations program to build further community engagement, and additional efforts to recruit and to retain more colleagues into the rural areas.

School leaders within the rural setting face different criteria for successful school development than those in other settings. These schools’ leaders face similar challenges to those of rural medical practitioners (Argent, 2008). The stressors of school leaders and faculty within these rural communities are convoluted by additional factors such as the lack of control over the available resources for teaching and learning, the access to technology, the social structures within the school community, the levels of community responsibility by various school stakeholders, and the rate of change of the complexion and composition of the school community, student, and teacher populations.

School leaders must address these additional factors to motivate students, teachers, and parents toward success in meeting the further demands of NCLB and Race to the Top (Protheroe, 2006). School leaders must provide professional development opportunities for the faculty within these rural and deprived school settings to strengthen the bonds of the teachers and students to the school. Administrative and management skills could enhance faculty support through creative methods to reduce class size and teacher overload while addressing special education issues (Young, 1997). Further opportunities to build teacher commitment and morale include the improvement of the
physical working environment and improving the community’s negative perception of the teachers, their challenges, and their successes. School leaders must utilize an innovative approach to these issues to build support for the multiple levels of the factors of teacher morale. Such approaches could include empowering teachers within the decision making processes, building adequate resources through fiscal and maintenance systems, developing professional growth opportunities such as professional learning communities, and reducing work pressures through affiliations, progressive instructional strategies, and improvement of student behaviors.

**Teacher Commitment and Morale**

Teacher commitment to the organizational values supports the collective effects of teachers’ efficacy, morale and stress (Ross & Gray, 2006). Efficacy refers to a teacher’s belief that he or she will be able to affect student learning. Teacher morale encompasses the overall spirit with which faculty members approach their profession and teacher stress measures a teacher’s expectations against his or her performances within the profession. All of these factors predict the effectiveness of the teaching and learning efforts within a school (Ross & Gray, 2006).

Morale and achievement are directly related. Ellenberg (as cited in Devi & Mani, 2010), found that high morale within schools indicated an increase in student achievement. Some factors are within control of the faculty, while other factors are under the control of the school administration with additional factors under the control of district level administration and the governing school board. Factors within the scope of control by teachers include some of the issues of the teaching and learning environment within their own classrooms, such as the physical layout and orderliness of the classroom,
issues relating to school facilities and services, aspects of the curriculum delivery, community relationships issues, relationships with site administration, and the perception of community pressures (Devi & Mani, 2010).

A few aspects of teacher morale that are external to teacher control include the salary levels paid to teachers, certain aspects of the teaching load, and the school facility and services challenges, many of which are imposed on the school and teachers from outside of the school from the various layers of bureaucracy and government, such as district, state, and federal mandates (Devi & Mani, 2010). Lower levels of morale and satisfaction lead to decreased teacher productivity and increased teacher burnout. Teachers with lower morale demonstrate a detachment from students, decreased quality of teaching, greater use of sick leave, and a dehumanized perception of students. These lower levels of teacher morale affect the attitudinal, emotional, and physical well being of teachers and students as these levels reflect internal conflict within the faculty and individual teachers. Some organizational factors override classroom factors when reviewing teacher morale levels (Hart, Wearing, Conn, Carter, & Dingle, 2000).

**Organizational Factors and Morale**

Organizational factors such as appraisal and recognition, curriculum coordination, effective discipline policy, excessive work demands, goal congruence, participative decision-making, professional growth, professional interaction, role clarity, student orientation, and supportive leadership are notable contributors to levels of teacher morale (Shalen & Hoardley, 2009). The market driven governmental policies often maintain current disparities between schools, districts, and states. These disparities relate to inequalities of assets and organizational factors which directly affect teacher morale. The
disparities of assets and organizational factors include physical plant issues, teaching materials, and economic dispensations that relate to academic achievement. These disparities present vulnerabilities within the overall educational process and are exposed through student achievement analyses and examination of teacher effect data (Shalem & Hoardley, 2009).

A strong correlation exists between these factors and the social inequities facing rural schools. Each of these factors tends to prevail within the context specific circumstances and events facing rural schools (Evans, 1997). The challenges facing rural schools are particular to their communities. These challenges range from poverty and a shrinking job base to lower values placed on education and a smaller teacher pool. This shrinking teacher pool is often faced with students who are cognitively under prepared by parents who are not positive role models and who are often not able to traverse the chasm between current school demands and their own experiences of school (Evans, 1997).

Teachers within rural schools are faced with learners who are deficient in health maintenance issues and are not cognitively prepared for school (Argent, 2008). These teachers must develop a specialized knowledge of the school community and setting within a very small teacher commune that lacks the social capital and knowledge resources to address the dynamics facing the contemporary rural setting. These dynamics include racial and social changes and a stagnation of the teachers’ school improvement efforts without the advantage of additional instructional time (Argent, 2008).

Current accountability measures fail to address the time these teachers invest within their schools and communities, the students’ performances as measured against their cognitive preparedness on mandated tests, and the teachers’ adherences to
educational governances and procedures particular to the school and its community (Teale & Scott, 2010). The evaluative lens must shift towards the determinants of job satisfaction and morale such as leadership orientations and perspectives as an influence on the expectations of teachers and its effect on teacher morale. Such a disparity between expectations, orientations, and outcomes relates directly to the level of individual and collective teacher morale within a school or district (Teale & Scott, 2010).

As the instructional leader within a school, the principal plays a critical role in implementing change (Meyer, Macmillan, & Northfield, 2009). While teachers possess the means for limiting the effects of these changes, informal faculty leaders provide an opportunity for school leaders at various levels to affect needed changes in teacher morale factors. These informal leaders’ abilities to stabilize the school situation provide direction to address the teacher morale factors through initiatives and a shift in the school culture. The school leader must establish and maintain an open culture by building trust through transparent decision making and consideration of the context of any initiatives (Meyer et al., 2009). This context includes the intrinsic and extrinsic cultural variables. The intrinsic variables relate to teacher efficacy, working with students, and overall job satisfaction. The two main extrinsic variables include the salary levels and teacher overload. All of these variables relate to the outcomes and influences of teacher job performance and satisfaction. Other initiatives have been proposed over time since Herzberg (1966) noted the need to address these variables through the removal of obstacles to promote job satisfaction and teacher morale. The increasing complexity of the role of a teacher within today’s schools presents a wider scope of work in addition to the face-to-face teaching. This increased complexity includes the addition of further
obstacles such as curriculum design changes, technology influences, school community dynamics, and resource management.

These obstacles are not static in today’s educational world. Thus, the school leadership must focus on systems to address the reduction of the effects of these ever changing factors (Mackenzie, 2007). The organizational implications for the teacher morale factors includes the teacher workload, status, and salary levels, as well as an increased appreciation for the influence of the media, professional development, and student welfare. While the site administration may have limited input into some of these factors, the teachers’ perceptions of these factors may rely heavily on the leadership and managerial tactics employed to facilitate the teachers’ job execution efforts (Mackenzie, 2007).

Teacher morale has been noted through research as a factor in student achievement, but largely ignored when considering working conditions, educational program changes, and politically induced movements such as NCLB and Race to the Top accountability and funding competitions (Banta, T. W., Hansen, M. J., Black, K. E., & Jackson, J. E. (2002). Teacher morale tends to sink when rapid, successive changes are made to educational programs. Student achievement tends to accompany the declining teacher morale. Sergiovanni (1994) noted that teacher job satisfaction tends to follow a continuum. He also noted that in accordance with Herzberg’s theory, teachers would be dissatisfied under a mutually exclusive assumption should the factors affecting their job satisfaction transition in a negative direction. The factors addressing job satisfaction include achievement, recognition, and responsibility, while work dissatisfaction condition factors include interpersonal relations, school policy and administration. Some of the
work dissatisfaction issues relating to persistent changes derive from the leadership practices employed (Sergiovanni, 1994).

Leadership practices also affect the school culture (Klassen, Usher, & Bong, 2010; Koludrovic, Jukic, Ercegovac, Reic, & Zivot, 2009). School culture links directly to collective efficacy, job satisfaction, and stress. Job satisfaction factors tend to focus more on the work itself while the dissatisfaction issues related more to work conditions. This polarization effect between the two types of factors supports Herzberg’s findings. The contexts of the schools’ cultures present motivational beliefs and issues. These beliefs and issues relate to the diversity within the setting. This diversity becomes a source of job satisfaction across different settings and may influence the teachers’ abilities to handle the stress with the onslaught of changes facing classroom teachers (Meyer, Macmillan, & Northfield, 2009). The administrative support of these teachers through engagement in policy making decisions presents an opportunity to enhance the teachers’ motivation and thus support the reduction of overall stress. This reduction of the overall stress will produce a more collective efficacy towards addressing the issues challenging teacher morale and its factors.

The teaching profession is often viewed through social and economic perils as a noble profession but not a lucrative effort when considering the working conditions (Bledow, 2009). Yet, many teachers remain within the profession through a personal initiative towards organizational citizenship (Bledow, 2009). The level of commitment by teachers to the profession reflects the importance of morale and job satisfaction determinants. These determinants such as leadership and individual orientations provide for relative perspectives and realistic expectations (Evans, 2007). These perspectives and
expectations provide teachers with a foundation on which to accommodate the school policies and rules, address the administrative burdens of the teaching posts, collaborate with fellow teachers and the administration, support professional development initiatives, and ensure more clear and consistent use of instructional time (Stallings, J. A., & Quinn, L. F. (1991).

Leaders must create an atmosphere to balance the positive and negative experiences for teachers (Morgan, Ludlow, O’Leary, & Clarke, 2010). This balancing act leads to a discussion of the origin, frequency and intensity of these episodes (Morgan et al., 2010). The emotional balance of teachers must not be micro-managed. Leaders must influence teachers’ episodic influences to prevent the heavily negative influence of frequency from overriding the positive experiences. These positive experiences fortify teacher motivation and impinge on the resilience of teachers to maintain their resolve to succeed (Morgan et al., 2010).

**School Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS)**

Teachers assimilate through social learning and motivational theories during the various stages of their careers. Moloney (2009) noted the angst with which most leaders address teacher morale and proposes to create an overall perception by teachers in which the “hope and flow” (p. 10) of the organization creates a congruency between organizational goals and personal needs. This study echoes Sergiovanni’s (1994) position that goals can be met and the perceived challenges of the school’s situation are able to be met through the personal capabilities of the individuals involved in the effort. This perception links the efficacy issues to organizational goal achievement through morale and motivation factors. Newly minted teachers possess very different goals, objectives, and motivation than the more seasoned veteran teachers. These goals,
objectives, and motivation levels reflect experiences within the classroom and of different administrative and leadership efforts.

Social learning theories support the examination of internal attributes and the external factors through the positive behavior support movement. The positive behavior support movement seeks a proactive approach to address behaviorist theories (Ross & Horner, 2007). Internal attributes addressed within the School Wide Positive Behavior Support efforts include the teacher stress and efficacy levels. The external environmental factors considered include the socially valuable outcomes, the procedures, and the systems within a school. Both of these attributes and factors form a foundation on which Colvin, Kameenui, and Sugai, (1993) proposed the SWPBS program to involve an application of behavioral analysis with an emphasis on creating a three-tiered system where behavioral expectations are clearly defined, proactively demonstrated and taught, and consistently and persistently acknowledged and monitored within the school through the SWPBS program and the utilization of the School Wide Information System program. Previously cited articles demonstrate a positive correlation between the SWPBS and lowering of teacher stress. Additionally, teacher efficacy was significantly affected by the SWPBS program.

**Communications**

SWPBS builds communication within a school. This communication supports the best teachers instead of punishing the worst teachers (Healey, 2009). Through a focus on the classroom interaction between teachers and students, SWPBS seeks to build the connecting relationships that change children’s behavior and achievements in order to transform a school into an environment of success for students. The maximization of
instructional time through an early investment in organizational communication prevents decisions based on the sands of convenience. The teachers are able to then tune into the students’ communications of their instructional needs in order to create and examine new ideas that promote a culture of student learning within the school community.

SWPBS with high fidelity includes a distributive model of leadership. This model builds a cohesive school team within the school and its community to participate actively in decision making (Hulpia, Devos, & Rosseel, 2009). This decision making addresses contextual variables within the school and its community. The enhanced cohesion across the school and its community indirectly impacts job satisfaction as the decentralization of some of the leadership’s functions builds organizational commitment by the teachers and the wider school community. Through this participative decision making, teachers and school stakeholders contribute to the guidance of the direction in which the school is progressing. These contributions build organizational commitments such as emotional stakes, loyalty, and personalized investment in the success of the school (Cheung, 2009). Such commitments reduce the tensions between school stakeholders. These reduced tensions nurture a lower student resistance to learning by targeting student anxiety, raising teacher and student expectations, and addressing the actions needed to improve the classroom performances by both teachers and students. Persistence must follow the implementation actions to establish a positive rapport between teachers and students, parents and schools, the school and its community, and school leadership and teachers. The collegial interaction between all groups creates partnerships to coordinate the efforts to provide students with opportunities for success rather than placing them at risk of failure (Cheung, 2009).
Response to Intervention (RtI)

Response to Intervention is often aligned to the SWPBS program through similar models and results’ displays using the pyramidal analogy. RtI in practice tends to be applied towards the early identification and intervention for students who could potentially be identified for special education support programs. The base of the pyramid displays approximately 80% of the student population who could benefit from active interventions by the classroom teacher. These interventions could include the integration of active teaching pedagogies, such as formative instruction, mild modifications to the scope and sequence of the teaching or individualized instruction, such as shortened assignments or modified assessments. The middle tier of the pyramid relates to the students in need of more intense interventions to succeed academically. These interventions could involve the utilization of inclusionary or resource style classes within the potential of further support through the integration of teaching assistants or aides. These students usually include 8% to 12% of the student population who are able to cope within the normal classroom with these more involved interventions. The upper apex of the pyramid involves the final 5% to 8% of the students who need high levels of academic support through more intensive interventions. These students could require more time within a self contained classroom with more individualized attention or support beyond the scope available within the normal classroom or the normal capabilities of the traditional classroom teacher.

Response to Intervention tends to remain focused within the special education field as a means for providing the support for identification and interventions for students who are under the suspicion of needing special education accommodations and support
programs. RtI within the middle school sector of the educational regime tends to focus more on the discrete components of assessment, scores and performance (Manzi, Alderton, & Erdmann, 2010). The planning and preparation required for a successful RtI program within a middle school taxes the resources of the middle school. The process through which the successful RtI program succeeds, demands further interventions for specific academic challenges while driving the instruction through data collection and analysis.

The progress monitoring of students addresses the selection of academic materials, instructional practices, and allocates the logistics for interventions while seeking long term sustainability on an individual student basis. These additional program demands on the classroom teacher are often beyond the scope of the individual classroom teacher’s present level of training as the integration of RtI extends beyond the usual classroom practices for addressing the demands and requirements of normal Individual Education Plans (IEP). These IEPs are written to provide the special needs students the integration and supplemental instructional interventions within the capabilities of the normal classroom. Further supports are often utilized through inclusion style classrooms when additional instructional support personnel are provided to address the issues within the RtI program. Additional support is usually provided through the resource classes which are conducted by special needs trained teachers who have the background and talents within the realm of needs for the targeted students.

Thus, the implementation of Response to Intervention as an instructional system usually relates more closely to identification rather than instructional issues. However, the use of RtI as an instructional foundation could increase the stresses on the classroom
teacher who is often ill trained to apply the RtI model not only correctly, but also proficiently. This training is an entirely separate certification area and requires additional years of education and experience to proficiently apply the RtI techniques. This lack of training has led to a situation where RtI has been utilized primarily for identification of students as needing special education interventions rather than being integrated as an instructional program. Thus, teachers find the RtI model being placed where it is able to induce less stress than if it were implemented as an instructional strategy where the additional stresses from the increase in the teacher load would reduce teacher morale.

Teaching and learning within schools is often disrupted by problem behaviors (Sugai & Horner, 2006). These behaviors could be addressed through effective interventions and practices. Unfortunately, these interventions and practices have not been sustained and expanded nor have they been consistently and systematically employed (Sugai & Horner, 2006). The SWPBS program proffers an emphasis on an integration of measurable outcomes, data based decisions for the evidence based practices, and an overt supporting system from the administration for the classroom teacher. The SWPBS program provides a comprehensive and sustainable tactic for school based operations.

**Alternatives**

Canter’s *Assertive Discipline* involves the use of tracking students’ transgressions against classroom and school rules through a tick marking system. The students then receive disciplinary measures based on the tally of their tick marks for each class or the pattern of tick marks across a period of time. This system of tracking student transgressions against the agreed class or school rules often led to the students’ and
teachers marching towards the brink of a stand-off, in which case the student gained control of the disciplinary procedures and processes.

This model often places a teacher in a position of reduced control of the teaching and learning environment from a reactionary position. The teacher records the infractions of classroom or school rules on the classroom whiteboard. The number of infractions then results in negative consequences for the transgressors. Within some school cultures and environments, this location of control resulted in students driving the culture of the school environment in a negative direction. The reactionary posture adopted by the faculty and administration placed limited options within the realm of control of the school personnel.

The assertive discipline model seeks to establish a common practice within a school environment, but the reactionary responses by the classroom teacher often degrades the faculty morale as the academic priorities are often sacrificed as the students are able to derail the academic progress of the classroom efforts of the faculty who often seek a consistent approach throughout the school. The faculty could be viewed as ducks within a shooting gallery should the students devise a strategy to implore the faculty to employ the assertive discipline model over the academic environment’s requirements as command and control could supplant the efforts to improve academic achievement. Additionally, the Assertive Discipline system does not include provisions for positive models from which to learn appropriate behaviors and assumes students values of quiet, orderly learning environments. The assertive discipline fails to encompass other aspects of teacher morale such as the physical environment or relationships within the school between faculty members themselves or the faculty members and the administration. The
assertive discipline program fails to provide any mark for fidelity to the program as does the School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET) report under the SWPBS program.

Character Education provided an alternative to SWPBS as it sought to encompass anything schools provided outside the arena of academics which helped children to grow and mature into better people (Kohn, 1993). Many schools in the U.S. made efforts to include moral teaching, values education, or character building activities within their whole student curricula. Kohn (1993) noted the educational practice actually carried out by schools in these character education themes too often failed to attain the pedagogical and practical standards framework outlined by character education leaders William Bennett and Thomas Lickona. The main flaw within these practices related to the focus on the curricula organization around values and traits which were often described as ethical principles or character traits through which the social skills consistently expressed these universally acceptable or fundamental values.

Leming (1997) noted that these fundamental lists varied between regions and schools with only a small number of these attributes appearing across the various lists. The assumption of the underlying outcomes relies on the individual student behavior manifesting these values. The pedagogical view fails to maintain a clear and explicit foundation of how these values are to be taught and learned as Leming’s four step model relies wholly on experiential learning. This model fails to address the perspectives on the knowledge and values as objective items rather than a subjective issue which may vary between cultures and generations. Lickona (1998) instead proposed a more comprehensive approach. Lickona’s approach promoted a more reflective process through more affective and cognitive practices to address the behavioral facets of
character education through the academic curriculum in conjunction with extra-curricular activities as part of the wider school culture. Lickona sought to build intrinsic motivation through reflective discussions and problem solving practices to draw out the character education issues rather than relying on a more didactic instructional practice and strategy.

The character education programs as practiced within many schools tended to devolve into a contextualized behavior training program. The mere conformity to the educators’ claimed absolute and universal virtues as defined by the approach to the particular context within which the educator formulated the lesson provided the students fewer opportunities to address issues from their developing perspectives on race, gender, class, or even culture through the full decision making process. Additionally, the increasing diversity and morally charged issues require a strong community, not necessarily a good community, to provide a framework for students to discuss these dynamic items rather than instilling the values in the students. Thus, the current practices within most character education programs tended to become dubious as the linkage between measuring character education and development and the morality actually existing is tenuous.

Performance Character programs, as proposed by Berkowitz and Bier (2007) tended to fall under the Character Education umbrella in describing the development of morals. This stance on character education tends to draw less attention than moral character since performance character programs relate more to establishing performance values through strategies implemented within a school and do not attempt to replace the parents’ contributory role in student development. Additionally, the performance character program parallels the School Wide Positive Behavior Support program in
building parental engagement to support students’ efforts and learning through the process. The performance character program examines 10 school based practices to affect school culture in building students’ motivation to achieve through the development of the dispositions needed to perform within the classroom. These 10 practices include the creation of a safe and supportive learning community, a culture of excellence, a growth mindset with an emphasis on the importance of effort, different types of thinking outlooks, work that matters, models of excellence, a culture that values feedback and revision, preparation programs for public speaking, rubrics that help students develop responsibility for their learning, and mastery learning potential. These 10 items relate to the core beliefs of the purpose of education. These two core beliefs hold that education correctly should address students’ needs to become smarter and better.

To become smarter and better, students must also develop both moral character and performance character. Moral character requires that students conduct themselves ethically while striving to achieve not only social justice, but to do so while living and working within a community. Performance character provides the students the foundation on which to build their efforts through the moral principles in school and life as they progress towards excellence. The performance character programs assume that students will endeavor to excel in all areas of their lives (Berkowitz & Bier, 2006). Thus, the performance character programs success relies on a student and school population whose culture endows the students with the internal values’ foundations on which to build and create the 10 core beliefs of the program.

Performance character programs fail to address the acquisition of the building blocks for the 10 foundational beliefs. These building blocks must be instilled within the
students through the parents and families of the students. Public schools are often faced with a diverse student population and culture which too often does not have the shared beliefs or resources to meld the blocks from the raw materials available within the school’s resources. Teachers facing these types of challenges are more focused on classroom control and survival that melding building blocks and laying foundations for more lofty goals.

Kohn (1993) discussed faults within the SWPBS movement through his discussion of incentives. Kohn maintained that such programs are doomed for failure as the short term gains diminish quickly and results in degradation to the level of lab animals. The development of students as lab rats relies on the long term value placed on the learning by the students. Kohn contended that for students to become lifelong learners, they must gain an appreciation for the process rather than the reward. The intrinsic values of the rewards fade quickly while working with the students to build an analytical mind about the learning itself rather than the performance level. Kohn’s thesis of the students’ perspectives on the learning is parallel to the establishment of a SWPBS environment. This establishment integrates the whole school community within the process rather than focusing on the eventual outcome.

**Other Issues**

Other concerns about the School Wide Positive Behavior Support program rest within the inclusivity of SWPBS (Vaughn, 2006). Students with more severe disabilities tend to remain uninvolved within the SWPBS efforts. These students need adaptations of the school’s SWPBS program in order to facilitate their integration within the program. This contextualization of the SWPBS program relies heavily on the school’s fidelity to
the SWPBS program through a school-wide application. The contextualization also requires flexibility within the school to provide individualization of the SWPBS for students facing challenges within their lives. These challenges include emotional issues and other cultural issues relating to value determination. Thus, schools must provide the more challenged students a menu of options and resources from which to develop an appropriate, individualized support system. The resources for these types of support systems are often not readily available to schools with very diverse school cultures and environments.

A critical component of the SWPBS program is the integration of the school community. As within the Title 1 program, school community integration is a vital component to the overall success of the efforts (Marshall & Mirenda, 2002). The community context establishes a setting for the routines within the school community. The challenges of establishing the SWPBS program within a school also include the collaboration within the school community to support the school through a partnership. This partnership must accept new challenges to assess, design, and implement the programs goals and efforts to achieve results. These collaborative efforts require active participation within the school-home-community triad to reciprocate information, problem solve, make decisions, and build relationships to buttress the SWPBS program objectives and execution.

Building collaborative environments within the school community require school leadership that engages all of the school’s stakeholders within an ongoing dialogue to achieve common definitions, goals, and objectives. These objectives are to reshape the disciplinary practices within a school community (Safran & Oswald, 2003). The
variables involved within this reshaping process involve the altering of views of the disorders within the school community, such as behavioral expectations differences between community, home, and school. The SWPBS framework seeks a holistic approach to the positive, collaborative process for establishing common definitions of behavioral expectations. The broader perspective is to establish a safer and more positive school environment. This type of environment related directly to Bandura’s (1993) four concepts for teachers’ morale. The environment as related to student conduct directly affects the emotive state and the experiences of the teachers. Should teachers persistently face challenging student behavior, the response of the teachers requires a very different classroom approach than when the students’ behavior are within the expectations of the agreed SWPBS objectives. Additionally, when the students’ behavior is within the SWPBS’ agreed objectives, the student and teacher accomplishments and experiences are very different. Both of these facets affect teacher morale and student advancement. The positive atmosphere affects the school’s ability to attract and retain faculty and staff accordingly.

**Barriers**

First and secondary degree barriers exist when implementing School Wide Positive Behavior Support programs (Kincaid, Childs, Blasé, & Wallace, 2007). The degree of fidelity with which a SWPBS program is implemented reflects the level of facilitation occurring and the impact of the facilitation on the barriers, such as practicality, operational, and systems issues. The themes of these issues related to the staff buy-in, use of data, consistency of implementation, and reward systems. An overarching factor that affects the implementation is the time provided for training and
addressing the SWPBS system as teachers are often inflicted with someone’s newer and grander ideas without the underlying support from the district or system level, addressing differences in pedagogical philosophies, or adequate and appropriate training.

The effects of a SWPBS program on student discipline and academic performance are critical within the early days of implementation (Luiselli, Putnam, Handler, & Feinberg, 2005). The whole school efforts must be designed through a consultative process with the faculty and the school community to underscore the efforts to improve instructional methods, to formulate behavioral expectations, to enhance classroom engagement, to reinforce positive behaviors, and to continue monitoring through a data driven evaluation and adjustment process. Further, the school discipline issues tend to present their greatest effects when SWPBS programs include social skills issues, behavioral interventions, and academic modifications. This behavior-changing program seeks to utilize consensus driven expectations through the overt teaching of interpersonal skills, a systematic reinforcement of positive performance towards success criteria, ongoing monitoring through data collection and analysis, and the integrations of stakeholders within the implementation process.

Sugai and Horner (2006) noted the concern of professional educators regarding problem behaviors that interrupt the overall learning process. The sustained practice of behavioral interventions presents the issue of widespread inconsistency. Alternatively, the SWPBS movement underscores the need for an integrated approach through a comprehensive system of measurable outcomes, data driven decisions, evidence based practices, and an overt support base for the high fidelity implementation of the SWPBS program from those implementing the program. All of these factors lead to a system
level of durable and effective school-based interventions which are proactive in their approach to addressing behavioral challenges within a school or system.

One method of informing and training faculty to build the overt support for the SWPBS program is through the exploitation of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) within a school or system (Webb, Vulliamy, Sarja, Hamalainen, & Poikonen, 2009). These PLCs tend to attract like minded professional educators whose concern for their professional growth and performances creates a common agenda to address issues facing their school or system. This common agenda crosses the various school cultural boundaries towards a focus on efforts to positively affect student discipline issues and academic performance (Luiselli, Putnam, Handler & Feinberg, 2005). PLC members tend to emphasize the improvement of instruction methods, formulating common student behavioral expectations, increasing student engagement in classroom learning activities, building positive rewards for performance, and building efficacy through data driven decisions.

Teacher efficacy improves when practitioners realize a positive outcome from their intervention techniques (Morin & Battalio, 2004). The SWPBS program provides even the low efficacy teacher with skills and tools with which to intervene when disruptive behavior occurs. These skills and tools include functional behavior assessments, behavior intervention plans, and positive rewards for improving behavior. This increase within the overall teacher efficacy level within a school provides an increased level of energy and motivation for faculty (Alexander, 2008). The challenges within the classroom and the profession in general become more manageable. The increased efficacy and energy levels could initiate a trend within a school or system. This
trend requires further support from school and system level leadership through the adherence to the SWPBS movement themes of data driven decisions, school community involvement, and a high level of fidelity of implementation of the SWPBS program.

Theoretical Background

A good deal of research has been conducted on morale within the workplace and some have been conducted on teacher morale in general. While much of this research focuses on the affective and physical factors influencing morale in the workplace, some researchers have discussed social capital, teacher efficacy, and job satisfaction as indicators of teacher morale (Cheung & Chan, 2010; Hart, Wearing, Conn, Carter, & Dingle, 2000; Klassen, Usher, & Bong, 2010). Teacher morale has many facets working in collaboration with varying degrees of influence. These differing influences may be examined on a more global scale when reviewing the research for a school, district or region, but ultimately determined by the individual values of the teachers involved in the study at a particular point in the teacher’s career. Additional research has been conducted on the disparities of the economies of schools and the external factors affecting the schools and the teacher morale. These external factors relate more specifically to the contextual issues within the school’s communities and operations. While these factors influence some of the internal factors within the confines of the school, most of them are site specific and reflect longer term patterns within communities or regions.

Morale and workplace productivity relationships were examined through the lens of management (Weakliem & Frenkel, 2006). These relationships noted the management’s priorities influencing the development of a corporate ethics and cultural system. Management’s values alter the relationships as the various factors of
productivity, quality control, lowering of costs, and health and safety change according to the demands placed on the different levels of the management structures. While workplace efforts are often noted as directly proportional to the levels of worker morale, the relationship between worker morale and productivity varies differently. The different perspectives by management and by the workers on effectiveness of the workers’ efforts within the workplace provide a contrasting litmus test with which to examine the relationships (Weakliem & Frankel, 2006).

Teacher morale has been researched recently in several studies to examine contextual issues such as legislative demands, school settings, and socio-economic factors (Byrd-Blake, Afolayan, Hunt, Fabunmi, Pryor, & Leander, 2010; Everton, Turner, Hargreaves, & Pell, 2007; Gunbayi, 2007; Hart, Wearing, Conn, Carter, & Dingle, 2000). These studies sought to review the external factors influencing teacher morale within a school through the stresses placed on teachers by the various influencers. The separate dimensions identified by these studies that cause stress to teachers, and thereby decrease teacher morale, include some of the same factors addressed within this study, but from the perspective that the direction and point of origin of these factors derives from external sources, which are too often outside of the realm of influence of the school leaders and teachers. Thus, these factors, although similar in identification, must be considered differently than when these factors are within the realm of control or influence of the school leaders and teachers.

Bandura’s (1963) social learning theory as a derivative of Vygotsky’s Social Development Theory provides a foundation on which to address teacher morale factors. Bandura proposed that individuals learn behaviors through social exposure, imitation, and
modeling. When Bandura’s social learning theory is applied within a school setting, the different groups within a school will begin to emulate the behavior of others and tend to concentrate towards an accepted standard or objective much like when oatmeal congeals when cooling into a concentrated blob. Where this central focus ends up being located is often under the locus of control of the school leadership and faculty. Should the school personnel and community establish common beliefs, standards, and values, the location of the central point could be translated to a level where there is improved student achievement.

This foundation led Sugai and Horner to develop SWPBS as a program to address student behaviors through a whole school community effort. The implementation of SWPBS with fidelity provides school communities the framework to address issues affecting teacher morale. A portion of the SWPBS program includes the integration of school stakeholders within the development, integration, and sustaining phases of the SWPBS program. The SWPBS program provides an internal locus of control for the school to address the teacher morale factors. While the examination of the school’s organizational health includes different labels and some additional factors, the main factors within teacher morale are specifically noted within the program, examined annually during the SWPBS SET Report, and continuously monitored through the SWIS behavior tracking program. These sources of data and information provide the school’s stakeholders ongoing feedback with which to discuss the school’s challenges, trends, and developmental opportunities. The premise of establishing student, faculty, and staff behavioral expectations, then teaching these expectations to each of these groups, brings forth the details of Bandura’s social learning theory. The ongoing support of these
expectations through a positive or optimistic perspective reflects a school’s education philosophy, mission, and values. These reflections must occur on a consistently persistent basis in order to establish and continue the desired behaviors. The consistency and persistence of the school stakeholders in maintaining their behaviors and expectations of students will be reflected in the student behavior data as tracked and reported through the SWIS program and the annual SET Report.

The teacher morale factors as reflected in the research questions in the present study relating to the teacher rapport with the principal, satisfaction with teaching, teacher salary, teacher load, curriculum issues, teacher status, community support of education, school facilities and services, community pressures are included within the regularly held discussions under the demands of fidelity for implementation of the SWPBS program. Some of these factors are within the direct control of the school and its stakeholders, but some are outside of this locus of control. The teacher rapport with the principal and the school facilities and services are under a higher level of control by site personnel as actions by on site personnel may influence these factors faster and with a greater reaction. The factors of teacher load, curriculum issues, and teacher status are less affected by on site personnel as some of these are partially determined by fiscal and legislative requirements. The factors of teacher salary, community pressures, and community support are longer term battles in which school leadership, school stakeholders, and teachers have a moderate level on influence. These factors tend to be wider community issues which require a longer term to change, tend to show smaller incremental changes, and often are a result of changes in the school community complexions and the dynamic political landscape.
**Contribution of the Study Results**

The current status of research within the SWPBS movement reflects a growing interest and success level for school based operations. The research tends to revolve around high school, elementary or behaviorally disturbed pupils. The middle school level rural students are often relegated to the outer realms of most research. The research on Title 1 schools remains primarily centered on urban issues, which may share some similar concerns with rural schools, but fails to address the current situational factors and trends facing rural, Title 1 schools. These trends include a changing composition and quantity of the rural population, the fiscal implications, and the available teachers within a rural community facing diminished economic developments. This review illustrates a gap within the current literature and research for middle, rural, and Title 1 schools.

**Conclusions**

The review of the literature establishes morale as a significant problem in rural schools. School organizational climate affects teacher morale through the internal psychological characteristics of each school (Xiaofu & Qiwen, 2007). The implementation of a SWPBS program within a school requires a commitment and recognition from the administration, the faculty, and the school community. The intervention approach reflects a more reactionary approach to problem behaviors that interfere with academic success (Shogren, Faggella-Luby, Bae, & Wehmeyer, 2004). Findings of the literature review were that little research has occurred within the SWPBS movement regarding the effect of the implementation of a SWPBS program on teacher morale in rural schools. The present study was an effort to examine the effects of the integration of a SWPBS program on teacher morale and its aspects of teacher efficacy.
and stress within two similar Title 1 middle schools in rural east Tennessee. The present study was designed to explore whether the implementation of a SWPBS program within one of these schools positively affected teacher morale levels by the exploration of several factors of morale such as community pressures, facilities status, rapport with the principal, and satisfaction with the job. The context of Chapter 3 is a review of the foundational constructs of the methodological approach that will be taken to test the effect of the SWPBS program.
CHAPTER 3: METHODS

The methodology utilized within this research study is explained within this chapter. Details are used in this explanation to describe the context of the study, the participants, the measurement instruments, and the methods employed to gather the data. The explanation of the data analysis procedures is also included. Relevant hypotheses related to whether teacher morale is affected by the stress levels of the faculty, as well as the level of efficacy at which the teachers perceive they are operating. The factors of efficacy and stress are indicative of teacher morale. Two schools were included in the study: one was identified as the test school, Middle School 1, and the other was identified as the control school, Middle School 2. The results of the tests using the Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire were examined through a independent sample t-test to determine whether a statistically significant difference existed between the opinions of the teachers of the two schools while using a school without a SWPBS program as the control group (Bentley et al., 2001). To adequately consider this issue within Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory and Herzberg’s Motivational Theory, the subordinate questions and hypotheses were tested as cited in Chapter 1.

Research Question and Hypothesis

Based on the previous sections, the primary research question and related hypotheses were as follows:

Research Questions

The following subordinate research questions will provide the framework for the inquiry.
RQ1: Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their rapport with the Principal be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The rapport with the principal was measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 2, 3, 5, 7, 12, 33, 38, 41, 43, 44, 61, 62, 70, 72, 73, 74, 92, 93, and 95 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.

Ho1: There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their rapport with the Principal on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

RQ2: Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their satisfaction with teaching be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The teacher opinions of their satisfaction with teaching were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 19, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 46, 47, 50, 51, 56, 58, 60, 76, 78, 82, 83, 86, 89, and 100 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.

Ho2: There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their satisfaction with teaching on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

RQ3: Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their salary be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The teacher opinions of their salary were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 4, 9, 32, 36, 39, 65, and 75 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.
**Ho3:** There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their salary on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

**RQ4:** Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their teaching load be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The teacher opinions of their teaching load were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 1, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, 31, 34, 40, 42, and 45 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.

**Ho4:** There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their teaching load on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

**RQ5:** Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their curriculum issues be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The teacher opinions of their curriculum issues were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 17, 20, 25, 79, and 88 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.

**Ho5:** There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their curriculum issues on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

**RQ6:** Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their status be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The teacher opinions of their status were measured through the faculty’s
responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 13, 15, 35, 37, 63, 64, 68, and 71 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.

**H06:** There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their status on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

**RQ7:** Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their community support be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The teacher opinions of their community support were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 66, 67, 94, 96, and 97 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.

**H07:** There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their community support on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

**The Research Context**

The two public rural middle schools in Tennessee selected for the study each had a student population of similar size: 511 sixth through eighth grade students in Middle School 1, with 498 students in Middle School 2. Both were located in rural settings, and are Title 1 schools. Each school’s student population is similar demographically with 95% of the student population being Caucasian and the remaining student population being of equal portions of African American, Asian, and Native American students. The student population with each school was similar in that Middle School 1 had 77% of the students eligible for free/reduced lunches, while Middle School 2, the control school, had 74% of the student population eligible for free/reduced school lunches. In Middle School
1, 15% of the students were classified as having disabilities, while Middle School 2 had 16% of its student classified as having disabilities. Each school possessed the same 1% of the student population as English Language Learners.

Both schools were similar in other ways as well. The students in each school generally represented families on the lower level of the socio-economic status as determined by the Title 1 status of the two schools. Title 1 schools received aid through federal funds and had a large number of students from the lower socio-economic strata. Both schools were accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Both schools met adequate yearly progress (AYP) for the 2008-2009 academic year. AYP is an accountability measure utilized under the Federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation enacted in 2001 to determine whether each school in the state of Tennessee has met the standards. The state mandated assessments for each student to measure the school growth in student academic achievement as AYP. MS1 implemented a SWPBS program, while MS2 will not have a SWPBS program.

**Research Participants**

Within each school the demographics of the faculty were similar. Both schools had a faculty comprised of 100% Caucasian personnel. Middle School 1 had a faculty that was 60% male teachers and 40% female teachers, while Middle School 2 had a faculty of 30% male teachers and 70% female teachers. Middle School 1 had a faculty in which 95% were highly qualified. Middle School 2’s faculty was 90% highly qualified under the NCLB legislation. Highly qualified status requires a faculty member to have a graduate degree and pass his or her subject area of the PRAXIS II exam. The breakdown of years of teaching experience with each faculty varies. The average number of years
teaching experience for Middle School 1 was 15.7 years with an average tenure at the school of 8.4 years, while Middle School 2 was 18.2 average years of experience with an average tenure at the school of 7.1 years.

**Instruments Used in Data Collection**

The instrument used to measure the teacher morale was the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire (Weiss et al, 1967; Mackenzie, 2007). Optimally, two instruments should be used as a comparative measure to address issues of variance between the sample groups (Ary et al, 2006). Within this study, only the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire was chosen as the variances between the two population groups were insignificant. The Perdue Teacher Opinionaire was also chosen due to copyright issues and an extensive history of usage that provided an excellent level of reliability and the high validity level for the instrument. Additionally, the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire provided a system with which to disaggregate the data of responses to address each of the research questions’ null hypothesis.

The Perdue Teacher Opinionaire began with a sample of 3,023 teachers from 60 high schools within Indiana through a stratified random sample, and 16 schools in Oregon (Bentley, R. R., Rempel, A. M., Lester, P., & Bishop, L. (2007). The testing and retesting of the instrument reported high levels of reliability in several relationships within schools. Among these relationships were teacher rapport with the principal at 0.88, satisfaction with teaching at 0.84, and teacher status at 0.81. The correlations ranged from 0.62 in community pressures to 0.88 for teacher rapport with the principal. The median correlation was 0.87. The validity of the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire provides similar results as the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire provides results for different
school levels and among individual teachers within a school. The differences between
the principals’ responses and the teacher responses will not be significant (Lester &
Bishop, 2000).

The initial use of the Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire included an oblique rotation of
extracted factors for 570 teachers (Rempel & Bentley, 1970). These analyses produced
ten factors to reflect three groups, high, middle, and low morale groups. With the factors
within this study that affected teacher morale included: 19 items regarding teacher
rapport with the principal (2, 3, 5, 7, 12, 33, 38, 41, 43, 44, 61, 62, 70, 72, 73, 74, 92, 93,
and 95); 20 items on satisfaction with teaching (19, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 46, 47, 50, 51, 56,
58, 60, 76, 78, 82, 83, 86, 89, and 100); 7 items on teacher salary (4, 9, 32, 36, 39, 65,
and 75); 11 items on teacher load (1, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, 31, 34, 40, 42, and 45); five items
on curriculum issues (17, 20, 25, 79, and 88); 8 items on teacher status (13, 15, 35, 37,
63, 64, 68, and 71); 5 items on community support of education (66, 67, 94, 96, and 97);
5 items on school facilities and services (16, 21, 49, 57, and 59); and 5 items on
community pressures (81, 85, 91, 98, and 99).

The factor of teacher rapport with the principal dealt with the teacher’s feelings
about the principal regarding his/her competency, interest in teachers and their work,
ability to communicate, and skills in human relations (Bentley & Rempel, 1970). The
satisfaction with teaching dealt with the teachers’ relationships with students and feelings
of satisfaction with teaching. The rapport among teachers dealt with teacher’s
relationships with other teachers, while teacher salary dealt with the teacher’s feelings
about the salary and salary policies. Teacher load dealt with feelings about record
keeping, clerical work, community demands on teaching time, extracurricular load, and
keeping up-to-date professionally. Curriculum issues focused on the teachers’ reactions to the adequacy of the school program in meeting students’ needs. The teacher status recorded the feelings of prestige, security, and benefits of the teachers. Community support of education reflected the extent to which the community understood and was willing to support a sound educational system, while school facilities and services dealt with the adequacy of the facilities, supplies, and equipment, as well as the efficiency of the procedures for obtaining materials and services. Community pressures accounted for the community expectations with respect to the teacher’s personal standards, participation in outside-school activities, and his/her freedom to discuss controversial issues in the classroom.

The Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire validity presented a discrimination opportunity between schools and among individual teachers within a school. The effort was focused on the differences between the means of the two schools. Additional studies could differentiate between levels or types of faculty within a school or between schools or exam the scores further between teachers and principals.

**Procedures**

Prior to the commencement of the study, approval to conduct the study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of Liberty University in compliance with U.S. Federal Government Department of Health and Human Services (2009) regulation 45 CFR § 46.10, which states the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research should not be greater in and of themselves than any ordinarily encountered in daily life, or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests. This quasi-experimental study had little control over the allocation
of the treatment, the implementation of the School Wide Positive Behavior Support Program, and the allocation of the faculty members was not a random assignment, but based on their existing employment assignment. The effects being measured were the changes in the faculty opinions for each of the seven researched factors of teacher morale. The advantages of using the quasi-experimental design minimize threats to external validity as natural environments do not suffer the same problems of artificiality as compared to a well-controlled laboratory setting. The disadvantages of this design pose many challenges for the investigator in terms of confounding variables and internal validity. These disadvantages relate to the level of control over the extraneous variables. Permission to conduct the study was also obtained from the superintendent of the school district and/or the Principals of each school in the study (Appendix A). After permission was granted, a letter of invitation to participate in the study and a consent form (Appendix B) was electronically circulated to faculty through the auspices of the school’s email delivery systems or mail system at the direction of the Principals. When the consent form was received, a demographic survey (Appendix C) was circulated to all faculty members, the answers to which were used to develop a picture of the participants in Middle School 1 and the respondents in Middle School 2. Finally, after application of the SWPBS intervention program in Middle School 1, the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire (Appendix D) survey was administered to the faculty at both schools.

The faculty of Middle School 1 was tested after the implementation of the SWPBS program using the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire as the instrument in a survey format. The format of the survey utilized a traditional paper-based format methodology completion. The faculty from Middle School 2 was tested as a control group after
implementation. The differences in the mean scores from the surveys for the faculty from Middle School 1 were analyzed against the differences in the mean scores from the surveys for the faculty from Middle School 2 using a independent sample t-test to determine whether there was a significant change over the implementation of the SWPBS program. The differences in the mean scores for Middle School 1 were analyzed for the test after the implementation of the SWPBS program. The degrees of freedom (df) within the t-test were determined by the number of participants, while the level of significance ($p$) was set at $p = 0.05$ (Ary et al., 2006). The independent sample t-test was applied for the data obtained from the items that applied to each of the research questions within each instrument (Harris et al., 2006). These items were identified after receipt of the instruments and permission to employ these instruments for this investigation. When the results of the t-test exceeded the overall level of significance, $p > 0.05$, the then null hypothesis ($H_0$) for that research question was rejected.

Part of the implementation of the SWPBS program was the employment of the School Wide Information System (SWIS) (Irvin, L. K., Horner, R. H., Ingram, K., Todd, A. W., Sugai, G., Sampson, N., & Boland, J. B. (2006). The SWIS system records Office Discipline Referral (ODR) incidences. The SWIS program provides a coding system for different tiers of behavior that result in an ODR. Under the MS1’s SWPBS program use of the SWIS program, ODR’s were coded and recorded. Reports were produced to monitor the fidelity of the school’s implementation of the SWPBS program. These reports for Middle School 1 were reviewed to ensure that the SWPBS program was being followed by the teachers within Middle School 1. The reports were generated to review the ODRs for each student and teacher to complete the monthly, semester, and end of
year summaries to measure the success of the SWPBS program. Middle School 1’s SWIS report showed a reduction from 15.25 ODR’s per day to 4.25 ODR’s per day over the course of this study.

**Data Analysis Design**

After the mean scores for each of the surveys’ items were calculated, each question within the Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire was examined under the respective teacher morale factor category. An independent sample t-test analysis was conducted on the means scores from the faculties from Middle School 1 and Middle School 2 for the t-test to ensure normal distribution of the responses. Box plots were chosen as the means for displaying this normality (Appendix F). The choice to utilize the differences between the means of the responses for each Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire item provided an opportunity to account for the range within the demographics of tenure at the school and within the profession, level of education, and familiarity with Middle School 1’s operations. The differences in the mean scores of the two tests for Middle School 1 and Middle School 2 were compared using the independent sample t-test under the same statistical constraints. The t-test was more appropriate within this research than the other tests as the t-test provided an opportunity to review a limited sample for normality within the responses. The two-tailed t-test provided for analysis of the potential that the SWPBS program could have a negative effect on the research questions despite the two-tailed t-tests’ advantage of a better ability to detect the effect. The t-test provided a more balanced perspective from which to analyze the results and potential discrepancies within this research. The analysis of the data was considered for the differences in the means
from the t-tests for Middle School 1 and Middle School 2 and were compared using the t-test set at a level of significance of 0.05 (Ary et al., 2006).

To answer the research questions, the differences in the mean scores for the items within the surveys were calculated. The differences in the means for the t-test for Middle School 1 were compared, and then the differences in the mean scores for the items within the survey Middle School 2 were calculated and compared. The questions for each factor were then grouped. The teacher morale satisfied the conditions to run an independent sample t-test. The independent sample t-test utilized a confidence interval of 0.99. The differences in the means were then compared to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference in accordance with the null hypothesis for each research question.

**Ethical Considerations**

Cozby (2009) stated “Ethical concerns are paramount when planning, conducting, and evaluating research” (p. 35). Education possesses a diverse workforce whose elements include years of service, number of co-workers, employment status, race, age, gender, and union or non-union membership. Each of these variables contributes to different perceptions in the workplace (Cozby, 2009). Confidentiality was observed in several ways during the conduct of the study, as follows.

The procedures for the protection of human participants were carefully heeded. A random numeric identifier was assigned to participants to ensure the anonymity of their responses throughout the research process. No name of any of the participants appears in the materials resulting from the investigation. Only the researcher had access to the data
entered by the participants and used for data analysis. Participants were evaluated existing factors that affect their morale relevant to their school; although this was not necessarily sensitive information, participants’ responses was kept confidential. Finally, the initial contact email clearly indicated that the researcher would maintain participant anonymity indefinitely and that the surveys would be administered by a third party. All materials pertinent to the study will be kept in a locked cabinet for 3 years after completion of the study, after which they will be safely destroyed.

This study complied with the Liberty University ethical guidelines and presented minimal risk to participants as it contained neither experimental treatment of the participants nor exposure to physical or psychological harm. The participants were all employees of school districts. Great care was taken to ensure that the participants fully understood the nature of the study and the fact that participation was voluntary. No sanctions were applied if participants declined or withdrew from the study. No information regarding participation of any individual was communicated to the school districts in which they work. Confidentiality of data was maintained at all times, and identification of participants or the schools where they work will not be available during the study and will not be available after the fact. These conditions were communicated to all participants at the start of the survey.

Summary of the Methods

Chapter 3 was a review of the methods employed in the quantitative study of teacher morale for Middle School 1 after implementation the SWPBS program. The significance of the change of teacher morale within Middle School 1 was determined through statistical analysis. The population included within this research included a
control group from Middle School 2 and an intervention group from Middle School 1. The use of the independent sample t-test related directly to the results of the treatment of the implementation of the SWPBS program at Middle School 1 during the time period of the implementation of the School Wide Positive Behavior Support program. The data collection method of the blind survey, through the traditional paper-based methodology, preserved the anonymity of the participants. The independent sample t-test’s level of significance provided a level of significance such that the statistical analysis provided an accurate measurement of the statistical difference with regard to each null hypothesis. Chapter 4 contains the results and analyses of these calculations using tables and written materials.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

The present study was an examination of the differences between two rural middle school’s teacher morale factors before and after Middle School 1 implemented the SWPBS. SWPBS is whole school community effort to improve student behavior issues as part of an overall school improvement effort. The teachers, parents, and wider school community members form the vast majority of the active players within these efforts through membership on various committees.

With the increased activity to improve the school and its climate, faculty must remain focused on student teaching and learning. Human capital is not an endless resource and presents challenges to teacher morale. Maintaining morale during new initiatives is important to the long term success of any new venture. Thus, the study of the teacher morale factors forms an integral ingredient in the success trajectory of a school and its wider community. Teacher morale factors studied within this project included faculty perceptions of their rapport with the principal, satisfaction with teaching, curriculum, community support, facilities, teaching load, teacher status, and salary.

The Perdue Teacher Opinionaire (PTO) was selected to collect data for analysis. This selection was based on the history, the high level of reliability, and validity of the instrument. No pilot study was needed for the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire because of its history and levels of reliability and validity already established. The Handbook of Tests and Measurements discusses the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire at length and provides the breakdown of the items within the instrument for each of the teacher morale factors.
The Perdue Teacher Opinionaire was used to survey the faculty of each school. Middle School 1 was surveyed after the implementation of the SWPBS program. Middle School 2 was surveyed concurrently with Middle School 1’s test.

**Demographics**

The two middle school faculties included within this study had similar demographics. The faculty size, race complexion, ratio of males to females, ages, years of overall experience, years of service at the school, and average years of education relating to degrees and highly qualified status were reviewed. Table 1 below shows the faculty characteristics for each school.

Table 1

*Demographic Characteristics of the Faculty of Both Schools*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Middle School 1</th>
<th>Middle School 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years of experience</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years of service at school</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years of education</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The two middle school student populations included within this study had similar demographics. The student body population sizes, race complexion, males, females, and ages are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

*Demographics of the Student Population of Both Schools*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Middle School 1</th>
<th>Middle School 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall student population</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major race</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest minority</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>11-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative personnel of the two middle schools included in the present study had similar demographics. The administration numbers, race complexion, males, females, ages, year of overall experience, years of service at the school, and average years of education relating to degrees and highly qualified status were reviewed. Table 3 shows the facets of the administration for each school.
Table 3

Demographics of the Administrative Personnel for Each School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Middle School 1</th>
<th>Middle School 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years of experience</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years of service at school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years of education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Setting and Context

Both schools serve rural communities and are located in the county seat. Each county seat’s population was about 12,000 people. Both are located in upper east Tennessee. The Middle School 1 parent education demographics revealed that 65% of the parents had a high school diploma, while 67% of Middle School 2’s parents had a high school diploma. The average income level in the zone for Middle School 1 was $32,000, while the average income level for Middle School 2’s zone was $34,000. The level of free or reduced lunches for Middle School 1 was 78% and the rate for Middle School 2 was 74%.

Covariates included faculty turnover within each school, socioeconomic variations within the faculty, school community, student populations within each school,
and changing student populations as the students progress through their respective grade levels. The control over these covariates was minimal. Effects on this study will be addressed in the discussion in Chapter 5. The questions were treated as the individuals within this study to control the variability within each school population.

**General Overall Results**

The responses within the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire were categorized according to the relevant teacher morale factor as listed in the Table 4 below.

Table 4

*PTO Category Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Title</th>
<th>Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapport with principal</td>
<td>2, 3, 5, 7, 12, 33, 38, 41, 43, 44, 61, 62, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 92, 93, 95.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with teaching</td>
<td>19, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 46, 47, 50, 51, 56, 58, 60, 76, 78, 82, 83, 86, 89, 100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport among teachers</td>
<td>18, 22, 23, 28, 48, 52, 53, 54, 55, 77, 80, 84, 87, 90.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher salary</td>
<td>4, 9, 32, 36, 39, 65, 75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher load</td>
<td>1, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, 31, 34, 40, 42, 45.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher status (in the community)</td>
<td>13, 15, 35, 37, 63, 64, 68, 71.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community support for education</td>
<td>66, 67, 94, 96, 97.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School facilities and services</td>
<td>16, 21, 49, 57, 59.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community pressures (expectations)</td>
<td>81, 85, 91, 98, 99.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The organization shown above provided a format for addressing each of the factors of teacher morale in accordance with the research questions. Additionally, this organization provided an opportunity to prepare, process, and analyze the data from the surveys in a meaningful manner. For example, the survey results were compiled in an excel spreadsheet to facilitate the calculation of the mean score for each item for each administration of the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire. The mean scores for each item could then be more readily entered into the statistical software.

The next step was to check that the results meet the conditions for the indeonended sample t-test on the test means for Middle School 1 and Middle School 2. These results were analyzed using box plots to check for normal distribution. These box plots are listed in Appendix F. By treating each question as an individual the sample sizes are illustrated in Table 5.

The differences between the two school faculty responses were considered. The mean responses for each question were considered for this study. The test data from Middle School 1 and Middle School 2 were considered for each factor examined within the study. The independent sample t-test was used to test small samples with the condition that the samples were drawn from a normal distribution. The responses of paired differentials on each of these factors were checked for normal distribution using box plots, which are displayed in Appendix F. As a result of this check for normality, normality did not occur for the factors of salary, curriculum issues, educational support, status, pressure, and services. To preserve the overall significance, all tests both used a significance level of 0.05 to achieve an overall significance of 0.10. The check for
normal distribution for the factor of curriculum issues showed a relatively normal distribution, but in the opposite directions.

Table 5

Sample Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor:</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community support</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport with principal</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of each survey were organized according to the measured factors within the Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire. Each factor had several questions within the Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire. While some factors have more questions than others, the breakdown for the results followed the measurement criteria for the Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire. The Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire measured each of these factors in a longitudinal dimension for each school’s faculty cohort, but this study’s focus remained
on comparing and contrasting the changes between each of the two schools’ faculty opinions. The results from the treatment school and the control school provided the data in the Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire results in to examine the effect of the introduction of the SWPBS on the factors of teacher morale. The results for each research question and the correlating research hypothesis are discussed below.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

For the first factor, Rapport with principal, Middle School 1 had a statistically higher result than Middle School 2. To investigate the first research question and evaluate the hypothesis, the independent sample t-test was used to calculate the statistical difference in the question values between the Middle School 1 differences and the Middle School 2 differences over the implementation period. The level of significance was .05 with a critical value of $P = .000009 < \alpha$ (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorenson, 2006).

**RQ1:** Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire’s questions about their rapport with the Principal be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The independent sample t-test showed statistically significant difference for between Middle School 1 and Middle School 2 results over the two year implementation and survey window. The rapport with the principal factor includes the teachers’ feelings about the principal’s competency, interests in the teachers and their work, ability to communicate, and skills in human relations (Rempel & Bentley, 1970). The factors were measured in questions 2, 3, 5, 7, 12, 33, 38, 41, 43, 44, 61, 62, 70, 72, 73, 74, 92, 93, and 95.
**Ho1**: There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their rapport with the Principal on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

The independent sample t-test using the significance level of 0.05 of the differences was used based on the reasonable assumption of normality (see box plot in Appendix F) of the sample. Throughout the seven paired difference sample tests with Middle School 1 and Middle School 2, a significance level of 0.05 was used in to achieve an overall significance of 0.10. The test statistic is the standardized difference in question values between the Middle School 1 differences and the Middle School 2 differences:

\[ t = \frac{(\text{RMS rapport} - \text{HMMS rapport})}{(\text{SE})} \sim t(29.3) \]

\[ t = 0.4886 \]

\[ df = 29.304 \]

\[ p\text{-value} = 0.3144 \]

The Confidence Interval (CI) for this data is CI\(_{.99}\) = (.24, ∞). The CI supports the position of being 99% confident that the true difference between the Middle School 1 teachers and the Middle School 2 teachers in the area of Rapport is more than 0.24.

The test results failed to reject Ho1; therefore Ho1 was accepted. Based on the observed difference in mean scores it appears that the Middle School 1 is not more effective in creating better attitudes in the area of rapport at Middle School 1 as opposed to Middle School 2.

For the second factor, satisfaction with teaching, Middle School 1 did not have a statistically higher result than Middle School 2. To investigate the second research
question and evaluate the hypothesis, the independent sample t-test was used to calculate the statistical difference in the question values between the Middle School 1 differences and the Middle School 2 differences over the implementation period. The level of significance was .05 with a critical value of $P = .000009 < \alpha$ (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorenson, 2006).

**RQ2:** Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their satisfaction with teaching be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The teacher opinions of their satisfaction with teaching were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 19, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 46, 47, 50, 51, 56, 58, 60, 76, 78, 82, 83, 86, 89, and 100 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.

**Ho2:** There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their satisfaction with teaching on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

Independent sample t-test using the significance level of 0.05 of the differences based on the reasonable assumption of normality of the sample was used. Throughout the 7 paired difference sample tests with Middle School 1 and Middle School 2, a significance level of 0.05 was used in order to achieve an overall significance of 0.05. An independent sample t-test was used on the differences in the responses based on the reasonable assumption of normal distribution (see box plot in Appendix F), of the sample. The test statistic is the standardized difference in question values between the Middle School 1 differences and the Middle School 2 differences.

\[ t = \frac{(\text{RMS satisfaction} - \text{HMMS satisfaction})}{(SE)} \sim t(37.98) \]
The Confidence Interval (CI) for this data is $CI_{99} = (-0.12, \infty )$. The CI supports the position of being 99% confident that the true difference between the Middle School 1 teachers and the Middle School 2 teachers in the area of satisfaction is more than -0.12.

This results in a failure to reject $H_0^2$, which was accepted; therefore, the alternative was rejected. Based on the observed difference in mean scores it appears that there is no significant difference in satisfaction scores at Middle School 1 as opposed to Middle School 2.

For the third factor, salary, Middle School 1 did not have a statistically higher result than Middle School 2. To investigate the third research question and evaluate the hypothesis, the independent sample t-test was used to calculate the statistical difference in the question values between the Middle School 1 differences and the Middle School 2 differences over the implementation period. The level of significance was .05 with a critical value of $P = .000009 < \alpha$ (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorenson, 2006).

**RQ3:** Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their salary be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The teacher opinions of their salary were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 4, 9, 32, 36, 39, 65, and 75 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.
**Ho3:** There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their salary on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

Throughout the seven paired difference sample tests with Middle School 1 and Middle School 2, a significance level of 0.05 was used to achieve an overall significance of 0.05. Since the Salary differential is short tailed (see box plot in Appendix F) and the sample size was relatively small, the independent sample t-test using the significance level of 0.05 was used.

\[ t = \frac{(RMS \text{ salary} - HMMS \text{ salary} )}{(SE)} \sim t(11.88) \]

\[ t = 1.2303 \]

\[ df = 11.878 \]

\[ p\text{-value} = 0.1212 \]

The results failed to reject Ho3; therefore, the alternative was rejected. Based on the observed difference in mean scores it appears that there is no significant difference in change in salary scores at Middle School 1 as opposed to Middle School 2.

For the fourth factor, teaching load, Middle School 1 had a statistically higher result than Middle School 2. To investigate the fourth research question and evaluate the hypothesis, the independent sample t-test was used to calculate the statistical difference in the question values between the Middle School 1 differences and the Middle School 2 differences over the implementation period. The level of significance was .05 with a critical value of \( P= .000009 < \alpha \) (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorenson, 2006).

**RQ4:** Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire’s questions about their teaching load be affected by the implementation of a
SWPBS program? The teacher opinions of their teaching load were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 1, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, 31, 34, 40, 42, and 45 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.

**Ho4:** There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their teaching load on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

An independent sample t-test using the significance level of 0.05 of the differences based on the reasonable assumption of normal distribution (see box plot in Appendix F), of the sample data was used. The test statistic is the standardized difference in question values between the Middle School differences and the Middle School 2 differences:

\[
t = \frac{\text{RMS Load} - \text{HMMS Load}}{\text{SE}} \sim t(19.99)
\]

\[
t = 0.0563
\]

\[
df = 19.991
\]

\[
p\text{-value} = 0.4778
\]

The Confidence Interval (CI) for this data is CI \(_{99}\) = (0.11, \(\infty\)). We can be 99% confident that the true difference between the MS1 teachers and the MS2 teachers in the area of Load is more than 0.11.

Thus, Ho4 was not rejected, and therefore caused Ho4 to be accepted. Based on the observed difference in mean scores it appears that there is not a positive significant difference in change in load scores at Middle School 1 as opposed to Middle School 2.

For the fifth factor, curriculum issues, Middle School 1 did have a statistically higher result than Middle School 2. To investigate the fifth research question and
evaluate the hypothesis, the independent sample t-test was used to calculate the statistical difference in the question values between the Middle School 1 differences and the Middle School 2 differences over the implementation period. The level of significance was .05 with a critical value of $P = 0.000009 < \alpha$ (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorenson, 2006).

**RQ5**: Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their curriculum issues be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The teacher opinions of their curriculum issues were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 17, 20, 25, 79, and 88 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.

**Ho5**: There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their curriculum issues on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

Throughout the 7 paired difference sample tests with Middle School 1 and Middle School 2, the study used a significance level of 0.05 in order to achieve an overall significance of 0.10.

Since the Curriculum Issues differential is right skewed (see box plot in Appendix F) and the sample size is small, the study used the independent sample t-test using the significance level of 0.05. The independent sample t-test of the differences was used.

$$t = \frac{(\text{RMS Iss} - \text{HMMS Iss})}{(SE)} \sim t(8)$$

$$t = 3.0764$$

$$df = 8$$

$$p\text{-value} = 0.007601$$
Therefore, the results rejected Ho5, and instead accepted hypothesis. Based on the observed difference in mean scores it appears that there is a positive significant difference in change in curriculum issues scores at Middle School 1 as opposed to Middle School 2.

For the sixth factor, status, Middle School 1 did not have a statistically higher result than Middle School 2. To investigate the sixth research question and evaluate the hypothesis, the independent sample t-test was used to calculate the statistical difference in the question values between the Middle School 1 differences and the Middle School 2 differences over the implementation period. The level of significance was .05 with a critical value of P= .000009 < α (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorenson, 2006).

**RQ6:** Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their status be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The teacher opinions of their status were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 13, 15, 35, 37, 63, 64, 68, and 71 on the PTO.

**Ho6:** There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their status on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

Throughout the 7 paired difference sample tests with Middle School 1 and Middle School 2, the study used a significance level of 0.05 in order to achieve an overall significance of 0.10.
Since the status differential is right skewed (see box plot in Appendix F) and the sample size is small, the independent sample t-test was used with the significance level of 0.05.

\[
t = \frac{(RMS \text{ Sta} - HMMS \text{ Sta})/(SE)}{\sim t(13.96)}
\]

\[
t = 1.7802
\]

\[
df = 13.96
\]

p-value = 0.04841

Thus, the study rejected Ho6, and instead accepted the alternative. Based on the observed difference in mean scores it appears that there is a positive significant difference in change in Status scores at Middle School 1 as opposed to Middle School 2.

For the seventh factor, education support, Middle School 1 did not have a statistically higher result than Middle School 2. To investigate the seventh research question and evaluate the hypothesis, the independent sample t-test was used to calculate the statistical difference in the question values between the Middle School 1 differences and the Middle School 2 differences over the implementation period. The level of significance was .05 with a critical value of P=.000009 < a (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorenson, 2006).

**RQ7:** Will the differences of teacher responses on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire’s questions about their community support be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program? The teacher opinions of their community support were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 66, 67, 94, 96, and 97 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.
**Ho7:** There will be no significant difference between the teachers’ responses about their community support on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire in the school which implemented the SWPBS program and the school that did not.

Since the educational support differential is left skewed (see box plot in Appendix F) and the sample size is small, the independent test was used with the significance level of 0.05.

\[ t = \frac{(\text{RMS Sta} - \text{HMMS Sta})/(\text{SE})}{(t(13.96))} \]

\[ t = 1.7802 \]

\[ P = .0484 < a \]

The study failed to reject Ho7; therefore, the study rejected the alternative. Based on the observed difference in mean scores it appears that there is no positive significant difference in change in educational support scores at Middle School 1 as opposed to Middle School 2.

**Summary of Results**

The results indicated, with the exception of salary and curriculum, all categories were normally distributed. Significant improvements were noted in the factors of curriculum issues and status. There were no statistically significant positive results for rapport with the principal, satisfaction, salary, educational support, and teaching load.

Considering the difference on each of the questions’ responses on the test for Middle School 1 and Middle School 2 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire the data was manipulated into a data form for use within the R matrix commands. The data was then broken out into categories according to the factor to which the question related.
Simon (2006) posited that if the null hypothesis is not rejected, this does not lead to the conclusion that no association or differences exist, but instead that the analysis did not detect any association or difference between the variables or groups. Failing to reject the null hypothesis is comparable to a finding of not guilty in a trial (Simon, 2006). Simon argued “the defendant is not declared innocent, instead is not enough evidence to be convincing beyond a reasonable doubt so in the case of the judicial system, the defendant is set free” (p. 32).

The Perdue Teacher Opinionaire was administered to Middle School 1 and Middle School 2 during August 2009. The Perdue Teacher Opinionaire was then given as a test for both Middle School 1 and Middle School 2 in March 2012. The Perdue Teacher Opinionaire was administered by paper at each school and returned to the researcher by a faculty member in order to divert potential introduction of bias into the enquiry. The Perdue Teacher Opinionaire results for each item within the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire were averaged to obtain a mean for each of the 100 items for each faculty’s test(s). The resultant means from the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire for each school were reordered and then grouped into categories by factor in order to facilitate entry into the statistical software. The effect of any outlier responses were minimized through the use of the mean for each question’s responses.

The results indicated, with the exception of salary and curriculum, all categories were normally distributed. The results were skewed for salary, curriculum, pressure, and services. Significant improvements were noted in the factors of - curriculum and status. There were no statistically significant positive results for satisfaction, salary, educational support, teaching load, rapport with the principal, and services.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Results of the analysis illustrate the need to consider teacher morale when implementing the SWPBS program. While some of the hypotheses were not supported through the statistical analysis, others were not rejected. Two significant teacher morale factors were noted for positive improvement during the period of implementation of the SWPBS program: curriculum issues and status. The failure to reject the hypotheses for satisfaction, salary, educational support, rapport with the principal and teaching load does not indicate a decline in teacher morale within each of these factors, but indicated that the changes were not statistically significant enough to reject the hypotheses for each of these factors.

Summary of Results

This study is an independent-sample t-test situation. Each of the questions in the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire was examined. This treatment provided the opportunity to examine the differences in the participants’ responses to each question over the course of time of the implementation of the SWPBS program. Since each question was examined, the differences in the responses to each question were reviewed and grouped according to the teacher morale factors to which the questions applied. The resulting measurements were the differences between the mean of the responses for each subject or question on the survey. During this review of the responses, the responses were checked for normality as a very necessary condition for performing t-tests. Although the t-test was discovered and developed by W. S. Gosset in regard to, and for, small sample testing, the normality assumption is a strict necessity for very small samples.

The level of significance was set at 0.05 for all tests in order to maintain an overall Type I error rate of 0.10. By not relaxing the overall level of significance, paired
difference tests can be conducted for all of the teacher morale factors. Type 2 errors are relative to a) sample size, b) the particular test, and c) the specific alternative parameter value. In this study, the independent sample t-test is most powerful among the t-tests for detecting differences in two groups, since the pairing acts as a blocking factor. Non parametric methods like the Wilcoxon test usually result in a drop in power which is to be expected because of the secondary nature.

**Conclusions**

The quantitative study was an examination of teacher morale factors over the time of implementation of a SWPBS program at the treatments school, Middle School 1, and used a control school, Middle School 2, to measure the differences in the opinions of each school’s faculty after the implementation period. Each question on the Perdue Teacher Opinionnaire was examined through statistical analysis. The questions were then grouped by the teacher morale factor they measured and the mean responses for each question were compared. The groups of the subjects were checked for normal distribution and sufficient number of subjects to satisfy the conditions for a t-test. Only the groups for teacher rapport with the principal, satisfaction, and teaching load were normally distributed. The remaining factor groupings of salary, curriculum issues, educational support, and status failed to provide sufficient subjects or a normal distribution.

Overall, protected results through the use of the statistical tests show that we failed to reject the hypothesis on five of the research questions: satisfaction, salary, educational support, teaching load, and rapport with the principal. The resulting significance levels for each of these five factors noted the failure to reject the hypothesis of the teacher opinions with teaching load, salary, educational support, rapport with the
principal and teaching load were not affected by the implementation of the SWPBS program. By not rejecting the hypothesis, this study was only able to deduce that the change was not statistically significant enough to accept the hypotheses.

The hypothesis was rejected on the two teacher morale factors of curriculum issues and status. Therefore, the study deduced that the teachers’ opinion on their curriculum issues and status was affected by the implementation of the SWPBS. The Confidence Interval (CI) provides support for the acceptance of these deductions.

SWPBS program fidelity requires a whole school community engagement. Each of the schools within this study are rural, Title I schools. These types of schools traditionally struggle to engage parents and the wider school community. These challenges present themselves within current issues of student preparedness, parent education levels, community value of education, and community dynamics. These presentations directly affect the teachers’ perceptions of the factors of teacher morale.

Bandura (1963) noted the four concepts of teacher morale, particularly the environmental effects on the emotive state and the experiences of the teachers. SWPBS programs present opportunities to collaboratively address the daily experiences of the students and teachers. These same opportunities concerned Sugai and Horner (2006) regarding behaviors that interrupt the overall teaching and learning process. These disruptions of the teaching and learning process directly influence the teachers’ daily, weekly, and semester experiences. These experiences influence the emotive state of the teachers.

The research was broken down into seven research questions and hypotheses to more closely examine the teacher morale factors. Each factor was analyzed by grouping
the responses to the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire questions by the relevant factor. The grouping for each factor was then statistically examined for normality and size of grouping to ensure the appropriate test was used.

RQ1 questioned teacher opinions of their rapport with the principal would be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program. The rapport with the principal was measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 2, 3, 5, 7, 12, 33, 38, 41, 43, 44, 61, 62, 70, 72, 73, 74, 92, 93, and 95 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.

Ho1 was not rejected. The rapport with the principal will be affected by the implementation of the SWPBS program. The rejection of this hypothesis led to the conclusion that Middle School 1 was not more effective in creating better attitudes in the area of rapport with the principal. Through the implementation of the SWPBS program, the enhanced communications plays a part in these changes. During the initial stages of the implementation of the SWPBS program, discussions were held with all sub groups of the wider school community, such as parents, students, business and community leaders. These discussions included topics such as community expectations and values, consequences and rewards for meeting the expectations, and establishing communications systems for ongoing discussions and follow ups. Following the SWPBS program with fidelity required ongoing communications through committee meetings and feedback to the school community on the school’s progress and the effects of the SWPBS program on student discipline.

The process for implementing a SWPBS program involved the entire school community participating in these discussions and ongoing activities to support the school
efforts. Through this enhanced communication, side bars often occurred between
teachers, parents, students, administrators, local business leaders, and other stakeholders.
The increase in discussions did not help build teachers’ attitudes towards the principal.

RQ2 questioned if teacher opinions of their satisfaction with teaching would be
affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program. The teacher opinions of their
satisfaction with teaching were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest
and posttest to survey items 19, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 46, 47, 50, 51, 56, 58, 60, 76, 78, 82,
83, 86, 89, and 100 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.

Ho2 was not rejected. The teacher opinions of the satisfaction with teaching will
not be affected by the implementation of the SWPBS program. The failure to reject the
hypothesis means that there was no significant difference in the changes in the responses
between the two faculties. The true differences between the two faculties satisfaction
with teaching was more than -0.05. The lack of significant differences has been
convoluted by some of the changes imposed on both of the schools by the state of
Tennessee. These changes include changes in teacher evaluation, curriculum and testing
changes, and changes in the tenure process by the state legislature. The political shifts
within the state have adversely affected the teaching profession in these rural areas in
attracting and retaining teachers.

RQ3 questioned if teacher opinions of their salary would be affected by the
implementation of a SWPBS program. The teacher opinions of their salary were
measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 4, 9,
32, 36, 39, 65, and 75 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.
Ho3 was not rejected. The teacher opinions of their salary will be affected by the implementation of the SWPBS program. The failure to reject the hypothesis means that there was no significant difference in the change in faculty responses at Middle School 1 as opposed to Middle School 2. The results were short tailed and no evidence of normality for this teacher morale factor. The sample size or number of questions addressing salary was also small. This factor could also have affected by the state of the economy within the school settings. Rural area schools face several issues within declining economies. Among these issues include job exits, slower recoveries, and changing demographics as businesses and families adjust to the changing economic factors.

RQ4 questioned if teacher opinions of their teaching load would be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program. The teacher opinions of their teaching load were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 1, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, 31, 34, 40, 42, and 45 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.

Ho4 was not rejected. The teacher opinions of their teaching load will not be affected by the implementation of the SWPBS program. The teaching load analysis failed to lead to the rejection of the hypothesis. This failure to reject through the independent sample t-test concluded that there was not a positive significant difference in the change in teachers’ attitudes between Middle School 1 and the changes at Middle School 2. We are able to be 99% confident that the true difference between Middle School 1 teachers and Middle School 2 teachers is more than 0.11. The attitudes towards the teaching load were influenced by the teacher engagement within the SWPBS implementation process.
and the effects of the program on the teachers’ experiences in the classroom and a daily basis.

RQ5 questioned if teacher opinions of their curriculum issues would be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program. The teacher opinions of their curriculum issues were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 17, 20, 25, 79, and 88 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire. Ho5 was rejected. The teacher opinions of their curriculum issues will be affected by the implementation of the SWPBS program. The rejection of the hypothesis for this question led to the conclusion that the differences between the changes for each faculty were positively significant at Middle School 1 as opposed to Middle School 2. With the responses being right skewed and fewer questions for this factor, the faculty viewed the curriculum issues in a neutral or negative perspective. These perspectives could be a result of the changes of the curriculum and testing within the state of Tennessee by the Department of Education. Constant curriculum changes tend to confuse and frustrate classroom teachers, who are struggling to master the course content.

RQ6 questioned if teacher opinions of their status would be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program. The teacher opinions of their status were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 13, 15, 35, 37, 63, 64, 68, and 71 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire. Ho6 was rejected. The teacher opinions of their status will be affected by the implementation of the SWPBS program. This change could be attributed to the enhanced levels of communication and teacher engagement within the SWPBS implementation process.
RQ7 questioned if teacher opinions of their community support of education be affected by the implementation of a SWPBS program. The teacher opinions of their community support were measured through the faculty’s responses on the pretest and posttest to survey items 66, 67, 94, 96, and 97 on the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire.

Ho7 was not rejected. The teacher opinions of their community support of education will be affected by the implementation of the SWPBS program.

**Comparison of Results with Previous Studies**

The literature review in Chapter 2 noted several challenges facing rural schools. Among these challenges affecting teacher morale are the socioeconomic dynamics, the lack of parental engagement, and the isolationism of the culture. One of the key components of the SWPBS is the development and integration of a family and community engagement plan. This plan is a requirement for Title I funding. Middle School 1 has utilized the plan to build further support for the students and the school. Through the SWPBS process, Middle School 1 utilized the collaborative process to build a framework to address behavioral issues. The social learning theory foundations of the program help to address the environmental and teacher morale factors (Bolin, 2007).

Much of the early research on School Wide positive Behavior Support programs focused on data and results of student behavior responses to the SWPBS introduction (Sugai & Horner, 2006). The growth within the SWPBS movement noted the improvement of exclusion rates and incidences of behavioral issues in middle school and in high school settings. Later studies noted relationships between the implementation or expansion of SWPBS programs and the mechanics of the SWPBS programs in teaching social skills to students, particularly at-risk students (Calarella, Ryan, Kristy, & Ellie,
The focus of these studies on student behavior could impact the teacher efficacy and morale factors and issues within this study. Student behavior could affect teachers’ views on some of the seven factors examined within this study, such as rapport with the principal, satisfaction, load, and status. The linkage to these factors could strengthen further as the school leader deals with incidences of student behavior which disrupt classroom instruction.

More recent research has been conducted on teacher efficacy and stress (Kelm & McIntosh, 2012). Relationships are being established through this research between the implementation of SWPBS programs as a school-wide approach to managing and improving student behavior. Results of this research note the significantly higher perceptions of teacher self-efficacy when the school level controls of student behavior are more systematic. Other research notes the improvement in student achievement and graduation rates through the increased investment in the school culture by the teachers. This increased investment leads to more effective and efficient use of resources, such as materials, time, and personnel (Flannery, Guest & Horner, 2010). The differences in the use of resources by teachers could be attributed to the enhanced communications required by following the SWPBS program with fidelity. The teacher perceptions of the practice of operational precision of the SWPBS program appeals to the teachers’ sense of efficacy and their morale factors.

Further research noted the economic analysis and effectiveness of the SWPBS program’s effects on school (Blonigen, Harbaugh, Singell, Horner, Irvin, & Smolkowski, 2008). By teaching the five core behaviors of the SWPBS program, the school creates economic advantages to meet the needs of the more challenging students. These cost
advantages directly affect teachers’ perceptions of the school environment and operations as the teachers, staff, and school community have direct input into the SWPBS program. This input reduces future costs through investing present costs to prevent future behaviors that disrupt instruction. Some of these costs include, teacher and staff time and efforts through an economy of scale application.

Chitiyo and Chitiyo (2012) note the need for valid and reliable measures in order not to create a false impression of the effectiveness of the SWPBS movement. The need for a rigorous design for future research on the methodology of SWPBS fundamentals is proposed for those researching the quality indicators for these programs within schools. However, the evidence based practices of SWPBS programs necessitate a review of the approaches, data, and systems used for the SWPBS movement within schools.

This study examined a different perspective on the SWPBS program. By collecting a baseline of teachers’ opinions on teacher morale factors before the implementation of a SWPBS program and the collecting the teachers’ opinions on the same factors after the implementation of the SWPBS program, this study reviews the changes in the teachers’ opinions on each of the seven factors. The opinions of the treatment school were collected concurrently with a similar school that was not implementing a SWPBS program. The control school that was not implementing the SWPBS program provided a basis against which to compare the teacher opinions’ changes over the course of the implementation of the SWPBS program. The levels of the reliability and validity of the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire satisfy the issues raised by Chitiyo and Chitiyo (2012) in their research. Kelm and McIntosh’s (2012) results also noted a similar comparison and results.
Arundel (2006) noted the improvement in the quality of instructional time and teacher morale as discipline issues decreased. The teachers’ transformational and managerial skills needed to address and improve student behavior impacted the teachers’ abilities to maintain instructional focus within the classroom. The impact on teachers affected the school climate and culture through a decrease in the time students were out of the classroom for behavior issues. The teachers’ perspective on their own productivity improved through better collaboration and communication (Caldarella, Shatzer, Gray, Young, & Young, 2011).

With the implementation of a SWPBS program, a shift occurs from reactive and aversive approaches to managing problem behaviors to a preventive and positive focus that creates reduced numbers of problem behaviors and enhances learning quality for all students. This shift alters the teachers’ perspective on their locus of control and subsequently their opinion on the factors that affect teacher morale. Part of this change in teachers’ perspectives may be attributed to their enhanced participation in the communications needed during the initial and ongoing leadership and management decisions required to implement and sustain a SWPBS program.

**Generalizations**

This study was an effort to examine two rural, Title I middle schools while one of the schools implemented a SWPBS program. The findings in this study through the analysis of the responses from the two faculties identified the teacher morale factors which were statistically significant different. Based on the use of the independent sample t-test for the teacher morale factors, we rejected our hypotheses on two of the factors, curriculum issues and status within the community. This study failed to reject the
hypotheses on the remaining five factors of teacher satisfaction, salary, educational support, and rapport with the principal and teaching load.

The rejection of the hypothesis for curriculum issues leads to the conclusion that Middle School 1 is more effective in creating better attitudes in this area. The rejection of the hypothesis for status leads to the conclusion that Middle School 1 is more effective in creating better attitudes in the area of teacher attitudes towards the teachers’ status in the school community.

The failure to reject the hypotheses for teacher satisfaction, salary, educational support, rapport with the principal and teaching load means that there is no significant statistical difference in the changes in teacher attitudes in these areas. When the study examined the statistical tests results within the Confidence Intervals (CI), the study was confident that the true differences between the Middle School 1 teachers and the Middle School 2 teachers were more than the lower limit set for each confidence interval. An example would be the CI set for teacher satisfaction, CI_{99} = (-0.12, \infty). With this confidence interval for satisfaction, we are 99% confident that the true difference between the Middle School 1 teachers and the Middle School 2 teachers in the area of satisfaction is more than -0.12.

The results of the research questions with two of the seven questions showing significant changes lead the conclusions that the implementation of the SWPBS provides opportunities for the program to positively impact the teachers’ opinions on each of the factors for teacher morale. Further research could occur within this field. Such research could investigate other sources of influences on teacher morale factors, examine other school settings, or dig deeper into each of the factors within this study.
The implementation of the SWPBS program during this study involved two schools. Further studies could examine the effects across a school district or include a significant number of schools with similar settings, such as all urban or all rural middle schools within a region. The research would face additional issues in data collection and demographics while building participation. A wider scope could provide additional support for generalizations of the results.

**Summary of Data Analysis**

The project sought to determine whether a statistically significant difference occurs on faculty morale between two rural Title I Middle Schools when a SWPBS program is introduced. The examination of the factors affecting teacher morale was conducted using the results from the Perdue Teacher Opinionaire. The results were inspected for normality as one of the conditions for statistical analyses. Several factors’ responses were found not to have normal responses, but demonstrated skewed results.

**Summary**

While factors affecting teacher morale must be examined to determine whether their contribution to the overall teacher morale is significant, the value placed on each factors varies according to the individual teacher and their personal value placed on each factors. This equation, which is often hard to quantify, exists more in a dynamic and qualitative nature within each individual. However, these seven factors demonstrate the current status of educational leadership in assessing, evaluating, and managing the overall synopsis for school or district. This need arises from the collective perceptions of the value placed on teachers within a school or district (Ross & Horner, 2007). “The status of the teacher reflects the socio-cultural ethos of a society…” (Devi & Mani, 2010). The
value placed on teacher morale indicates leadership’s ability to effectively identify the processes and procedures needed to effectively communicate with the faculty and stakeholders to address change, conflict management, and decision making (Harris, A., Chapman, C., Muijs, D., Russ, J., & Stolle, L., 2006).
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Appendix A: Application to Conduct Research

XXXXX School System
Title of Research: SWPBS and Teacher Morale Date Submitted: August 20, 2007

Researcher’s Name: William A. Royal

Targeted Audience: Faculty Dates of the Research: August 1, 2009 – April 30, 2012

University/Sponsoring Agency: Liberty University, Lynchburg, Virginia

By signing below, you agree that you have completed all items on the checklist, read and meet the guidelines as outlined in Policy and Administrative Procedure Special Interest Materials Distribution. You also agree to submit any significant changes in the procedures of your project to the Superintendent’s Office for prior approval.

William A. Royal XXXXX School

Name of Researcher(s) [Type or Print] Name of Department/School

_______________________________________ __________________________
Signature(s) Date

This research involving human participants, if approved will be under the direct supervision of the following representative of sponsoring University/Agency.

Dr. Samuel Smith, Graduate Education
Faculty Advisor/Agency Representative [Type or Print] Name of Department

_______________________________________ __________________________
Signature Date

By signing below, you agree to allow the above researcher(s) to conduct research within your building.

_______________________________________ __________________________
Signature of Principal Date

For Office Use Only
Date Received: _________________

The attached request was reviewed by: ______________________________________
Recommendation: _____Approved _____Deny
Reason: ____________________________________________________________
Signature Department

For Superintendent’s Use Only
Your recommendation has been accepted. Please notify the requestor of the status of their request. A copy of their research findings should be submitted to the Office of the Superintendent at the time of completion. Address Omitted.

________________________________________
Superintendent’s Signature
Appendix B: Letter of Invitation and Consent Form

Dear ______________________,

I am a student at the Liberty University working on a doctorate in Educational Leadership. I am conducting a research study entitled: *Effect of the Introduction of a School Wide Positive Behavior Program on Teacher Morale*. The purpose of the research study is to explore the perceptions of school faculty about teacher morale factors.

Your participation will involve a survey that will take less than 15 minutes of your time. A short follow up phone call may be necessary for clarification of your school’s feedback if needed. Participants will remain anonymous in perpetuity.

Your participation in the study is voluntary. Should you choose to withdraw from participation at any time you may do so without demur. The results of the study will be published as a dissertation, but your name will not be associated with any results.

This research poses no foreseeable risk to any of the participants in the study. In this research, there are no foreseeable risks. Although there may be no direct benefit to you, the possible benefit of your participation may help by providing educators nationwide with the opportunity to reevaluate the processes and incidence teacher morale.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please call me at 423-293-0170.

Sincerely,

William A. Royal

---

By signing this form, I acknowledge that I understand the nature of the study, the potential risks to me as a participant, and the means by which my identity will be kept confidential. My signature on this form also indicates that I am 18 years old or older, and that I give my permission to voluntarily serve as a participant in the study described.

Signature of participant_______________________________________Date______________

Signature of researcher_______________________________________Date______________
Appendix C: Demographic Survey

This survey was designed to collect information pertaining to middle school faculty demographics. Data collected from this survey will be used for dissertation research purposes only.

Please review and complete all questions listed on the survey. Once you have completed the web-based survey, please follow the instructions on your computer screen. Thank you for your help and support.

1. How many total years have you served as a teacher in your whole career?

   a) Less than five years
   b) 6 - 10 years
   c) 11-15 years
   d) 15 – 20
   e) More than 20 years

2. How many years have you served as a faculty member at your present school?

   a) 1 - 5
   b) 6 - 10
   c) 11 - 15
   d) 15 - 20
   e) More than 20 years
3. Indicate your age range.

   a) 25 - 35  
   b) 36 - 45  
   c) 46 - 55  
   d) 56 - 65  
   e) 66 +

4. What is your race?

   a) Caucasian  
   b) African American  
   c) Hispanic  
   d) Asian  
   e) American Indian  
   f) Other

5. What is your gender?

   a) Male  
   b) Female

6. What is your educational background?

   a) Some college  
   b) Associate degree or technical school completion  
   c) Bachelors degree  
   d) Masters or Advanced degree
Appendix D: SET Report for MS1

School-Wide Evaluation Tool Report

School: (MS1)  District: County  Principal: XXXXXXXXXX

SET Data Collectors: XXXXXX  Date SET Conducted: 10/30/09

SWPBS Coach: XXXXXXX

General Statement:

The standard criterion for considering schools as having primary preventions in place is acknowledged to be a mean of 80% average implementation across features of the SET and 80% specifically on the feature for behavioral expectations taught (known as the 80-80 criteria). MS1 School’s SET results were 70% for Behavioral Expectations Taught and 77% for the mean across all seven features of Primary Preventions.

Commendations:

1. The principal, XXXXXXXXX, reported the SWPBS team was representative of all faculty and staff and that the team meetings take place at least monthly.

2. One hundred percent of the faculty and staff interviewed reported that they had issued XXXbucks to students and had given them feedback as to why they were being rewarded.

3. One hundred percent of the students interviewed at MS1 Middle School reported that they had received a XXXbuck since school began.

4. School-wide rules have been agreed upon and are documented. The school rules are linked to the letter “R” to help students and staff readily recall the three school-wide rules.

5. New administration has taken the initiative to revise procedure and policy to reflect SWPBS; i.e., faculty handbook, discipline flowchart, and crisis plan.

Recommendations:

1. While MS1 is using SWIS data management system for reviewing and compiling discipline referral information, additional training is needed for data entry, due to only one person in the building being trained to enter data.

2. The school-wide rules posted throughout the school should be presented in ways that all students can understand them. There are students who do not read and who are poor
readers at MS1 School who would benefit from having both the rules and expectations posted with graphics and symbols to help support the text.

3. A clearer understanding of who is the team leader can be established to the faculty and the team if that person is the one who presents updates to the entire faculty on SWIS data and other SWPBS related topics, such as rewards celebrations and procedural changes.

4. While a plan for rewarding behavioral expectations has been completed; document who is to do what when and where in a permanent tool such as the faculty handbook as well as provide an explanation of the reward system for students and parents in the student handbook and/or agenda book.

5. Eleven out of fifteen staff members at MS1 School were aware of specific procedures for what to do in a crisis situation (e.g. stranger with a gun in the building). Develop specific procedures for emergency situations and document them. Also, hold staff and faculty discussions about what to do in emergency situations such that all staff gains an understanding of the procedures. Make the developed crisis plan accessible to all faculty and staff (currently under revision due to change in administration).
Appendix E

THE PURDUE TEACHER OPINIONAIRE
Prepared by Ralph R. Bentley and Averno M. Rempel
This instrument is designed to provide you the opportunity to express your opinions about your work as a teacher and various school problems in your particular school situation. There are no right or wrong responses, so do not hesitate to mark they statements frankly. Please do not record your name on this document.
Read each statement carefully. Then indicate whether you (A) agree, (PA) probably agree, (PD) probably disagree, (D) disagree with each statement. Circle your answers.

1. Details, “red tape,” and required reports absorb too much of my time. A PA PD D
2. The work of individual faculty members is appreciated and commended by our principal. A PA PD D
3. Teachers feel free to criticize administrative policy at faculty meetings called by our principal. A PA PD D
4. The faculty feels that their suggestions pertaining to salaries are adequately transmitted by the administration to the board of education. A PA PD D
5. Our principal shows favoritism in his relations with the teachers in our school. A PA PD D
6. Teachers in this school are expected to do an unreasonable amount of record keeping and clerical work. A PA PD D
7. My principal makes a real effort to maintain close contact with the faculty. A PA PD D
8. Community demands upon the teacher’s time are unreasonable. A PA PD D
9. I am satisfied with the policies under which pay raises are granted. A PA PD D
10. My teaching load is greater than that of most of the other teachers in our school. A PA PD D
11. The extra-curricular load of the teachers in our school is unreasonable. A PA PD D
12. Our principal’s leadership in faculty meetings challenges and stimulates our professional growth. A PA PD D
13. My teaching position gives me the social status in the community that I desire. A PA PD D
14. The number of hours a teacher must work is unreasonable. A PA PD D
15. Teaching enables me to enjoy many of the material and cultural things I like. A PA PD D
16. My school provides me with adequate classroom supplies and equipment. A PA PD D
17. Our school has a well-balanced curriculum. among our teachers. A PA PD D
18. Teaching gives me a great deal of personal satisfaction. A PA PD D
19. The curriculum of our school makes reasonable provision for student individual differences. A PA PD D
20. The procedures for obtaining materials and services are well defined and efficient. A PA PD D
21. Generally, teachers in our school do not take advantage of one another. A PA PD D
23. The teachers in our school cooperate with each other to achieve common, personal, and professional objectives. ........................................A PA PD D
24. Teaching enables me to make my greatest contribution to society. ....A PA PD D
25. The curriculum of our school is in need of major revisions. .................A PA PD D
26. I love to teach. ......................................................................................A PA PD D
27. If I could plan my career again, I would choose teaching. ....................A PA PD D
28. Experienced faculty members accept new and younger members as colleagues..........................................................A PA PD D
29. I would recommend teaching as an occupation to students of high scholastic ability. ..........................................................A PA PD D
30. If I could earn as much money in another occupation, I would stop teaching..........................................................A PA PD D
31. The school schedule places my classes at a disadvantage..................A PA PD D
32. Within the limits of financial resources, the school tries to follow a generous policy regarding fringe benefits, professional travel, professional study, etc. .....................................................A PA PD D
33. My principal makes my work easier and more pleasant. ......................A PA PD D
34. Keeping up professionally is too much of a burden. .............................A PA PD D
35. Our community makes its teachers feel as though they are a real part of the community. ............................................................A PA PD D
36. Salary policies are administered with fairness and justice. ....................A PA PD D
37. Teaching affords me the security I want in an occupation. ....................A PA PD D
38. My school principal understands and recognizes good teaching procedures. .........................................................................A PA PD D
39. Teachers clearly understand the policies governing salary increases...A PA PD D
40. My classes are used as “dumping grounds” for problem students. ......A PA PD D
41. The lines and methods of communication between teachers and the principal in our school are well developed and maintained........A PA PD D
42. My teaching load at this school is unreasonable. .................................A PA PD D
43. My principal shows a real interest in my department.............................A PA PD D
44. Our principal promotes a sense of belonging among the teachers in our school. .................................................................A PA PD D
45. My teaching load unduly restricts my nonprofessional activities. ........A PA PD D
46. I find my contacts with students, for the most part, highly satisfying and rewarding............................................................A PA PD D
47. I feel that I am an important part of this school system. .........................A PA PD D
48. The competency of the teachers in our school compares favorably with that of teachers in other schools with which I am familiar..........A PA PD D
49. My school provides the teachers with adequate audio-visual aids and projection equipment. .............................................................A PA PD D
50. I feel successful and competent in my present position. ........................A PA PD D
51. I enjoy working with student organizations, clubs, and societies. .........A PA PD D
52. Our teaching staff is congenial to work with........................................A PA PD D
53. My teaching associates are well prepared for their jobs......................A PA PD D
54. Our school faculty has a tendency to form into cliques.........................A PA PD D
55. The teachers in our school work well together.....................................A PA PD D
56. I am at a disadvantage professionally because other teachers are better prepared to teach than I am. ............................................A PA PD D
57. Our school provides adequate clerical services for the teachers. .........A PA PD D
58. As far as I know, the other teachers think I am a good teacher.
59. Library facilities and resources are adequate for the grade or subject area which I teach.
60. The “stress and strain” resulting from teaching makes teaching undesirable for me.
61. My principal is concerned with the problems of the faculty and handles these problems sympathetically.
62. I do not hesitate to discuss any school problem with my principal.
63. Teaching gives me the prestige I desire.
64. My teaching job enables me to provide a satisfactory standard of living for my family.
65. The salary schedule in our school adequately recognizes teacher competency.
66. Most of the people in this community understand and appreciate good education.
67. In my judgment, this community is a good place to raise a family.
68. This community respects its teachers and treats them like professional persons.
69. My principal acts interested in me and my problems.
70. My school principal supervises rather than “snoopervises” the teachers in our school.
71. It is difficult for teachers to gain acceptance by the people in this community.
72. Teachers’ meetings as now conducted by our principal waste the time and energy of the staff.
73. My principal has a reasonable understanding of the problems connected with my teaching assignment.
74. I feel that my work is judged fairly by my principal.
75. Salaries paid in this school system compare favorably with salaries in other systems with which I am familiar.
76. Most of the actions of students irritate me.
77. The cooperativeness of teachers in our school helps make our work more enjoyable.
78. My students regard me with respect and seem to have confidence in my professional ability.
79. The purposes and objectives of the school cannot be achieved by the present curriculum.
80. The teachers in our school have a desirable influence on the values and attitudes of their students.
81. This community expects its teachers to meet unreasonable personal standards.
82. My students appreciate the help I give them with their schoolwork.
83. To me there is no more challenging work than teaching.
84. Other teachers in our school are appreciative of my work.
85. As a teacher in this community, my nonprofessional activities outside of school are unduly restricted.
86. As a teacher, I think I am as competent as most other teachers.
87. The teachers with whom I work have high professional ethics.
88. Our school curriculum does a good job of preparing students to become enlightened and competent citizens. ...............................................A PA PD D
89. I really enjoy working with my students. ..........................................................A PA PD D
90. The teachers in our school show a great deal of initiative and creativity in their teaching assignments. .........................................................A PA PD D
91. Teachers in our community feel free to discuss controversial issues in their classes. ............................................................................A PA PD D
92. My principal tries to make me feel comfortable when visiting my classes. .........................................................................................A PA PD D
93. My principal makes effective use of the individual teacher’s capacity and talent. ..............................................................................A PA PD D
94. The people in this community, generally, have a sincere and wholehearted interest in the school system. ..................................................A PA PD D
95. Teachers feel free to go to the principal about problems of personal and group welfare. .................................................................A PA PD D
96. This community supports ethical procedures regarding the appointment and reappointment of members of the teaching staff..............A PA PD D
97. This community is willing to support a good program of education....A PA PD D
98. Our community expects the teachers to participate in too many social activities. .................................................................A PA PD D
99. Community pressures prevent me from doing my best as a teacher. ..A PA PD D
100. I am well satisfied with my present teaching position......................A PA PD D
Appendix F: Box Plots
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