Stress in Alabama's Education Employees: Intensity, Manifestation, Connection to Turnover Intentions, and Alleviation Techniques

by

Allison Baulch King

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
May 6, 2023

Keywords: educator stress, turnover, attrition, retention

Approved by

Andrew Pendola, Chair, Assistant Professor of Educational Foundations, Leadership and Technology
Amy Serafini, Assistant Professor of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology
Chih-hsuan Wang, Professor of Educational Foundations, Leadership and Technology
Jason Bryant, Associate Clinical Professor of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology

Abstract

Schools across America are filled with educators who are skilled in their craft but stressed with their work, which is leading to alarming rates of burnout, turnover, and attrition. Much of the existing professional literature addressing public education largely identifies financial limitations as the driving force behind these challenges, but more recent research has looked at alternative factors such as working conditions, workplace demands, and collaborative support as potential reasons behind their frustrations. This study builds upon and advances possible reasons behind the profession's challenges, looks at how the stress factors manifest themselves and vary by demographics, reviews employees' considerations for leaving the workplace and profession, and more. Additionally, policy considerations and modifications in professional practice that could be targeted to improve classroom climate, reduce educator stress, increase student learning, and contribute to increased teacher recruitment and retention are presented.

Acknowledgements

I am so very thankful to so many for their support and guidance in helping to make this journey a successful one for me. To my precious PapPaw, Art Bridges, thank you for always pushing me to further my education and for being my greatest supporter along the way. I am forever thankful for your wisdom that never seems to lead me wrong. To my wonderful husband, Matt, thank you for always cheering for me and upholding our family life so that I could chase my dreams. I love you more than you'll ever know. To my unbelievable mom, Beth (BeBe), you always sacrifice your time to support me in anything I need, and your many babysitting moments along this journey are just another example of that. Your steadfast love is something I will always hold dear and cherish. To my beautiful children, Carson and Caroline, thank you for your willingness to share some of your mom's time with Auburn University for the last several years. I hope that, even through the sacrifice, you've learned something from me about commitment, perseverance, and hard work. Always hold those virtues dear and know they'll take you far in life. To the best dissertation chair and committee Auburn has to offer, thank you all for your support and guidance in making me a better student, a better researcher, and a better person. Dr. Pendola, your vast knowledge and expertise were such a blessing to me throughout this journey. Thank you for your leadership and patience. Dr. Serafini, Dr. Bryant, and Dr. Wang, I am so very grateful for your time and investment while advising me. You all helped me to think of ways to make my study even better. To the school district leaders in Central Alabama, thank you for your support of my research and for allowing your employees the opportunity to participate in this important study. It is through efforts such as these that we will be able to move our profession forward.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter I: Introduction

Schools across America are filled with educators who are skilled in their trade but stressed with their work, which is leading to alarming rates of burnout, turnover, and attrition. Much of the existing professional literature addressing public education largely identifies financial limitations as the driving force behind these challenges, but more recent research has looked at alternative factors such as working conditions and collaborative support as potential reasons behind their frustrations. Given the alarming rate of teacher turnover in Alabama, this dissertation works to isolate the causes of high teacher stress and offer potential interventions to reduce teacher exits. Utilizing a regional survey of education employees in central Alabama, this dissertation aims to (1) identify triggers for stress using Fimian's stress inventory, and (2) identify potential alleviants to such stress. Results of this survey and the associated analysis will serve as a vehicle to communicate with school decisionmakers and policymakers on targeted precursors to teacher stress and to offer localized and actionable interventions.

Stress among education employees is a common occurrence and a concept that has plagued the profession for many years, however, these challenges are currently at an all-time high (Richards et al., 2018). This study assesses what the research is telling us regarding the reasons for these statistics, and how we can best address the needs in an effort to better the lives of employees and increase student learning. By studying and understanding the reasons behind the frustrations, we can best address how to correct them.

The purpose of this study is to identify sources of teacher stress, to identify points where educators move beyond stress and leave the workplace or profession, and to identify strategies that will decrease stress for employees. Each of these provide valuable insight that districts can

use to implement policies and procedures that can promote happiness within and retention among employees.

Sources of Stress

Individuals are leaving the education profession in record numbers, and approximately one half of new teachers are leaving the profession within the first five years (Aloe et al., 2014). Such high attrition rates affect student learning and school district management. While this is a statistic that has been reported by many across various medians throughout the years, it is important to explore and understand what factors might contribute to this alarming trend. Research supports many reasons for the realities of attrition, most of which point to overall job dissatisfaction due to teacher stress, but the specific, overarching themes break down to be work load, support, and relationships (Benons, 2020; Esther & Viljayalakshmi, 2020; Harry, 2020; Jordan, 2020; Khojah & Aaif, 2020; Patterson, 2003; Raja & Kanagaraj, 2020; Ramos & Galleto, 2020; Ramas & Hughes, 2020; Wang & Sun, 2018). Below, I address several specific sources of stress.

Student Discipline

As noted by Ramas and Hughes (2020), most of educators' frustrations centered around student discipline. Additionally, Esther & Vilayalakshmi (2020) state that occupational stress begins and ends at the workplace, and it needs to be controlled at the workplace. They share that the main reasons for teacher stress are student behavior problems. Additionally, the challenges that stress can bring to an employee's health and performance and their research showed that "34% experience stress because of student discipline and poor communication" (Esther & Vilayalakshmi, 2020, p. 3).

Excessive Workload

Ramas and Hughes (2020) additionally found that the second most likely reason for frustration and departure is excessive work load, noting "Instead of seeing teachers quietly leave in frustration, and only then rely on repeated exit interviews to turn things around as espoused by an administrator, schools need to develop proactive policies that more comprehensively address overall working conditions within the organization" (p. 55). Esther & Vilayalakshmi (2020) found similar facts to be true. They share that the main reasons for teacher stress are workload and work hours. Additionally, they cite the challenges that stress can bring to an employee's health and performance and their research showed that "46% of women teachers agree that they experience a moderate level of work stress because of excessive working hours and management policies" (Esther & Vilayalakshmi, 2020, p. 3).

Lack of Support and Relationships

Support and relationships have long showed to be critical in managing teacher stress. Research shows that teacher burnout and attrition are the result of a lack of administrative support and little or no relationship with colleagues and/or members of school or district leadership (Jordan, 2020). Teachers want collaboration with colleagues to share ideas and resources as a means of support and that relationships and connections are crucial, so she directs employers to make concerted efforts for employees to connect with each other and administrators. "Teachers teach more effectively when they work in professional cultures where their opinions and input are valued, and where they can openly share about their successes and struggles" (Jordan, 2020, p. 4), and "The power of human relationships on teacher retention is substantial" (Jordan, 2020, p. 62). How school leaders operate further correlates with teacher retention (Benons, 2020). Teachers feel positive about their job environment when leaders

exhibit transformational leadership. As noted by Benons (2020) “the strategies school leaders employ and the characteristics they exhibit play a key role in retaining teachers. The researcher was able to identify specific characteristics principals exhibited that led to them retaining teachers for three or more years” (p. 4). In light of this, Khojan & Aaif (2020) share that successful mentoring programs are the key to employee satisfaction and retention. Their work reveals the details of what a successful mentoring program looks like, and it includes specific steps for celebrating the employees along the way including ceremonies for mentor completion and tenure. Esther & Vilayalakshmi (2020) share that some of the main reasons for teacher stress are management, to include poor communication, assessments, and lack of appreciation.

Work/Life Balance and Flexibility

Research has further underlined the importance of maintaining an appropriate work/life balance in an effort to manage stress. Research has revealed that lower and mid-level employees are more stressed than top-level management, which has proven to be true in schools as well. Human resources programs like Fun Fridays and employee engagement events do not help to reduce employee stress (Raja & Kanagaraj, 2020). While having a good work/life balance is an essential component of well-being, it may not lead to greater productivity on the job (Ramos, 2020). Rather, meaningful evaluations, constructive feedback, significant staff development, mentoring, and open communication are the most important keys to keeping employees happy in their profession (Ramos, 2020). Essentially, if these aforementioned practices are in place and healthy, the employees may still have stress if their work/life balance is not optimized. Even if this is the case, however, research suggests that the employees will be much less likely to leave the profession.

Addressing Stress

In light of these sources of stress, a body of research has begun to look for ways teacher stress can be more directly addressed. For example, Harry (2020) conducted research that recommends for school leaders to design tasks and jobs in ways that would bring about improvement. Her study showed that flexible job schedules should be incorporated into personnel management, and that if these flexibilities are implemented, employee commitment and performance will increase. She states that stress is inevitable and cannot be eliminated, so it must be able to be managed to ensure effectiveness in the workplace, and that policies designed to accommodate employees and maximize flexibility is the greatest way to do this. Esther & Vilayalakshmi (2020) also found lack of flexibility to be a source of stress. Their study revealed that 20% of employees say stress is due to lack of freedom" (Esther & Vilayalakshmi , 2020, p. 3).

Research supports many reasons for teacher stress, burnout, and attrition. Evidence suggests that student discipline, workload, resources, and flexible scheduling are physical factors that directly affect educators, however, non-physical factors such as engaging and transformational leaders who offer support and show appreciation, mentoring with meaningful feedback, and communication and collaboration with other prove to be equally as important. Research shows that teachers are turning over and leaving the profession at an alarming rate, and the individuals' studies outlined in this review give us a great glimpse into why that is and offer specific steps we can take to aid in addressing this problem.

Purpose

Given the above statement of the problems regarding teacher stress, the purpose of this study is to identify specific sources of teacher stress, identify points where educators' intentions

to move from their current workplace or leave the profession, identify how the stress manifests itself, and identify strategies that will decrease stress for employees. As we've learned from the research, there is a great deal of workplace stress among education employees. Furthermore, the need to understand workplace stress in order to become knowledgeable on how we can address and correct it is another notable purpose of this study. The work we conduct here does just that.

Research Questions

The research questions addressed in this study are as follows:

1. What are the most pressing triggers for teacher stress, and do they differ by demographic and positional characteristics?
2. Do stress factors lead individuals to consider leaving their workplace or the profession, and do these intentions differ by demographic and positional characteristics?
3. How does workplace stress manifest itself among educators, and do these reactions differ by demographic and positional characteristics?
4. What actions can be taken to help individuals cope with or alleviate stress and do these techniques differ by demographic and positional characteristics?

Research Design

This study was conducted using a survey based quantitative research methodology. Survey tools via Auburn University were utilized for data collection. The survey collected demographic and geographic information on the respondents as well as their opinions on stress in the profession. The indicator questions were framed around a Likert-type scale where respondents gauged their level of agreement or disagreement with the indicator statement.

After the survey was developed, it was distributed to individuals across the state of Alabama. Participants were comprised of professionals currently working in K-12 schools with varying demographics in the form of a selected sampling. This helped to ensure that individuals from different geographics and indicator categories were represented in the study. For example, the study was distributed among employees that work in urban, suburban, and rural schools. The sampling was also diversified in that some employees were novice teachers and others more veteran teachers. The survey collected demographic information such as age, race, education level, and more. Developing these indicators into the survey helped us to gather specific information and interpret data on a more detailed level by looking at how stress affected people differently based on these demographics.

Assumptions

Some assumptions related to this study may include:

1. Respondents are able to identify their own workplace stress.
2. Respondents are able to identify their levels of stress and determine which factors affect them the most
3. Respondents will be honest, open, and truthful in their responses.

Delimitations

- Time of the study: January 2022- December 2022
- Location of the study: Alabama
- Sample of the study: K-12 public school certified employees

Limitations

1. The sample research population is limited to the state of Alabama, so the responses may or may not align with those in other areas of the country.

2. Given the anonymous nature of the survey and distribution requirements, there is an inability to control for who will or will not complete the survey, which may lead to issues of selection bias. For example, surveys are only distributed vis email and may eliminate those who do not check email or use technology regularly.

   All responses are self-reported and, therefore, may not accurately reflect respondents' levels of stress due to issues such as social desirability.

3. Due to privacy concerns, respondents may not be able to openly share their opinions or give additional details they may wish to share. For example, Teachers may be apprehensive to respond to the survey on their work email addresses or devices for fear of compromising their anonymity.

Significance

Educators are the cornerstone of our community and serve a vital role in developing our youth and our future. Unfortunately, education in our country is at a pivotal crossroads. With more employees leaving the profession than ever before and fewer coming into the work, the future is not as positive as it once was. Given the profession's critical role in our society, we must proceed with efforts to uncover the reasons behind these unfortunate realities in order to secure a strong and viable future for our students.

While the topic of stress among educators has been studied before, looking at which of those factors, if any, are resulting in them leaving the profession or considering leaving the profession will be a new contribution. Additionally, the gathering and sorting of data based on the unique geographic and demographic information we're collecting will also be a new addition to the research.

Organization of the Study

This study is divided into five chapters. Chapter One introduces the topic of study, along with the purpose and problem statement, definitions, and research questions. A review of the literature relevant to the study is found in chapter Two. Chapter Three outlines the methodology used to conduct the study, including demographics and sampling methods of individuals participating in the study as well as the survey instruments utilized. Chapter Four describes how the data collected was analyzed. Finally, Chapter Five presents a summary of the outcomes of the study as well as the applications relevant to practice and recommendations for additional research related to the topic.

Chapter II: Literature Review

Education employees' triggers for stress and their implications have been studied across academic paradigms for quite some time. "Research conducted in training organizations indicates that teachers frequently experience heavy demands in the workplace and as many as one third of them experience stress and exhaustion" (Cemaloglu, 2011, p. 495). Furthermore, teacher stress not only impacts employees' health and job satisfaction negatively, it also figures prominently into the nation's high rates of teacher attrition (Prilleltensky et al., 2016). Looking at the topic from an overarching perspective, we are able to identify two general categories of stressors for employees: contextual and personal. The contextual factors are those areas of the work that exist outside of the individual teacher and are part of the education system itself. These may include environmental factors such as workload, building administration, accountability, or resources, but may also include student work ethic and behavior, political configurations, parent and family components, instructional needs, or support and empowerment within the building. Personal factors are the second of the two general categories, pertain to the individual teacher, and include things like self-efficacy, resilience, coping skills, motivation, personality, and lifestyle. "Findings show that workload, school environment, coordination/mentoring, classroom environment, and emotional factors are major causes" of stress for education employees (El Helou et al., 2016).

Employees in school districts may experience stress through personal or contextual factors, or both, depending on the individual. When looking to minimize stress and evaluate the factors affecting employees, the contextual factors are more easily addressed by a school administrator than the personal factors due to them being more within their control. Regardless

of who can control the levels of stress, work must be done since "nearly 90 percent of all educators experience moderate to high levels of stress" (Kodavatiganti & Bulusu, 2011, p. 89).

Contextual or School-Related Factors Leading to Stress

Environmental Structures & Political Factors

The most commonly reported triggers for stress among education employees relate to environmental factors within the workplace. Fernet et al. (2012) share that "the work environment has been considered to be the main determinant of burnout" through their lens of the JD-R Model (p. 514). Whether it's challenges with school administration, increased accountability measures, pressures, expectations and demands, limited resources, political alliances and bureaucracy, or lack of support, the elements that make up the overall environment of the school can contribute to a great deal of stress for employees. In a study conducted by Stauffer and Mason (2013), several teachers cited that a "lack of appreciation for teachers by the public in general, the constant criticism by politicians, newspapers, and parents…the constant pressure from the school system to implement new programs, strategies, curriculum" and "decrees from the higher ups that don't make sense, don't put kids first, and don't respect my time" were stressors for them (pp. 817-818). Many also shared that so often policies, paperwork, and procedures were so overwhelming that they felt they were left with little time to actually teach, which supports the finding that the expectations and demands they receive from administrators and the district to the time crunch they feel related to instruction. One teacher in the study linked the expectations and time demands in her statement which shared "Many of the stressors I feel as a teacher tend to fall under the heading of scheduling and required forms (activities, paperwork). Trying to fit everything in the allotted time we are given is the most difficult. This will cause panic, anxiety, and frustration" (p. 818). Comparably, another teacher

stated that “Another stressor for me is the paperwork required by the school, district, or state… At times it can feel more like all a person does is test and document rather than teach” (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 818). Standardized testing accountability measures is also a factor that is documented as a major stressor for teachers in many studies on the subject.

School administrators can play a critical role in a school’s environmental and political components. As we find in much of the research, administrators’ personalities, leadership styles, and decision making can be a significant factor in determining the overall environmental structure. One study discovered relationships between the acts of leadership by principals and the motivation, morale and work satisfaction levels of their teachers (Cemaloglu, 2011). Cemaloglu (2011) specifically found that transformational leadership styles were most effective in building the organizational health of a school and that transactional leadership styles negatively affected the school’s overall structural health. This study further noted that positive leadership acts of principals such as motivation, communication, decision-making, and problem solving were found to be most prevalent in transformational leaders, which ultimately led to positive organizational health in education organizations (Cemaloglu, 2011, p.507). Comparably, another group of researchers, Richards et al. (2018), found the structural environment to be a significant factor in determining levels of stress in employees and in how they dealt with the stress they faced. Their qualitative study revealed that teachers who reported low burnout found their work environments to be nurturing and supportive, while those who reported high burnout classified their workplaces as combative and restraining (Richards et al., 2018, p.780). As Stauffer and Mason (2013) asserted, school leaders’, specifically principals’, behaviors and management styles are noted to be significant factors in setting the tone and climate of the school and can therefore contribute greatly to or potentially alleviate the stress teachers may face. This belief

was also found to be true in a study conducted by Prilleltensky et al. (2016). They reported that the organizational level can be a great source of stress, and the actions of administration and management style of the principal can affect a teacher's well-being. The study further found "when organizational demands seem out of balance with a sense of personal control, the resulting tension can create great stress" (Prilleltensky, 2016, p. 108). Many teachers interviewed shared that they felt "a lack of respect and support from administrators with regard to time and scheduling, expectations and demands, and the allotment of resources" (Stauffer & Mason, p. 818).

Factors of Student Behavior and Work Ethic

Students' behaviors, work ethic, and attitudes are a commonly reported trigger for stress that educators report. Although these factors are outside of their direct control, they can serve as a way to alleviate or compound the stress teachers face. Student misbehavior is a prominent factor related most strongly to teacher stress or burnout (Aloe et al., 2014). Although there isn't one specific definition for student misbehavior, the concept generally centers around "behaviors that disrupt the teaching-learning process or interfere with the orderly operation of the classroom" (Aloe et al., 2014, p. 32). These things may include, but are not limited to, skipping class or coming in late, disrupting instruction, verbally disrespecting teachers, failure to follow instructions, off-task behavior, and other societal concerns such as bullying and harassment. The Aloe et al. (2014) study determined that the link between student misbehavior and teacher burnout is a dynamic one. The teachers in the study report spending a "significant amount of time dealing with problem behaviors" and one-third of them indicated that the "misbehavior interferes with their teaching" (Aloe et al., 2014, p. 33). As teachers deal with the challenges presented by misbehaviors, the classroom climate may change and the teacher's relationship with

the students may change. “A poor student-teacher relationship and students’ perceptions of low emotional support from the teacher may, in turn, increase conflict and misbehavior in the classroom” (Aloe et al., 2014, p. 33). The multivariate meta-analysis that was conducted through this study found statistical significance between student misbehavior and the three components of burnout, most notably emotional exhaustion.

Often students’ behaviors and motivation are closely linked with their home environments’ perceptions and feelings about the district or school and education in general. The school system’s decision making, operational structures, and communication “affect parents’ attitudes toward learning, which in turn contributes to poor student attitude and behavior, low student achievement, and difficulty in maintaining a productive learning environment” (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 822). One teacher shared “Negative and inappropriate behaviors abound, and I am constantly having to assert my command and authority over my classes to keep the environment under control so learning can take place” (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p.822). Sixty-seven percent of teachers surveyed in this study referenced that students’ behaviors and attitudes were of great concern and stress for them. Specifically, they shared “Sometimes I get impatient when my students misbehave and distract others or prevent me from teaching” (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 821) and “The stressors associated with working with students re the problems with discipline and their lack of respect for themselves and others. The ‘I don’t care attitude’ gets tiring and makes teaching more of a struggle” (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 821). Another stated, “Students who are daily behavior problems who are not removed from the classroom and in turn affect the level of instruction of the other children creates stress because of the time dedicated to dealing with the disruptive students’ behaviors” (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 821). These

specifics, and others, related to student discipline and work ethic are very much a challenge for our education employees and cause stress for them on a consistent basis.

Instructional Factors

Instructional demands in schools today are at an all-time high, and increased accountability measures in the 21st Century have brought about great challenges and stress for educators. National and state mandates through legislation and policy development bring about often impossible or next to impossible requirements for education systems that are already stretched so thinly. These guidelines, while often well intentioned, trickle down to the individual classrooms and place a lot of responsibility and stress onto the shoulders of the teachers required to implement them. In a study conducted by Stauffer and Mason (2013), 91% of teachers shared that instructional demands, such as workload, responsibilities, time to accomplish teaching, and curriculum concerns brought about great stress for them in their work. Many shared that there is simply too much to do and too little time with which to do it. Others referenced the frequent changes to curriculum and accountability as being a challenge. One teacher stated that the "county changes the curriculum way too often [and] they need to leave it alone for enough time to see a difference" (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p.821). Another shared "How do I cover the required curriculum assuring my students, at all levels, have learned the material?" (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 821). Still another frustration was "I feel I do a lot of everything, but nothing well" (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 821). As previously mentioned, these mandates often come from government structures that make policies without consideration of the implications they may bring, and much of the stress these requirements create could potentially be avoided if those making the policies visited the classrooms and looked at the best ways for implementation, while also considering the historical realities that have been most and least effective. One teacher in the

Stauffer and Mason (2013) study shared "I have completed my 21st year of teaching and have seen educational trends go full circle from one extreme to another" (p. 821).

Empowerment and Support

In a profession as challenging as teaching, support and empowerment from others is an important component of success for some education professionals. In one study, Richards et al. (2018) found that teachers reported lower levels of stress in schools where they felt empowered in their work and supported by their colleagues. A great source of this comes through the informal networks and relationships individuals have with their co-workers. These may be developed through social opportunities or collaborative professional learning. Teachers in the study spoke to this concept by sharing that they "talked to other teachers in the school district who had been doing this a while" (Richards et al., 2018, p.775), and had "colleagues who get together for coffee and talk about 'what would you do in this situation?' "(Richards et al., 2018, p.775).

Their findings also related stress levels to the availability of resources. One teacher with limited resources reported that she'd tried to engage students through educational You Tube videos only to discover that they were blocked (Richards et al., 2018, p. 775). This created stress for her. On the other hand, another teacher reported that her resources were plentiful as she had "one or two volunteers in my room every day" and that those individuals "cut down on a lot of stress in that they get all of the copies and those things done for us" (Richards et al., 2018, p.775). Another echoed the help of resources in contributing to lower stress when he stated that the administration provided him with "enough money to buy the resources I need to teach… I feel supported" (Richards et al., 2018, p.775).

The importance of support was also found to be an important factor in a study conducted by Prilleltensky et al. (2016) which stated that "a caring and compassionate working environment is an important protective factor" (p. 108). They further shared that "empathetic listening and supportive mentoring are interpersonal antidotes to the adversarial relationships teachers often experience in working with colleagues, students, and parents" (Prilleltensky et al., 2016, p. 108).

School Culture and Climate

School culture and climate makes up a broad span of factors that can be hard to pinpoint and often vary by building, but they can have significant implications on staff stress and attrition. Generally, culture and climate issues center around personnel matters, whether it be peer relationships with colleagues or supervisory relationships with administration. Some of these include, but are not limited to, turnover in staff and administration leading to retraining or starting over each year, role misapprehension, and negativity among co-workers. In a Stauffer and Mason (2013) study, working relationships were listed as a major stressor for teachers, whether those were with administration, other teachers, or even front office staff. Concerns with administrative relationships centered around the administrator being "unsupportive or unfriendly…who did little to build up staff morale" in a school environment where "positive feedback is almost never given, but one's errors are pointed out immediately" (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 819). Similarly, a 2018 study conducted by Richards, Hemphill, and Templin also cited administrators as those who set the tone for the culture and climate of the school, and even surmised that the administration has the greatest impact on school culture. Teachers in this study perceived an affirmative school culture when administrators were engaged and attentive with the staff, students, and needs of the school. One teacher reported that she'd "been in schools

where students never see the principal unless they are in trouble" as opposed to schools where "the principal is out front every morning shaking their hands and giving compliments" (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p.774). Another teacher reported to be very excited about his principal and the tone he sets for the building stating that he is in the classroom a lot and "wants to know what's going on and is involved." He further stated, "His relationship with the children is amazing…He sets the tone for the entire building" (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 775).

The teachers who cited negative peer relationships as challenging spoke to "negativity, competitiveness, and drama" (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 819) as being things that brought them stress. Some also referenced other teachers being disrespectful and unethical as a matter or concern and stress for them. Another 2016 study echoed this by sharing "teachers' level of trust in the positive interactions and attitudes of colleagues and administrative staff correlate with burnout levels; as confidence increases, burnout level decreases" (El Helou et al., 2016, p. 553).

In contrast, research conducted by Richards et al. (2016) shared insight from teachers who perceived a strong sense of community that was grounded in positive relationships with colleagues and structures to promote collaboration. One teacher shared, "This is the best school I've ever been in" (Richards et al., 2016, p. 774), and another echoed that "the teachers are so tight-knit and there is a real sense of community. I feel like everybody cares about the well-being of these kids and their families" (Richards et al., 2016, p. 774). These employees reported low levels of stress in their buildings. As evidenced by the research, the makeup of a school's culture and climate can have great bearing on the school's success and the employees' stress levels.

Another study found similar sentiments to be true. Cemaloglu (2011) looked at the way principals' leadership styles and organizational health affected teachers' relationships and workplace bullying. His research found that transformational leadership was most effective in

fostering positive relationships between colleagues and led to a decrease in exhaustion and stress among employees. As leaders practiced transformational leadership in their schools, the organizational health improved and workplace challenges between colleagues or workplace bullying decreased. On the contrary, principals or leaders who practiced transactional leadership found their schools to have lower organizational health and no impact or a negative impact on workplace bullying and relationships among colleagues (Cemaloglu, 2011). This work gives implications for leadership structures that may work best to keep the overall health and happiness of the organization strong and lead to positive employee interactions.

Outside of personnel matters, culture and climate issues can arise from things such as a general lack of respect or appreciation as it relates to job demands as well. One teacher shared that "As a teacher, you spend time planning, involved on committees, talking to parents, documenting progress, testing and behavioral issues. You are a parent, nurse, and other professionals. Sometimes I think people forget that we are people with our own family, and that school is not our life, just a small part of it" (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 819). These additional responsibilities often require teachers to work many hours on nights and weekends that are outside of their contracted time without additional compensation. This both directly and indirectly contributes to the culture and climate of the building or district.

Overall, across the studies, teachers perceived a sense of community and lower stress when they had positive relationships with colleagues, administrators who were engaged, and worked in places where structures were in place to promote collaboration. On the contrary, teachers that experienced combative and restraining work environments reported feeling demoralized and marginalized while also experiencing a lack of community and high levels of stress.

Parent and Family Factors

The stress caused by parent and family factors may be one of the most, if not the most challenging of all, simply because it's the one that the school employee has the least amount of control over. Student factors and parent/family factors emerged as separate, but closely related themes in the study conducted by Stauffer and Mason (2013). Sixty-three percent of teachers in this study cited that parent expectations and the home environment influence students in the classroom and are sources of stress for them. "Parenting style and the family environment were listed as stressors to teachers that affected students' attitudes, behaviors, and their engagement in the learning process" (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 822). This assertion can be made on both sides of the coin depending on the situation. On one side you have stress on teachers because students come to school with little to no home support, and on the other side teachers can feel stress because parents intimidate them with unrealistic expectations and lots of communication. Although quite different, both of these scenarios can be extremely challenging and stressful for educators. Regardless of which side of the situation they face teachers feel frustrated that "accountability for student success is high on the teachers and no so much accountability is placed on the parents" (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 822).

Regarding lack of support at home, one teacher shared that many parents "take little to no responsibility for their children's educations" and students "do not come to school ready to learn. The school system failed many of their parents, so their children do not easily buy into education. A large part of my job is getting students to the point where they are ready to absorb the lesson I am trying to teach" (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 822). This idea was further echoed by another educator who states that "Frequently students stay up late, come without breakfast, and have not done their homework to practice skills. Tardies and absences reflect the parent's

attitude about school" (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 822). In a follow up to this, the parents' attitudes about and lack of respect for school are often evident to teachers when they try to address concerns. One teacher shared that "it is difficult to make a suggestion to a student without fearing retribution from parents who think their child is perfect and who thinks the teacher is the source of all the problems" (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 823). Stauffer and Mason's research further finds that less motivated students often do not have parents who support their education at home. Because of this, teachers face challenges in trying to find ways to encourage these students to work hard and take responsibility for themselves and their assignments. Although it can be difficult to reach these students due to the poor support and lack of role models at home, educators work hard to help them understand the importance of their education.

On the other side of the coin, some educators deal with challenges from parents who are overly involved with their student's education and are very demanding of the teacher's time. One teacher speaks specifically to these demands saying "They pop in my classroom at any time of the day, call us, write notes, email us- our parents need constant attention and validation. [They] 'pester' us about little things" (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 823). While some teachers feel that the longer they teach, the more confident and less intimidated they become when dealing with these kinds of parents, they still state that "anytime a parent calls, writes you a note, or wants a conference, a teacher feels stressed and nervous" (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 823). This work surrounding pleasing parents and meeting their expectations is a high stressor for many educators.

Independent of overly involved versus not involved interaction styles is the challenge of unstable home environments that are physically, mentally, and emotionally damaging to

students. This factor affects teachers on a personal level and certainly causes great stress for them. One teacher expresses this beautifully in saying "In our school my other area of stress involves the expectation of achievement from students with massive home problems, parents who either don't know how to parent or don't care, or other circumstances. Reaching students with difficult backgrounds is personally taxing because these family situations are out of my control" (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 824). Another teacher followed up on this by stating "one of the stressors I experience is student behavior as a result of their home life. I hate to see kids who have no idea how to handle problems because their parents don't either. Many times, parents expect the teacher to be able to change their child's behavior when the parents themselves are unwilling to change" (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p.824). As a result of this, teachers are tasked with trying to be a consistent, good influence in the child's life for the time they are with them. They work diligently to provide a safe and orderly environment for learning because they know that those hours in their classroom may be the only stable hours of that student's day.

Personal Factors Leading to Stress

Not all of the stress triggers teachers face are related to matters surrounding their workplace. Aside from the stressors within the work environment itself, there are elements of stress that are embedded within oneself as an individual and a professional. There has been an emerging effort in the field of education around how individuals handle stress as professionals, and how individuals are able to cope with this stress differently based on their levels of resilience and self-efficacy. Just as Fernet et al. (2012) shared in their research, the JD-R model, while proven to be an effective indicator of workplace level demands and stress, does not factor in the motivational and individual factors "which may be important underlying mechanisms" in

understanding the stress of educators (p. 515). They further share that individual factors such as self-efficacy, optimism, and organizational-based self- esteem as well as personal self-esteem "mediate the relationships between workplace factors" and stress (Fernet et al., 2012, p. 515).

Another model worth noting is that of Self Determination Theory (SDT), a theory discussed in an article by Fernet et al. (2012). The researchers assert that while the SDT is geared toward motivational factors, the environmental factors must be in place as well to facilitate the psychological functions by which the self-determination theory is based (Fernet et al., 2012, p. 516).

These personal factors often play a significant role, and the level of significance they carry varies between individuals. Most notably, the personal elements discussed in the literature center around psychological characteristics such as personality traits, and they can serve as a risk factor or protective factor for employees with respect to stress and burnout. Personal factors "serve as either relative weaknesses or personal strengths, either exacerbating individual exposure to stress or helping them effectively manage it" (Zysberg et al., 2017, p. 124).

Self-Efficacy/Resilience

"Resilience refers to the process of, capacity for, or outcome of successful adaptation despite challenging circumstances" (Hong, 2012, p. 419). Researchers in the field have studied resilience as a way to determine how teachers' identity development relates to their levels of job satisfaction, motivation, career decision making, and teaching effectiveness. Additionally, Hong (2012) shares that educators who are resilient tend to respond positively in the stressful classroom or school environment, demonstrate effective strategies for working with challenging students, and derive deeper satisfaction in their work (p. 419). In understanding resilience, others have specified the need to focus on the process of building resilience in individuals rather than

just relying on educators to be resilient on their own. Another study's results conducted by Prilleltensky et al. (2016) agreed with Rutter sharing that "individual teachers can benefit from mindfulness training and self- compassion" (p. 109). This work has continued today and many focused studies are centered around this and helping the individuals develop into resilient citizens and workers rather than just expecting people to be. Additionally, teacher preparation programs need to focus more training and pay more attention to classroom management and psychological techniques to cope with stress so teachers are more equipped to handle the stress and challenges they face each day.

"Self-efficacy has been considered as one of the most important factors influencing individuals' choices of activities or goals, as well as how much effort they expend, how long they persevere in the face of difficulties and their resilience to failures" (Hong, 2012, p. 420). Additionally, other studies find that "certain personality traits and patterns put individuals at a greater risk of experiencing stress, ineffectively processing it, and thus being exposed to burnout" (Zysberg et al., 2016, p. 125).

Hong (2012) further shares that self-efficacy can be defined as "people's judgment of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performance" (p. 420). Essentially, an individual's performance may not be seen through the lens of what actually occurs, but rather filtered through their beliefs about their capabilities to perform at certain levels. This assertion further shares that someone's level of motivation and actions are based more on what they subjectively think or believe rather than what is objectively true. These constructs make up the essential nature of what self-efficacy is, and where an individual places themselves along that scale may, and likely does, determine their perceptions of stress and how it is managed in the workplace. Likewise, a study by Parker et al. (2012)

echoed Hong's findings by examining the self-worth theory and reporting that teachers' perceptions of self are the basis by which they evaluate their work. Furthermore, a third study conducted by Zysberg et al. (2016) examined the concept of emotional intelligence in employees and how it plays into employees' interpretation of and reaction to stress in the workplace. Here, Zysberg et al. note that emotional intelligence is a powerful factor for employees protecting themselves from feeling of stress. They further suggest that "EI is negatively associated with stress, and therefore a potential protective factor" (Zysberg et al., 2016, p. 126). Therefore, employees who have a firm grasp on the concept of emotional intelligence may be less likely to experience this workplace stress.

Hong's (2012) study examined a group of teachers and how their personal perceptions, self-efficacy, and resilience played into them deciding to leave the profession ("leavers") or stay in ("stayers"). The study found that the "stayers and leavers showed different resilient attitudes and responses to challenging situations" (Hong, 2012, p. 431). When leavers faced challenges, they experienced diminished self-efficacy and experienced emotional burnout because they attributed the difficulty to their own personal characteristics or personality. Stayers, on the other hand, faced the same challenges, but because they set strict emotional guidelines between themselves and their students, they were able to avoid taking negative events personally and maintained strong self-efficacy (Hong, 2012, p. 431). Following along these same ideas, a study by Zysberg et al. (2016) echoed the importance of emotional intelligence for educators in managing their stress and coping with burnout. The work pointed to the role of emotional intelligence in stress management, sharing that regulating emotions through the effective processing of challenging situations will reduce adverse outcomes (Zysberg et al., 2016, p. 133).

A study by Prillenltensky et al. (2016) took these same concepts and outlined specific personal risk factors to watch for and how those can be combatted with protective factors. This study found that isolation, inadequacy, and anxiety were risk factors that promoted educators' stress, and suggestions for Professional Learning Communities (PLC's), mindfulness training, coping strategies, improved teacher preparation programs, and professional development opportunities mixed with other protective factors could help to combat these risk factors and keep teachers in the profession (Prillenltensky et al., 2016).

Hong (2012) suggested that the level of resilience may also pertain to what the educator perceives as the root cause of the problem. If an educator feels that their difficulties arise from external or organizational elements (such as school policies or working conditions) that are beyond their control, they are less likely to make an effort to be persistent. On the other hand, if the challenges are perceived by the educator to be failures that are within their control (effort, choices, etc.), they are more likely to be resilient and utilize coping strategies to adjust the controllable factors in the future (Hong, 2012, p. 421).

Hong's (2012) research shows us that "…teachers who have a stronger sense of efficacy perceive difficulties as challenges rather than threats, and thus invest their effort in the face of adversities and direct their efforts into resolving problems. Whereas those who have a low sense of efficacy believe there is little they can do to change the problems they perceive, and thus put forth less effort and do not strongly persevere when difficulties arise" (p. 420). It is important for educators to remember that much of the stress they encounter is within their control to manage using skills they already possess.

Motivational Factors

Teachers have many factors, both contextual and personal, that impact their motivation for work. Empirical research by Eyal and Roth (2011) examined the differences between autonomous motivation versus controlled motivation in teachers and how that motivation affects their stress levels as employees. Their findings revealed that "autonomous motivation was negatively related to teachers' self-reported burnout and positively related teachers' sense of self-actualization at work, whereas the reverse was true for teachers'-controlled motivation" (Eyal & Roth, 2011, p. 262). Additionally, they found that teachers' autonomous motivation to teaching predicted students' autonomous motivation to learning. The study also examined motivation through the lens of the self-determination theory which linked autonomous motivation and personal accomplishment. This autonomous motivation was found to be much more positive when compared to controlled motivation that was positively correlated to negativity and stress. Hence, being autonomously motivated not only leads to an individual's increased efforts but also to increased energy and excitement, while counteracting feelings of exhaustion, burnout, and frustration.

Similar research by Parker et al. (2012) studied motivation through the lens of the self-worth theory and goal theory, tying in some of the elements discussed by researchers regarding self-efficacy and resilience. Their research found that the self-worth theory suggests that a driving force for individuals in education is the need to maintain and desire to promote self-worth (Parker et al., 2012, p. 504). Because education is an achievement domain, it can be a space where self-worth is evaluated, maintained, enhanced, and threatened. The study further noted that "teacher perceptions are in an ongoing state of vulnerability. This vulnerability is in part due to the social, moral, and professional realities of teaching and also due to the social,

moral, and professional realities of teaching and also the societal expectations of what a 'good' teacher should be" (Parker et al., 2012, p. 504). Given this information, it is no surprise that teachers place a lot of stake into their self-worth and the positive or negative way that self-worth is perceived by one or others could be a basis for motivation (or lack thereof).

Effects of Professional and Personal Stressors on Education Employees

Teachers often experience stress in their work. When stress becomes an overbearing presence in a teacher's life, it can lead to feelings of burnout and it is estimated that five to twenty percent of all teachers reach a level of burnout (Parker et al., 2012, p. 503). The construct of burnout has been a centralized focus for research in recent years and involves the compounded effects of stress over time. "The term burnout was first coined by Freudenberguer in 1974 to describe the demotivation and emotional exhaustion he witnessed in volunteers working at a health clinic" (Aloe et al., 2014, p.30). In his work he witnessed physical and psychological symptoms such as headaches, nausea, sleeplessness, and irritability or frustration. Burnout is a multidimensional construct that is comprised of the three following components: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. Aloe et al. (2014) expound upon these concepts with specific, definitive indicators:

- *Emotional Exhaustion* refers to a worker not having the emotional resources to give of Oneself psychologically and is often the component that is considered the primary Element of burnout.
- *Depersonalization* refers to the cynical feelings a worker exhibits toward his or her clients.
- *Personal Accomplishment* denotes a worker's feelings of dissatisfaction about his or her achievements in the workplace.

While burnout has been found to be present in many human service professions, the research on burnout in education is vast and of particular interest to teachers. The work they are doing on a day-to-day basis is consistently a challenge that causes them stress and can advance to the level of burnout.

Methods for addressing or alleviating teacher stress

Methods for attending to and correcting the challenges of teacher stress most commonly center around recommendations to address the contextual factors within the building. Stauffer and Mason (2013) share that "policy makers need to use comprehensive measures to address the teachers' needs and concerns in order to keep them in the teaching profession" (p. 826). They further state that leaders must acknowledge that stress in teachers and staff is part of the overall school climate, then address the matter at a school-wide level. Many studies have suggested various ways in which to do this. How one's demeanor and emotions frame these conversations may be equally as important as what content is shared. Just as the old saying reminds us that "it's not what you say, it's how you say it," Stauffer and Mason (2013) suggest "that this may be done through shared leadership structures that give teachers more ownership in school governance and by providing social and professional support for teachers" (p. 812). Addressing challenges teachers are facing at this contextual/systematic level will often have trickle down effects for improving productivity, morale, and overall school climate. Some suggestions for success with this by category are as follows:

Political and Educational Structures

Often, political and educational structures are organized and trickled down to schools from the state level and district office putting them out of the control of local school administration, but there are some things involving local decisions within the building that

school leaders can guide and influence to help alleviate stress for the teachers and staff in the building. Stauffer and Mason (2013) point specifically to three components that may be most effective in achieving this: incorporating a shared decision-making process, preparing for and addressing curricular changes, and making efficient and meaningful use of teachers' time. In each of these three, most of the specifics of the strategy involve two things- autonomy and communication. Things like flexibility in choosing committees, gathering insight from teachers when making decisions, communication that includes reasoning and rationale for changes in curriculum, and allowing the educators a say so when planning for meetings during their planning or off contract time (while also respecting the parameters of that time when the meeting(s) does take place) are all strategies that can be effective with reducing stress within the educational structure.

Instructional Factors

The identified instructional factors of workload and responsibilities, time for teachers to accomplish tasks, and curriculum concerns were cited as instructional factors that were a source of stress for educators. Given this, some suggestions for administrators to consider when planning to alleviate the stress were to protect planning time for teachers and provide professional development on topics as requested (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 828). These may include time for collective planning with colleagues, using creative strategies to maximize time in the master schedule, and scheduling professional development sessions around topic of concern and stress for teachers.

School Climate

Themes centered around relationships emerge from the data regarding school climate. Specifically, Stauffer and Mason (2013) found "role misapprehension and negativity among

colleagues to be predominant" (p. 829). As the building's direction setters, school climate is one area that administrators have a great deal of influence over within their building, so the suggestions for addressing these challenges are well within their realm of control and responsibilities. Some of Stauffer and Mason's (2013) suggestions for this include acknowledging teachers' stress and the role it plays in their work, actively listening and being attentive to their concerns, and recognizing teachers' efforts both large and small (p. 829). These efforts can be achieved through things like coordinated programs such as mental health supports to help address needs, listening attentively to concerns brought by staff through eye contact and a distraction free environment, and giving positive reinforcement to educators for a job well done (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 830). Recognition of teachers and simply offering a safe space for them to be heard can be simple and low-cost tasks but will often build trust and lower stress simply because they feel that they belong and are valued.

Student Factors

As research showed, student behaviors and performance were of great stress to teachers. Administrators can help to relieve this stress by utilizing their internal staff and external resources. These may include, but are not limited to, offering the assistance of student support teams and RtI programs and suggesting consultations with school counselors in an effort to help students (Stauffer & Mason, 2013, p. 831). Reminding teachers of these supports being in place and how to make the most of the resources available to them may be helpful in alleviating their stress.

Parent and Family Factors

Parent and Family factors can be especially challenging because they aren't solely things that are within the school's or staff's control, and often they can't be addressed and corrected

within the building or parameters of the school day. Stauffer and Mason (2013) suggest soliciting internal support of the school to navigate these complex issues and relationships. Suggestions for this may include consulting with school counselors and other professionals on how to build and foster parent relationships and/or referring teachers to additional resources that they can offer as support for their students' families. By working to meet families' needs, teachers and administrators' stress may be reduced.

Personal Factors

Although individuals vary in what will motivate or encourage them, motivation and encouragement seem to be a centralized strategy for helping teachers with the personal factors they face that cause them stress. For example, Hong's (2012) research found several strategies and practices that can be helpful. First, meaningful mentoring where positive affirmations and supports are in place is important. These relationships may include but are not limited to affirmation of identity development through positive emotional exchanges, effective organization of personal and professional resources, and supportive networking. Each of these will help to build teachers up and encourage them personally, which will in turn help to increase their positive feelings about themselves and their abilities and help them to grow professionally. Secondly, verbal persuasion that includes colleagues or school administrators building the employees up and giving encouraging feedback is extremely helpful in combatting negative personal factors. This can be done both formally and/or informally, but recognizing their efforts and achievements can go a long way in building their self-efficacy (Hong, 2012, p. 433). Similarly, a related study found that "emotions play a significant role in the way teachers respond to challenging circumstances, noting that positive emotions such as joy, satisfaction, and interest can function to promote proactive efforts to deal with stressful situations and help

teachers build supportive interpersonal relationships, which may in turn contribute in developing better coping strategies in the face of challenging circumstances" (Deater-Deckard et al., 2006, p. 54). This information aligns exactly with what the stayers in Hong's (2012) study shared. Despite all of the connections to emotional experiences and emotions relating to teachers' feelings of stress and self-efficacy, none of the teachers in Hong's study shared that they'd received any training related to handling emotional situations or recovering from emotional trauma (Hong, 2012, p. 434). Therefore, professional development or training sessions centered around how to handle emotions in the classroom or how to best handle emotionally charged situations may be helpful in assisting education professionals with coping when challenges arise. Over time, these practices may become habit for them and help them to be happier and more successful in their careers.

Conceptual Framework

March and Simon's dissatisfaction model is the guiding framework used in this work. Essentially this classic theory work suggests that individuals leave a particular job, career, or workplace when multiple challenges are in place, and the calculated drawbacks or negative elements of the work outweigh the benefits (Bowen & Siehl, 1997, p. 57). In addition to Bowen and Siehl's (1997) review of March and Simon's foundational model, another group of researchers communicated the theory's validity through their work in 2016, as well. In this, Hom et al. (2017) share the details of March and Simon's inaugural study and how their assertions took the topic of turnover and looked at it through a new lens which painted it to be a much more complex construct than an individual just deciding to quit. Through this model, researchers argue that there is a process involved in which dissatisfaction evolves into turnover over time through a linear sequence. "Dissatisfaction- thoughts of quitting- evaluation of subjective expected utility

(SEU) of job search and costs of quitting- search intentions- evaluation of alternatives- comparison of alternatives and present job- quit intentions- quits" (Hom et al., 2017, p. 533).

High levels of workplace stress have clearly shown to link to March and Simon's first stage of dissatisfaction and thoughts of quitting (Hom et al., 2017), which has subsequently shown to be one of the primary drivers of teacher exit intentions (Fernet, et al., 2012; Hong, 2012). However, as noted above, less research has focused on the latter stages of March and Simon's (1958) model. Given that subjective expected utility is a balance of dissatisfaction and satisfaction, research focusing on interventions to either reduce stress and dissatisfaction or to improve satisfying workplace conditions has the potential to balance the equation to lower towards lower levels of stress and improved retention. Given the paucity of such research in the face of a growing teacher shortage in Alabama and problematic high stress for teachers and students, this study aims to address this gap in literature.

Chapter III: Methods

Stress among education employees is a cause of grave concern leading to the alarming teacher attrition rates of today. The purpose of this study was to identify sources of stress for education employees and look at ways we can address these stress factors in a way that will not only be beneficial to the education employees, but to the students and the district as well.

Need for Research

As seen in Chapter Two's literature review, there is considerable existing research that looks at teacher stress and analyzes the source of that stress, however, there is little to no research that takes that information a step further and investigates specific implications of how the stress manifests itself in our area and how it may be linked to additional actions employees take. Specifically, this research looked to address the following gaps that currently exist:

- How does stress impact employees in Central Alabama?
- How does the stress Alabama's education employees face vary by demographics?
- How is stress experienced by employees connected or not connected to their intentions to exit the workplace or profession?
- How does stress manifest itself in Alabama's educators?
- What solutions to stress are evidenced by Alabama's educators or what could be implemented to alleviate some stress for them?

Research Questions

As evidenced by the research in Chapter Two, teacher stress stems from a myriad of sources and can vary between individuals. The need to determine and focus on these sources and how they can be best addressed is what will drive the research. Teachers generally experience stress in the workplace due to factors within the organization itself but can also experience stress

due to personal characteristics as well. This research sought to determine if these factors do in fact ring true with those in Alabama, or if there are other areas that are a source of stress for our teachers. Additionally, we took our research a step further to determine possible strategies for addressing the stress teachers face and how this work can offer practical implications for school leaders. Both steps aligned with the conceptual framework centered around March and Simon as well as the validated constructs developed by Fimian. Research filled the gaps that currently exist in the research we have. Specifically, the research questions we will explore and seek to answer are as follows:

1. What are the most pressing triggers for teacher stress, and do they differ by demographic and positional characteristics?
2. Do stress factors lead individuals to consider leaving their workplace or the profession, and do these intentions differ by demographic and positional characteristics?
3. How does workplace stress manifest itself among educators and do these reactions differ by demographic and positional characteristics?
4. What actions can be taken to help individuals cope with or alleviate stress and do these techniques differ by demographic and positional characteristics?

Each of these research questions serves as an indicator that addresses a gap in the current research available. When aligned with the gaps outlined previously, the first question closes the gap between how stress impacts teachers in central Alabama, and how the stress Alabama's teachers face vary by demographics. Similarly, the second question finds how stress experienced by employees is connected or not connected to their intentions to exit the workplace, and the fourth question looks to discover what solutions to stress are evidenced in Alabama's educators or could be implemented to alleviate some stress for them.

Method

The study utilized a survey developed through Auburn Qualtrics for data collection and data was analyzed using Jamovi. Descriptive Statistics (means, standard deviations) were used to collect demographic data, with independent samples t-tests were used to make comparisons across categories. Initial descriptive statistics were collected for each category and question, then question responses were crossed-identified with each of the demographic categories as well in order to note trends or significant outliers.

Participants

Study participants were comprised of current, in-service education professionals in central Alabama. These participants were gathered from the school districts in and around central Alabama. Many participants were teachers, but also included additional certified personnel such as administrators, librarians, counselors, instructional coaches, and others. Participants had a wide range of backgrounds, grade levels, ethnicities, geographic locations, and years of experience.

Data Sources

The source of data collection was a Qualtrics survey developed through Auburn University. There were five sections of the survey:

- Demographic Information
- Sources of Workplace Stress
- Likelihood of Leaving the Profession due to stress factors
- How stress manifests itself in educators
- How workplace stress can be coped with and/or alleviated.

Section one that collects demographic information was outlined in a format of selecting answers from a drop-down menu of options. Sections two, three, four, and five were presented in the form of a Likert-Type scale where participants gauged their sources of stress in the form of a scale where they indicated the level of their frequency or agreement with the indicator. In section two, the participants rated how each of the stressors listed affects them as a professional when it came to that indicator being a source for stress for them. Indicators for respondents were based on Michael Fimian's Teacher Stress Inventory (TSI), which is a validated and reliable construct for measuring stress (Fimian, 1988), and we validated our study's reliability through the Cronbach's Alpha measure. The TSI is a widely used inventory as is designed for full time K-12 educators. The 49-item assessment serves as an indicator of not only physiological and behavioral stress, but also other contextual and environmental areas, and was chosen because of its alignment to our current research that shows stress developing from both individual or personal factors as well as factors within the organization itself. Fimian's (1988) document outlining the construct specifically notes that "it is apparent in the literature that teacher stress is not attributable to a single source" (p. 2) which aligned with our framework outlined through March and Simon's (1958) work. The assessment is divided into 10 sections- 5 that identify sources or factors of stress (time management, work-related stressors, professional distress, discipline and motivation, professional investment) and 5 that identify the manifestations of stress (emotional, fatigue, cardiovascular, gastronomical, behavioral) (Fimian, 1988). Before the development of the Teacher Stress Inventory, the phenomenon of teacher stress was difficult to access as it was equated with burnout. Therefore, in an attempt to specifically assess "different stress experiences" that are particular to the teaching profession, the Teacher Stress Inventory was developed in 1984. The TSI first developed norms with a sample size of 3,447 public

education employees across eight states. Since that time, it has been widely used in North America over the last 35+ years and has been used and validated in Greece, Nigeria, South Africa, and other locations around the world. The assessment uses a 5 point scale, as each indicator allows respondents to select from one of five levels of agreement with the indicator. The higher the score, the greater the level of agreement with the statement. A lower score indicates a less favorable agreement with the indicator.

In section three, the participants responded to only a couple of questions by sharing if one or more of the indicators in Section two have led them to consider leaving their current workplace or profession, following in line with March and Simon's dissatisfaction model to establish which stress triggers create the level of dissatisfaction that outweighs the utility of their current position. Section four allowed participants to use the same Likert scale to indicate the frequency by which stress causes a variety of reactions to manifest themselves in their lives. These indicators are adapted following Fimian's (1988) construct as well. Section five allowed participants to indicate their methods for coping with stress and/or ideas for how it can be alleviated. Options for teacher responses on coping mechanisms were drawn from a thorough review of the literature. Participants will share their level of agreement or disagreement with each of the indicators. Below, an overview of the survey is provided.

Survey

Section 1: Demographic Information

- Gender
- Age
- Race/Ethnicity
- Primary role in district (regular classroom, special ed, counselor, librarian, etc.)

- School system (urban, rural, suburban)
- School Setting (elementary, middle, high, K-12)
- Years of experience in education

Section 2: Stress Indicators (adapted from Fimian, 1988)

Factors that lead me to stress at work include:

Table 1

Stress Indicator Survey Items

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
Work Related Stress:					
Little time to prepare	5	4	3	2	1
Personal priorities being shortchanged	5	4	3	2	1
Too much work to do	5	4	3	2	1
Caseload/Class is too large	5	4	3	2	1
School day pace is too fast	5	4	3	2	1
Too much paperwork	5	4	3	2	1
Professional Distress:					
Lack of promotion or advancement opportunities	5	4	3	2	1
Not progressing rapidly in job	5	4	3	2	1
Need more status and respect	5	4	3	2	1
Lack of recognition	5	4	3	2	1
Receiving an inadequate salary/benefit	5	4	3	2	1
Lack of support from administration					
Professional Investment:					
Personal opinions not sufficiently aired	5	4	3	2	1
Lack of control over decisions	5	4	3	2	1
Not emotionally/intellectually stimulated	5	4	3	2	1
Lack of opportunities for improvement	5	4	3	2	1
Discipline and Motivation:					
Having to monitor pupil behavior	5	4	3	2	1

Discipline problems in my classroom	5	4	3	2	1
Teaching students who are poorly motivated	5	4	3	2	1
Students who would do better if they would try harder	5	4	3	2	1
Inadequate or poorly designed discipline practices	5	4	3	2	1
Authority rejected or challenged by pupils/administrators	5	4	3	2	1
Time Management:					
Not enough time to get things done	5	4	3	2	1
Multi-task/ Do more than one thing at a time	5	4	3	2	1
Become impatient	5	4	3	2	1
Have little time to relax	5	4	3	2	1
Easily overcommit myself	5	4	3	2	1
Think about unrelated matters	5	4	3	2	1
Feel uncomfortable wasting time	5	4	3	2	1

Section 3: Attrition/Turnover Intentions

One or more of the indicators above cause or have caused me to consider leaving my current workplace	5	4	3	2	1
One or more of the indicators above cause or have caused me to consider leaving the education profession.	5	4	3	2	1

Section 4: Manifestation of stress (adapted from Fimian, 1988)

My stress at work manifests itself through:

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
Emotional Manifestations:					
Feeling insecure	5	4	3	2	1
Feeling unable to cope	5	4	3	2	1
Feeling vulnerable	5	4	3	2	1
Feeling depressed	5	4	3	2	1
Feeling anxious	5	4	3	2	1

Feeling angry	5	4	3	2	1
<u>Behavioral Manifestations:</u>					
Calling in sick	5	4	3	2	1
Using prescription drugs	5	4	3	2	1
Using over the counter drugs	5	4	3	2	1
Using alcohol	5	4	3	2	1
Shutting down/not wanting to do anything	5	4	3	2	1
<u>Cardiovascular Manifestations:</u>					
Rapid/shallow breath	5	4	3	2	1
Feelings of increased blood pressure	5	4	3	2	1
Feelings of heart pounding/racing	5	4	3	2	1
<u>Gastronomic Manifestations:</u>					
Stomach pain of extended duration	5	4	3	2	1
Stomach cramps	5	4	3	2	1
Stomach acid	5	4	3	2	1
<u>Fatigue Manifestations:</u>					
Physical exhaustion	5	4	3	2	1
Physical weakness	5	4	3	2	1
Becoming fatigued in short time	5	4	3	2	1
Sleeping more than usual	5	4	3	2	1
Procrastinating	5	4	3	2	1

<u>Section 5: Coping with and alleviating stress in the workplace (adapted from Fimian, 1988)</u>

I feel that stress can be alleviated by:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Providing additional supports and resources in the classroom	5	4	3	2	1
Making curriculum changes	5	4	3	2	1
Making effective use of teachers' time/ protecting planning time	5	4	3	2	1
Increasing teachers' flexibility	5	4	3	2	1
Having administrators listen to concerns and offer solutions	5	4	3	2	1
Utilizing recognition programs and positive reinforcement	5	4	3	2	1
Increasing availability of personal and professional resources	5	4	3	2	1

Training on how to cope with stress and handle emotional situations	5	4	3	2	1
Practicing yoga or exercise programs	5	4	3	2	1

Data Collection

Study participants were primarily determined via the individual school districts' employee database. These central Alabama school districts were selected based upon their varying geographics and demographics. All invitations for participation were emailed out to individuals via the central office staff and/or principals in the building. This served as our primary source of recruitment, and I was able to obtain access to individuals' email addresses by working with the local district superintendents. Each of them granted us access to their employees and approved their participation. No financial incentives were offered for the study. Invitations for survey participation were sent to individuals' personal and work email addresses in the middle of Fall 2022. The survey was available for completion for approximately 6 weeks. Follow-up emails were prepared for distribution to invited participants at weeks 2, 4, and 6 with reminders for them to complete the survey if they have not already done so, but these were not sent due to the high participation rates.

Data Analysis

Survey data was analyzed using the JAMOVI software. Statistical significance within descriptive statistics and correlations based upon pre-assigned values for each indicator's response options based on independent two-tailed t-tests. Additionally, the stress indicators (Section 2) were cross referenced with the demographic information collected (Section 1) to identify trends and correlations.

Table 2

Research Questions, Data Sources, and Analysis

Research Question	Data Source	Data Analysis
What are the most pressing triggers for teacher stress, and do they differ by demographic and positional characteristics?	Auburn Qualtrics Survey	Means, Standard Deviations, Independent Samples t-tests
Do stress factors lead individuals to consider leaving their workplace or the profession, and do these intentions differ by demographic and positional characteristics?	Auburn Qualtrics Survey	Means, Standard Deviations, Independent Samples t-tests
How does workplace stress manifest itself among educators and do these reactions differ by demographic and positional characteristics?	Auburn Qualtrics Survey	Means, Standard Deviations, Independent Samples t-tests
What actions can be taken to help individuals cope with or alleviate stress and do these techniques differ by demographic and positional characteristics?	Auburn Qualtrics Survey	Means, Standard Deviations, Independent Samples t-tests

Ethical Considerations

I secured the approval of the Institutional Review Board and shared that approval with the participants and education leaders assisting me in an effort to promote transparency and authenticity. All participants were presented with information regarding what their participation will mean and all details pertaining thereto were shared ahead of them agreeing to participate, including how their responses will be kept anonymous and secure. Although questioning gathered some geographic and demographic details, anonymity was secured. All results will be used for the purposes of this study and not for any other purpose.

Assumptions

Some assumptions related to this study may include:

1. Respondents are able to identify their own workplace stress.

2. Respondents are able to identify their levels of stress and determine which factors affect them the most.
3. Respondents will be honest, open, and truthful in their responses.

Limitations

1. The sample research population is limited to the state of Alabama, so the responses may or may not align with those in other areas of the country or the world.
2. May get more responses from one geographic region or demographic group than another due to inability to control for who will or will not complete the survey.
3. All responses are self-reported and, therefore, may not accurately reflect respondents' levels of stress.
4. Due to using a survey as the method for data collection, respondents may not be able to openly share their opinions or give additional details they may wish to share. Also, if the answer they wish to choose as a response to the question isn't available as an option, the results may not be a true reflection of the participant's feelings.
5. Surveys are only distributed vis email and may eliminate those who do not check email or use technology regularly.
6. Environmental conditions in which respondents complete surveys may affect results.
7. Conducting the research study in the spring may be challenging and response rates may be lower due to it being a busy time of the school year for teachers.
8. Teachers may be apprehensive to respond to the survey on their work email addresses or devices for fear of compromising their anonymity.

Chapter IV: Results

This chapter details the results and findings from the survey. As outlined in previous chapters, the purpose of this study was to identify sources of stress for education employees and look at ways we can address these stress factors in a way that will not only be beneficial to the teachers and administrators, but to the students and the district as well. The research questions we sought to answer are as follows:

1. What are the most pressing triggers for teacher stress, and do they differ by demographic and positional characteristics?
2. Do stress factors lead individuals to consider leaving their workplace or the profession, and do these intentions differ by demographic and positional characteristics?
3. How does workplace stress manifest itself among educators and do these reactions differ by demographic and positional characteristics?
4. What actions can be taken to help individuals cope with or alleviate stress and do these techniques differ by demographic and positional characteristics?

Data Collection

The data collection instrument used in this study was a survey developed through Auburn's Qualtrics. The survey was distributed via email to approximately 2,900 certified employees across central Alabama. A link for the survey was sent to superintendents in Autauga County Schools, Elmore County Schools, Chilton County Schools, Coosa County Schools, Montgomery County Schools, Pike Road City Schools, and Tallassee City Schools. From there, the district leaders forwarded it on to their certified staffs as an "all users" email. The one exception to this was Montgomery County. The Montgomery County school district sent it to their principals and asked them to distribute it to the certified staff members in their buildings.

Surveys were distributed beginning on October 6, 2022, and responses were received between October 6, 2022, and November 23, 2022. Responses were received from 773 individuals and 612 completed all questions, equating to a response rate of 21.1%. 612 individuals completed all questions, giving a response rate of 21.1%.

Reliability

Data for each scale and subscale were used to determine reliability. An acceptable level of reliability was reached, and the results of this are exhibited through the Cronbach's alpha scores outlined in Table 3. This study also demonstrated appropriate post-hoc power for an independent samples t-test, assuming an alpha level of 0.05. Following two prior studies validating the TSI (Boshoff et al., 2018; Kourmousi et al., 2015) had respective scale means of 3.5 (SD 0.77) and 2.5 (SD 0.62). This study had a total scale mean of 3.88 (SD 0.47) and demonstrated 100% power using G*Power 3.1 with 612 subjects and alpha set at 0.05 (Faul et al., 2007).

Table 3

Chronbach's Alpha Scale Reliability

Workplace: Average interitem covariance: .64 Scale reliability coefficient (α): 0.86	*Profession*: Average interitem covariance: .86 Scale reliability coefficient (α): 0.86
Discipline: Average interitem covariance: .86 Scale reliability coefficient (α): 0.90	*Time:* Average interitem covariance: .62 Scale reliability coefficient (α): 0.87

Demographic Characteristics

The JAMOVI software program (Version 2.3.18) was used to analyze the data. Of all responses received where the participant indicated gender, 84.9% came from females and 13.5%

were from males. The remaining 1.7% were comprised of 1.5% that preferred not to say and 0.1% who registered as non-binary.

Table 4

Frequencies of Gender

Gender	Counts	% of Total	Cumulative %
Female	622	84.9 %	84.9 %
Male	99	13.5 %	98.4 %
Non-binary	1	0.1 %	98.5 %
Prefer not to say	11	1.5 %	100.0 %

Out of all responses received where participants indicated their race/ethnicity, 84.3% of respondents were Caucasian or white, 12.3% were African American, 1.2% were Hispanic or Latino, 0.1% were Asian, and the remaining 2.0% were of a different racial group than those listed. This demographic breakdown is somewhat different from the total population sample, where approximately 77% of the sample's certified employees are Caucasian or White and 20% are African American.

Table 5

Frequencies of Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Counts	% of Total	Cumulative %
African American	90	12.3 %	12.3 %
Asian	1	0.1 %	12.4 %
Caucasian/ White	617	84.3 %	96.7 %
Hispanic/Latino	9	1.2 %	98.0 %
Other	15	2.0 %	100.0 %

Out of the respondents who indicated their age, results were as follows: 30.7% were between the ages of 36-45, and 29.2% were between the ages of 46-55. Another 21.4% were between the ages of 26-35 and 12.8% between 56-65. 4.5% were in the 18-25 age range, and 1.4% were over the age of 65.

Table 6

Frequencies of Age Range

Age Range	Counts	% of Total	Cumulative %
18-25	33	4.5 %	4.5 %
26-35	157	21.4 %	25.9 %
36-45	225	30.7 %	56.6 %
46-55	214	29.2 %	85.8 %
56-65	94	12.8 %	98.6 %
65+	10	1.4 %	100.0 %

The respondents served the school district in a variety of roles. Of the respondents who indicated their role within the school setting, 57.4% were general education classroom teachers, 9.8% were special education teachers, 4.8% were administrators, 4.6% were intervention teachers or instructional coaches, 2.7% were librarians, 2.6% were counselors, and 2.3% were coaches or athletic directors. The remaining 15.7% serve in some other capacity within the school district.

Table 7

Frequencies of Role in District

Role in District	Counts	% of Total	Cumulative %
Administrator	35	4.8 %	4.8 %
Coach or Athletic Director	17	2.3 %	7.1 %

Role in District	Counts	% of Total	Cumulative %
Counselor	19	2.6 %	9.7 %
General Education Classroom Teacher	420	57.4 %	67.1 %
Intervention Teacher/ Instructional Coach	34	4.6 %	71.7 %
Librarian	20	2.7 %	74.5 %
Other	115	15.7 %	90.2 %
Special Education Teacher	72	9.8 %	100.0 %

Out of respondents who reported the geographic area of their school, 43.5% of participants work in rural schools or districts, 40.3% serve in suburban areas, and 16.2% work in urban locations.

Table 8

Frequencies of Geographic Area

Geographic Area	Counts	% of Total	Cumulative %
Rural	311	43.5 %	43.5 %
Suburban	288	40.3 %	83.8 %
Urban	116	16.2 %	100.0 %

Participants worked in a variety of school building settings. As seen in Table 9, 42.8% work in elementary schools, 19.9% work in high schools, 19.4% work in middle or junior high schools, 9.8% work in a K-12 school, 2.2% work in an alternative school, 0.8% in a career or technical school, and the remaining 5.1% work in some other setting within the district.

Table 9

Frequencies of School Grade Level

School Grade Level	Counts	% of Total	Cumulative %
Alternative School	16	2.2 %	2.2 %
Career/Technical School	6	0.8 %	3.0 %
Elementary (serves any or all grades between K-5)	311	42.8 %	45.8 %
High (serves any or all grades between 9-12)	145	19.9 %	65.7 %
K-12 (serves all grades from K-12)	71	9.8 %	75.5 %
Middle/ Junior High (serves any or all grades between 6-8)	141	19.4 %	94.9 %
Other	37	5.1 %	100.0 %

Table 10

Frequencies of Years of Experience

Years of Experience	Counts	% of Total	Cumulative %
0-3 Years	90	12.3 %	12.3 %
10-12 Years	68	9.3 %	21.6 %
13-15 Years	64	8.7 %	30.3 %
16-18 Years	81	11.1 %	41.3 %
19-21 Years	69	9.4 %	50.8 %
22-24 Years	78	10.6 %	61.4 %
25 Years or more	109	14.9 %	76.3 %
4-6 Years	97	13.2 %	89.5 %
7-9 Years	77	10.5 %	100.0 %

As seen in Table 10, respondents indicated a variety of years of experience in education. 14.9% have 25 years or more, 13.2% have worked between 4-6 years, 12.3% have between 0-3 years, 11.1% have served between 16-18 years, 10.6% between 22-24 years, and 10.5% between

7-9 years. 9.4% have between 19-21 years in education, 9.3% have served between 10-12 years, and 8.7% have worked between 13-15 years. This population or respondents represents a diverse sampling and is closely aligned with the population percentages of professional employees across the state.

Research Question #1

"What are the most pressing triggers for teacher stress, and do they differ by demographic and positional characteristics?" Participants were asked to consider factors of stress and indicate the level at which that component of their work affected them. The results are as follows:

Table 11

Stress Indicator Proportions (n=...)

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
Too little time to prepare	32.2%	32.7%	25.5%	7.4%	2.2%
Personal priorities being shortchanged	31.2 %	29.5%	24.6%	11.6%	3.1%
Too much work to do	42.8 %	31.2%	18.5%	5.0%	2.6%
Caseload/ Class size too large	38.5 %	24.4%	21.8%	11.2%	4.2%
School Day too Fast Paced	20.8 %	22.8%	28.3%	19.9%	8.2%
Too much paperwork	51.6 %	22.1%	18.8%	5.4%	2.1%
Lack of Promotion or Advancement Opportunity	17.4 %	16.1%	25.7%	24.1%	16.7%
Not progressing rapidly in job	10.7 %	12.2%	24.2%	32.5%	20.5%
Need more status and/or respect	20.6 %	20.9%	22.8%	19.7%	16.0%
Lack of recognition	22.1 %	19.9%	26.0%	18.7%	13.2%
Inadequate salary and/or benefits	47.0 %	23.6%	17.0%	8.5%	3.9%
Lack of support from supervisors	21.9 %	15.0%	27.7%	23.0%	12.4%

Personal opinions not sufficiently aired	15.6 %	23.1%	29.6%	23.6%	8.1%
Lack of control over decisions	26.5 %	25.4%	28.3%	13.2%	6.7%
Not emotionally or intellectually stimulated	9.1 %	10.6%	28.5%	34.6%	17.1%
Lack of opportunities for improvement	15.4 %	14.6%	27.6%	30.0%	12.3%
Having to monitor pupil behavior	30.2 %	27.6%	23.7%	14.0%	4.5%
Discipline problems in my classroom	24.5 %	25.0%	24.1%	18.6%	7.8%
Working with students who are poorly motivated	37.1 %	27.2%	21.3%	10.4%	4.1%
Students who would do better if they tried harder	34.0 %	29.9%	22.5%	9.0%	4.6%
Inadequate or poorly designed discipline practices	24.2 %	21.8%	28.0%	19.8%	6.2%
Authority rejected or challenged by students and/or supervisors	24.8 %	23.5%	24.2%	18.8%	8.7%
Not enough time to get things done	47.3 %	25.7%	17.0%	7.4%	2.6%
Multi-tasking/ doing more than one thing at a time	50.6 %	26.6%	12.4%	8.1%	2.3%
Become impatient	16.8 %	25.5%	33.4%	18.7%	5.6%
Having little time to relax	40.8 %	26.9%	20.6%	9.0%	2.6%
Easily overcommit myself	28.0 %	26.5%	29.3%	13.1%	3.1%
Think about unrelated matters	13.5 %	20.7%	33.1%	25.6%	7.1%
Feel uncomfortable wasting time	26.7 %	22.6%	23.9%	19.7%	7.1%

As seen in these results, the most pressing factors that caused stress among were (1) multi-tasking/ having to do more than one thing at a time (77.3% of respondents indicating this is frequently or very frequently a problem), (2) too much work to do (74.0% of respondents indicating this is frequently or very frequently a problem), (3) too much paperwork (73.7% of respondents indicating this is frequently or very frequently a problem), (4) not enough time to get

things done (73.0% of respondents indicating this is frequently or very frequently a problem), and (5) inadequate salary and/or benefits (70.6% of respondents indicating this is frequently or very frequently a problem)

These results were comprised of all respondents. After this overall review, each of the stress factors was cross referenced individually with each of the demographic categories. Additionally, responses were coded into numerical values where a value of 5 correlated with the response "Very Frequently" and a value of 1 correlated with the response "Never." Using these values, means were calculated for each of the stress indicators overall and for each of the individual demographic categories. Higher means indicate that respondents reported the factor to be a greater source of problem or stress for them and the lower means indicate the factor was not as great of a source of their stress in the workplace. Standard deviations for each stress factor were also recorded and evaluated, and they are reflected as well. Results of all educators as compared to gender, race/ethnicity, school level, locale, role in district, and years of experience are displayed in the tables that follow.

Table 12

Survey Results by All Educators and Gender

				Gender/Sex			
	All Educators			Male		Female	
	Mean	*SD*		Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Too Little Time to Prepare	3.85	*1.03*		3.3	*1.17*	3.94	*0.98*
Personal Priorities being shortchanged	3.74	*1.11*		3.43	*1.16*	3.79	*1.1*
Too much work to do	4.07	*1.02*		3.62	*1.21*	4.14	*0.97*
Caseload/ Class size too large	3.82	*1.18*		3.45	*1.29*	3.88	*1.15*
School day too fast paced	3.28	*1.23*		2.66	*1.15*	3.38	*1.21*
Too much paperwork	4.16	*1.04*		3.8	*1.15*	4.22	*1.01*
Lack of Promotion or Advancement Opportunities	2.93	*1.33*		2.78	*1.43*	2.95	*1.31*
Not progressing rapidly in job	2.6	*1.24*		2.65	*1.37*	2.59	*1.21*
Need more status and/or respect	3.1	*1.36*		2.8	*1.56*	3.15	*1.32*
Lack of recognition	3.19	*1.33*		2.84	*1.47*	3.25	*1.3*
Inadequate salary and/or benefits	4.01	*1.15*		3.64	*1.35*	4.08	*1.11*
Lack of support from supervisors	3.11	*1.32*		2.95	*1.53*	3.13	*1.29*
Personal opinions not sufficiently aired	3.14	*1.18*		2.88	*1.36*	3.18	*1.14*
Lack of control over decisions	3.52	*1.2*		3.2	*1.33*	3.56	*1.17*
Not emotionally or intellectually stimulated	2.6	*1.16*		2.58	*1.22*	2.6	*1.14*
Lack of opportunities for improvement	2.81	*1.22*		2.67	*1.28*	2.82	*1.21*
Having to monitor pupil behavior	3.65	*1.18*		3.23	*1.25*	3.71	*1.15*
Discipline problems in my classroom	3.4	*1.25*		2.93	*1.25*	3.46	*1.24*
Working with students who are poorly motivated	3.83	*1.16*		3.69	*1.19*	3.84	*1.16*
Students who would do better if they tried harder	3.8	*1.14*		3.58	*1.14*	3.83	*1.14*
Inadequate or poorly designed discipline practices	3.38	*1.22*		2.98	*1.22*	3.44	*1.2*
Authority rejected or challenged by students and/or supervisors	3.37	*1.28*		3.06	*1.28*	3.42	*1.27*
Not enough time to get things done	4.08	*1.08*		3.45	*1.23*	4.18	*1.02*
Multi-tasking/doing more than one thing at a time	4.15	*1.07*		3.58	*1.29*	4.25	*0.99*
Become impatient	3.29	*1.12*		2.96	*1.13*	3.34	*1.11*
Have little time to relax	3.94	*1.1*		3.53	*1.19*	4	*1.07*
Easily overcommit myself	3.63	*1.11*		3.38	*1.2*	3.67	*1.1*
Think about unrelated matters	3.08	*1.13*		2.86	*1.09*	3.11	*1.14*
Feel uncomfortable wasting time	3.42	*1.26*		3.16	*1.28*	3.45	*1.26*
N	624			86		527	

Table 13

Survey Results by All Educators and Race/Ethnicity

	All Educators		Race/Ethnicity					
			Black		Hispanic		White	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Too Little Time to Prepare	3.85	*1.03*	3.3	*1.26*	4.14	*0.9*	3.92	*0.98*
Personal Priorities being shortchanged	3.74	*1.11*	3.2	*1.31*	3.86	*0.69*	3.8	*1.07*
Too much work to do	4.07	*1.02*	3.43	*1.32*	4.14	*0.69*	4.13	*0.95*
Caseload/ Class size too large	3.82	*1.18*	3.54	*1.39*	4.71	*0.49*	3.83	*1.15*
School day too fast paced	3.28	*1.23*	2.91	*1.36*	4.29	*0.95*	3.32	*1.21*
Too much paperwork	4.16	*1.04*	3.69	*1.32*	4.57	*0.53*	4.21	*1*
Lack of Promotion or Advancement Opportunities	2.93	*1.33*	2.74	*1.43*	4.14	*1.07*	2.95	*1.31*
Not progressing rapidly in job	2.6	*1.24*	2.57	*1.3*	3.86	*1.21*	2.59	*1.22*
Need more status and/or respect	3.1	*1.36*	2.49	*1.42*	3.86	*1.46*	3.17	*1.33*
Lack of recognition	3.19	*1.33*	2.64	*1.39*	4	*1.41*	3.23	*1.31*
Inadequate salary and/or benefits	4.01	*1.15*	3.96	*1.26*	4.71	*0.49*	4.01	*1.15*
Lack of support from supervisors	3.11	*1.32*	2.74	*1.39*	3.14	*0.9*	3.14	*1.31*
Personal opinions not sufficiently aired	3.14	*1.18*	2.86	*1.29*	3.29	*1.25*	3.17	*1.17*
Lack of control over decisions	3.52	*1.2*	3.14	*1.32*	3.86	*1.07*	3.55	*1.19*
Not emotionally or intellectually stimulated	2.6	*1.16*	2.58	*1.21*	3.57	*1.13*	2.59	*1.15*
Lack of opportunities for improvement	2.81	*1.22*	2.66	*1.29*	3.57	*1.13*	2.8	*1.21*
Having to monitor pupil behavior	3.65	*1.18*	3.54	*1.29*	4.14	*1.21*	3.64	*1.16*
Discipline problems in my classroom	3.4	*1.25*	3.15	*1.32*	4	*0.82*	3.41	*1.25*
Working with students who are poorly motivated	3.83	*1.16*	3.67	*1.19*	4.57	*0.53*	3.82	*1.16*
Students who would do better if they tried harder	3.8	*1.14*	3.64	*1.28*	4.67	*0.52*	3.8	*1.13*
Inadequate or poorly designed discipline practices	3.38	*1.22*	3.41	*1.36*	3.57	*0.98*	3.37	*1.21*
Authority rejected or challenged by students and/or supervisors	3.37	*1.28*	3.09	*1.38*	3.86	*1.35*	3.38	*1.27*
Not enough time to get things done	4.08	*1.08*	3.49	*1.42*	4.29	*1.11*	4.14	*1.01*
Multi-tasking/doing more than one thing at a time	4.15	*1.07*	3.47	*1.3*	4.43	*1.13*	4.23	*1*
Become impatient	3.29	*1.12*	2.97	*1.16*	3.86	*1.07*	3.32	*1.11*
Have little time to relax	3.94	*1.1*	3.43	*1.26*	4.14	*0.9*	4.01	*1.06*
Easily overcommit myself	3.63	*1.11*	2.99	*1.22*	4	*1.15*	3.72	*1.07*
Think about unrelated matters	3.08	*1.13*	2.9	*1.15*	3	*1.41*	3.11	*1.12*
Feel uncomfortable wasting time	3.42	*1.26*	3.19	*1.27*	3.86	*0.9*	3.44	*1.27*
N	624		69		7		531	

Table 14

Survey Results by All Educators and School Level

	All Educators		School Level			
			Elementary		High School	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Too Little Time to Prepare	3.85	*1.03*	3.98	*1*	3.82	*0.99*
Personal Priorities being shortchanged	3.74	*1.11*	3.83	*1.12*	3.72	*0.99*
Too much work to do	4.07	*1.02*	4.2	*1.01*	4.07	*0.97*
Caseload/ Class size too large	3.82	*1.18*	3.85	*1.19*	3.69	*1.13*
School day too fast paced	3.28	*1.23*	3.66	*1.12*	2.92	*1.14*
Too much paperwork	4.16	*1.04*	4.27	*0.98*	4.16	*0.98*
Lack of Promotion or Advancement Opportunities	2.93	*1.33*	2.97	*1.34*	2.94	*1.34*
Not progressing rapidly in job	2.6	*1.24*	2.65	*1.23*	2.56	*1.28*
Need more status and/or respect	3.1	*1.36*	3.19	*1.32*	2.83	*1.33*
Lack of recognition	3.19	*1.33*	3.26	*1.31*	2.98	*1.34*
Inadequate salary and/or benefits	4.01	*1.15*	4.21	*1.05*	3.79	*1.22*
Lack of support from supervisors	3.11	*1.32*	3.12	*1.28*	2.92	*1.3*
Personal opinions not sufficiently aired	3.14	*1.18*	3.23	*1.17*	3	*1.15*
Lack of control over decisions	3.52	*1.2*	3.61	*1.19*	3.34	*1.21*
Not emotionally or intellectually stimulated	2.6	*1.16*	2.69	*1.16*	2.49	*1.22*
Lack of opportunities for improvement	2.81	*1.22*	2.8	*1.24*	2.78	*1.22*
Having to monitor pupil behavior	3.65	*1.18*	3.82	*1.1*	3.39	*1.14*
Discipline problems in my classroom	3.4	*1.25*	3.75	*1.19*	3	*1.14*
Working with students who are poorly motivated	3.83	*1.16*	3.73	*1.19*	3.89	*1.07*
Students who would do better if they tried harder	3.8	*1.14*	3.76	*1.15*	3.88	*1.06*
Inadequate or poorly designed discipline practices	3.38	*1.22*	3.53	*1.22*	3.04	*1.15*
Authority rejected or challenged by students and/or supervisors	3.37	*1.28*	3.46	*1.23*	3.14	*1.29*
Not enough time to get things done	4.08	*1.08*	4.24	*1.02*	4.08	*1.07*
Multi-tasking/doing more than one thing at a time	4.15	*1.07*	4.28	*0.98*	4.17	*1.02*
Become impatient	3.29	*1.12*	3.4	*1.14*	3.2	*1.12*
Have little time to relax	3.94	*1.1*	4.08	*1.05*	3.92	*1.11*
Easily overcommit myself	3.63	*1.11*	3.67	*1.14*	3.76	*1.09*
Think about unrelated matters	3.08	*1.13*	3.28	*1.15*	2.96	*1.12*
Feel uncomfortable wasting time	3.42	*1.26*	3.48	*1.26*	3.43	*1.28*
N	624		3.57	*1.29*	3.34	*1.29*

Table 15

Survey Results by All Educators and Locale

	All Educators		Locale					
			Urban		Suburban		Rural	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Too Little Time to Prepare	3.85	*1.03*	3.74	*1.03*	3.97	*0.96*	3.81	*1.07*
Personal Priorities being shortchanged	3.74	*1.11*	3.71	*1.16*	3.84	*1.06*	3.69	*1.13*
Too much work to do	4.07	*1.02*	3.96	*1.03*	4.16	*0.93*	4.03	*1.09*
Caseload/ Class size too large	3.82	*1.18*	3.65	*1.26*	3.85	*1.12*	3.84	*1.21*
School day too fast paced	3.28	*1.23*	3.12	*1.3*	3.3	*1.15*	3.36	*1.26*
Too much paperwork	4.16	*1.04*	4.21	*0.98*	4.23	*0.97*	4.06	*1.12*
Lack of Promotion or Advancement Opportunities	2.93	*1.33*	2.9	*1.41*	2.85	*1.35*	3.04	*1.27*
Not progressing rapidly in job	2.6	*1.24*	2.59	*1.27*	2.56	*1.26*	2.67	*1.21*
Need more status and/or respect	3.1	*1.36*	2.92	*1.45*	3.11	*1.34*	3.18	*1.35*
Lack of recognition	3.19	*1.33*	3.13	*1.41*	3.19	*1.3*	3.24	*1.33*
Inadequate salary and/or benefits	4.01	*1.15*	4.14	*1.23*	3.93	*1.16*	4.07	*1.08*
Lack of support from supervisors	3.11	*1.32*	3.11	*1.37*	3.16	*1.3*	3.07	*1.32*
Personal opinions not sufficiently aired	3.14	*1.18*	3.05	*1.25*	3.17	*1.18*	3.18	*1.16*
Lack of control over decisions	3.52	*1.2*	3.45	*1.26*	3.57	*1.2*	3.53	*1.17*
Not emotionally or intellectually stimulated	2.6	*1.16*	2.72	*1.23*	2.53	*1.14*	2.64	*1.15*
Lack of opportunities for improvement	2.81	*1.22*	2.8	*1.27*	2.83	*1.22*	2.79	*1.2*
Having to monitor pupil behavior	3.65	*1.18*	3.58	*1.24*	3.58	*1.19*	3.77	*1.13*
Discipline problems in my classroom	3.4	*1.25*	3.38	*1.3*	3.37	*1.25*	3.46	*1.23*
Working with students who are poorly motivated	3.83	*1.16*	3.65	*1.19*	3.78	*1.11*	3.97	*1.15*
Students who would do better if they tried harder	3.8	*1.14*	3.71	*1.17*	3.75	*1.11*	3.91	*1.13*
Inadequate or poorly designed discipline practices	3.38	*1.22*	3.32	*1.22*	3.4	*1.21*	3.41	*1.23*
Authority rejected or challenged by students and/or supervisors	3.37	*1.28*	3.24	*1.31*	3.44	*1.29*	3.37	*1.26*
Not enough time to get things done	4.08	*1.08*	4	*1.12*	4.2	*0.99*	4.01	*1.13*
Multi-tasking/doing more than one thing at a time	4.15	*1.07*	4.07	*1.07*	4.21	*1.02*	4.15	*1.09*
Become impatient	3.29	*1.12*	3.29	*1.15*	3.28	*1.1*	3.31	*1.12*
Have little time to relax	3.94	*1.1*	3.87	*1.12*	3.96	*1.09*	3.98	*1.09*
Easily overcommit myself	3.63	*1.11*	3.67	*1.13*	3.64	*1.07*	3.63	*1.14*
Think about unrelated matters	3.08	*1.13*	3.25	*1.16*	3.06	*1.09*	3.03	*1.17*
Feel uncomfortable wasting time	3.42	*1.26*	3.56	*1.14*	3.49	*1.29*	3.3	*1.29*
N	624		104		256		253	

Table 16

Results by All Educators and Role in System

	All Educators		Role in System			
			Teachers		Administrators	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Too Little Time to Prepare	3.85	*1.03*	4.01	*1*	3.65	*1.02*
Personal Priorities being shortchanged	3.74	*1.11*	3.84	*1.07*	3.88	*1.34*
Too much work to do	4.07	*1.02*	4.21	*0.94*	4.04	*1*
Caseload/ Class size too large	3.82	*1.18*	3.81	*1.16*	3.72	*1.17*
School day too fast paced	3.28	*1.23*	3.42	*1.22*	3	*1.29*
Too much paperwork	4.16	*1.04*	4.3	*0.94*	4.15	*0.88*
Lack of Promotion or Advancement Opportunities	2.93	*1.33*	2.91	*1.39*	2.88	*1.37*
Not progressing rapidly in job	2.6	*1.24*	2.57	*1.28*	2.62	*1.33*
Need more status and/or respect	3.1	*1.36*	3.11	*1.4*	2.88	*1.48*
Lack of recognition	3.19	*1.33*	3.17	*1.34*	3.12	*1.37*
Inadequate salary and/or benefits	4.01	*1.15*	4	*1.17*	3.65	*1.23*
Lack of support from supervisors	3.11	*1.32*	3.07	*1.3*	3.27	*1.19*
Personal opinions not sufficiently aired	3.14	*1.18*	3.18	*1.19*	2.96	*1.11*
Lack of control over decisions	3.52	*1.2*	3.57	*1.2*	3.31	*1.23*
Not emotionally or intellectually stimulated	2.6	*1.16*	2.58	*1.16*	2.65	*1.09*
Lack of opportunities for improvement	2.81	*1.22*	2.77	*1.24*	2.88	*1.31*
Having to monitor pupil behavior	3.65	*1.18*	3.82	*1.09*	2.92	*1.23*
Discipline problems in my classroom	3.4	*1.25*	3.65	*1.12*	2.64	*1.35*
Working with students who are poorly motivated	3.83	*1.16*	4.02	*1.05*	3.19	*1.2*
Students who would do better if they tried harder	3.8	*1.14*	3.99	*1*	3.23	*1.07*
Inadequate or poorly designed discipline practices	3.38	*1.22*	3.44	*1.18*	2.81	*1.3*
Authority rejected or challenged by students and/or supervisors	3.37	*1.28*	3.34	*1.23*	3.12	*1.34*
Not enough time to get things done	4.08	*1.08*	4.24	*1.02*	3.96	*1.15*
Multi-tasking/doing more than one thing at a time	4.15	*1.07*	4.22	*1.04*	4	*1.2*
Become impatient	3.29	*1.12*	3.35	*1.15*	3.35	*0.98*
Have little time to relax	3.94	*1.1*	4.06	*1.05*	3.96	*1.14*
Easily overcommit myself	3.63	*1.11*	3.66	*1.12*	3.96	*0.89*
Think about unrelated matters	3.08	*1.13*	3.13	*1.16*	3.19	*1.17*
Feel uncomfortable wasting time	3.42	*1.26*	3.54	*1.28*	3.48	*1.19*
N	624		376		26	

Table 17

Results by All Educators, Years of Experience

	All Educators		Years of Experience			
			0-3 Experience		25+ Experience	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Too Little Time to Prepare	3.85	*1.03*	3.58	*1.15*	3.64	*1.03*
Personal Priorities being shortchanged	3.74	*1.11*	3.55	*1.13*	3.57	*1.15*
Too much work to do	4.07	*1.02*	3.82	*1.1*	3.91	*1.03*
Caseload/ Class size too large	3.82	*1.18*	3.69	*1.29*	3.54	*1.23*
School day too fast paced	3.28	*1.23*	3	*1.28*	3.24	*1.2*
Too much paperwork	4.16	*1.04*	3.9	*1.14*	4.04	*1.04*
Lack of Promotion or Advancement Opportunities	2.93	*1.33*	2.69	*1.28*	2.7	*1.37*
Not progressing rapidly in job	2.6	*1.24*	2.46	*1.24*	2.36	*1.26*
Need more status and/or respect	3.1	*1.36*	2.83	*1.32*	2.95	*1.36*
Lack of recognition	3.19	*1.33*	2.84	*1.38*	2.98	*1.32*
Inadequate salary and/or benefits	4.01	*1.15*	4	*1.26*	3.64	*1.25*
Lack of support from supervisors	3.11	*1.32*	2.89	*1.37*	3.09	*1.27*
Personal opinions not sufficiently aired	3.14	*1.18*	2.87	*1.21*	2.97	*1.08*
Lack of control over decisions	3.52	*1.2*	3.19	*1.35*	3.36	*1.17*
Not emotionally or intellectually stimulated	2.6	*1.16*	2.49	*1.16*	2.4	*1.17*
Lack of opportunities for improvement	2.81	*1.22*	2.8	*1.21*	2.62	*1.26*
Having to monitor pupil behavior	3.65	*1.18*	3.56	*1.12*	3.45	*1.12*
Discipline problems in my classroom	3.4	*1.25*	3.54	*1.26*	3.05	*1.15*
Working with students who are poorly motivated	3.83	*1.16*	3.83	*1.14*	3.76	*1.11*
Students who would do better if they tried harder	3.8	*1.14*	3.8	*1.15*	3.73	*1.12*
Inadequate or poorly designed discipline practices	3.38	*1.22*	3.39	*1.07*	3.15	*1.16*
Authority rejected or challenged by students and/or supervisors	3.37	*1.28*	3.32	*1.27*	3.21	*1.28*
Not enough time to get things done	4.08	*1.08*	3.83	*1.18*	3.97	*1.04*
Multi-tasking/doing more than one thing at a time	4.15	*1.07*	3.93	*1.16*	4.07	*1.06*
Become impatient	3.29	*1.12*	3.31	*1.25*	3.13	*1.06*
Have little time to relax	3.94	*1.1*	3.83	*1.13*	3.73	*1.09*
Easily overcommit myself	3.63	*1.11*	3.52	*1.26*	3.37	*1.05*
Think about unrelated matters	3.08	*1.13*	2.93	*1.19*	2.82	*1.07*
Feel uncomfortable wasting time	3.42	*1.26*	3.35	*1.31*	3.13	*1.22*
N	624		71		92	

Some notable discoveries from this deeper study of responses are as follows:

1. Classroom teachers rated the factors “too little time to prepare”, “too much work to do”, “too much paperwork”, “monitoring student behavior” and “discipline problems in the classroom” as a higher source of stress for them than did other job categories. In fact, classroom teachers were the employee category that rated the highest levels of stress among most all indicators when compared to those in other roles in the system.
2. All school grade levels rated “too little time to prepare”, “too much paperwork”, “multi-tasking”, and “not enough time to prepare” as a strong source of stress for them, as the “very frequently” selection was the top choice among all school types. The same was true for the “too much to do” indicator, although the greatest percentage was among those working in elementary schools. Furthermore, almost all of the stress indicators received higher scores from those who work in elementary schools as opposed to secondary schools, indicating that our elementary employees are more stressed overall than our secondary employees. The only exception to this was in the area of student motivation and effort, where secondary employees indicated a higher level of stress than those working in elementary settings.
3. Student discipline and behavior was rated as more of a stress factor for elementary and middle school employees than it was for high school employees.

4. “Personal opinions not being aired” and “lack of control with decisions” showed to be more of a stress factor for elementary employees than it did for secondary employees.
5. The top 5 stress factors overall were all rated “very frequently” by a majority across all geographic school districts (urban, suburban, and rural)
6. Employees across all levels of experience considered “inadequate salary and benefits” a “very frequent” source of stress for them.
7. Early career educators indicated “lack of opportunities for improvement” as a concern for them more than that of veteran employees.
8. Employees across all experience levels indicated “poorly motivated kids” as a top stressor for them. The same was true for stress indicators of “not enough time to get things done”, “multi-tasking”, and “little time to relax.”
9. Males reported lower rates of stress around the areas of student discipline than females.
10. Females reported higher levels of stress across all indictors with the exception of one. Men reported that “not progressing rapidly in job” was more of a stress factor for them than females, but in all other categories females reported higher levels of stress.
11. Hispanic respondents reported higher stress levels than other ethnic groups. African American respondents reported the lowest levels of stress based on the factors surveyed.

Next, independent samples two-tailed t-tests were run to assess research question one and note significant findings. The results of this analysis are presented in the following

tables. Notably, each category is compared to the non-group mean. For example, Hispanic teachers are compared to the mean of all non-Hispanic teachers; Elementary teachers are compared to all non-elementary teachers.

Table 18

T-Tests for Between-Group Mean Differences

	Female	Black	Hispanic	White	Elementary	High School
Too Little Time to Prepare	0.64***	-0.61***	0.3	0.46***	0.22**	-0.04
Personal Priorities being shortchanged	0.36**	-0.61***	0.12	0.41**	0.15	-0.02
Too much work to do	0.52***	-0.71***	0.08	0.47***	0.24**	0.01
Caseload/ Class size too large	0.43**	-0.31*	0.91*	0.12	0.07	-0.16
School day too fast paced	0.72***	-0.42**	1.02*	0.27	0.66***	-0.46***
Too much paperwork	0.42***	-0.53***	0.42	0.35**	0.20*	0.01
Lack of Promotion or Advancement Opportunities	0.17	-0.22	1.22*	0.08	0.07	0.02
Not progressing rapidly in job	-0.06	-0.03	1.27**	-0.1	0.09	-0.05
Need more status and/or respect	0.35*	-0.68***	0.77	0.48**	0.15	-0.34*
Lack of recognition	0.42**	-0.62***	0.82	0.33*	0.12	-0.26*
Inadequate salary and/or benefits	0.44**	-0.06	0.71	-0.02	0.34***	-0.28*
Lack of support from supervisors	0.18	-0.42*	0.04	0.22	0.02	-0.25
Personal opinions not sufficiently aired	0.30*	-0.32*	0.14	0.2	0.14	-0.19
Lack of control over decisions	0.36*	-0.42**	0.34	0.21	0.16	-0.22
Not emotionally or intellectually stimulated	0.02	-0.02	0.98*	-0.1	0.16	-0.15
Lack of opportunities for improvement	0.16	-0.16	0.78	0	-0.01	-0.03
Having to monitor pupil behavior	0.48***	-0.12	0.5	-0.04	0.30**	-0.34**
Discipline problems in my classroom	0.54***	-0.28	0.61	0.13	0.60***	-0.50***
Working with students who are poorly motivated	0.15	-0.18	0.75	-0.02	-0.16	0.08
Students who would do better if they tried harder	0.25	-0.17	0.88	-0.01	-0.07	0.1

Inadequate or poorly designed discipline practices	0.46**	0.03	0.19	-0.08	0.25*	-0.44***
Authority rejected or challenged by students and/or supervisors	0.36*	-0.31	0.5	0.12	0.15	-0.30*
Not enough time to get things done	0.73***	-0.66***	0.21	0.47***	0.27**	0.01
Multi-tasking/doing more than one thing at a time	0.67***	-0.77***	0.28	0.56***	0.21*	0.02
Become impatient	0.38**	-0.36*	0.57	0.2	0.20*	-0.11
Have little time to relax	0.47***	-0.58***	0.2	0.45***	0.24**	-0.03
Easily overcommit myself	0.30*	-0.73***	0.37	0.59***	0.07	0.17
Think about unrelated matters	0.26	-0.21	-0.08	0.21	0.35***	-0.15

Note: ***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.1. All results of two-tailed t-tests, where identified group mean is compared to remaining sample mean.

Table 19

T-Tests for Between-Group Mean Differences (continued)

	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Teacher	Younger
Too Little Time to Prepare	-0.15	0.18	-0.1	-0.31*	-0.25*
Personal Priorities being shortchanged	-0.05	0.14	-0.11	-0.22	-0.2
Too much work to do	-0.13	0.15	-0.07	-0.28*	-0.18
Caseload/ Class size too large	-0.2	0.06	0.05	-0.15	-0.32*
School day too fast paced	-0.21	0.01	0.12	-0.32*	-0.05
Too much paperwork	0.07	0.12	-0.16	-0.29*	-0.13
Lack of Promotion or Advancement Opportunities	-0.04	-0.15	0.17	-0.27	-0.28
Not progressing rapidly in job	-0.03	-0.09	0.11	-0.16	-0.29*
Need more status and/or respect	-0.23	0.01	0.12	-0.31	-0.18
Lack of recognition	-0.08	-0.02	0.07	-0.39*	-0.25
Inadequate salary and/or benefits	0.14	-0.16	0.08	-0.02	-0.44***
Lack of support from supervisors	-0.01	0.08	-0.08	-0.25	-0.03
Personal opinions not sufficiently aired	-0.13	0.03	0.04	-0.31*	-0.21
Lack of control over decisions	-0.09	0.06	0	-0.38*	-0.18
Not emotionally or intellectually stimulated	0.14	-0.13	0.05	-0.12	-0.24
Lack of opportunities for improvement	-0.01	0.04	-0.03	-0.01	-0.22
Having to monitor pupil behavior	-0.09	-0.13	0.19	-0.1	-0.23
Discipline problems in my classroom	-0.03	-0.06	0.08	0.16	-0.40**
Working with students who are poorly motivated	-0.23	-0.1	0.23*	0	-0.08
Students who would do better if they tried harder	-0.12	-0.1	0.17	0.01	-0.08
Inadequate or poorly designed discipline practices	-0.08	0.02	0.03	0.01	-0.27
Authority rejected or challenged by students and/or supervisors	-0.17	0.11	-0.02	-0.06	-0.19
Not enough time to get things done	-0.1	0.19*	-0.13	-0.28*	-0.13
Multi-tasking/doing more than one thing at a time	-0.11	0.08	-0.02	-0.25	-0.1
Become impatient	-0.01	-0.03	0.03	0.02	-0.19
Have little time to relax	-0.09	0.01	0.04	-0.13	-0.25*
Easily overcommit myself	0.04	-0.01	-0.02	-0.13	-0.31*
Think about unrelated matters	0.2	-0.03	-0.09	-0.17	-0.30*
Feel uncomfortable wasting time	0.16	0.11	-0.21*	-0.08	-0.34*

Note: ***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.1. All results of two-tailed t-tests, where identified group mean is compared to remaining sample mean.

The demographic category of gender proved to be statistically significant with several indicators. With the stress factors of time to prepare, personal priorities, too much work, caseload/class size, school day pace, too much paperwork, lack of recognition, discipline, not enough time, multi-tasking, and having little time to relax, females reported significantly higher levels of stress than that of their male colleagues. The aforementioned stress factors proved to be statistically significant in the demographic category of gender, therefore we can reject the null and results are likely not due to chance. The remaining stress factors did not show statistical significance among gender, so we fail to reject the null with those categories as the results are likely due to chance.

The demographic category of ethnicity showed statistical significance with some indicators as well. Black survey participants were statistically less stressed and white participants were statistically more stressed when responding to our indicators. This proved to be true with the categories of time to prepare, personal priorities, too much work, school day pace, too much paperwork, lack of recognition, status and respect, discipline, not enough time, multi-tasking, overcommitting, and having little time to relax. These stress factors proved to be statistically significant in the demographic category of ethnicity, therefore we can reject the null and results are likely not due to chance. The remaining stress factors did not show statistical significance among ethnicity, so we fail to reject the null with those categories as the results are likely due to chance. The demographic category of grade level proved to be statistically significant with two indicators. Secondary survey participants were statistically less stressed and elementary participants were statistically more stressed in the areas of student discipline and the school day being too fast paced. Because these two stress factors proved to be statistically significant in the demographic category of grade level, we can reject the null hypothesis and results are likely not

due to chance. The remaining stress factors did not show statistical significance among grade level, so we fail to reject the null with those categories as the results are likely due to chance.

In the demographic category of geographics, there was no statistical significance among any of the stress factors. Therefore, we fail to reject the null hypothesis for urban, suburban, and rural geographic areas and accept that the responses are likely due to chance.

In the demographic category of role/school position, there was no statistical significance among any of the stress factors. Therefore, we fail to reject the null hypothesis for different positions experiencing stress differently and accept that the responses are likely due to chance.

The demographic category of years of experience proved to be statistically significant in the areas of student discipline and salary and benefits. More novice employees (0-3 years of experience) reported significantly lower levels of stress in these categories than their more veteran (25+ years) colleagues. Therefore, with these two factors and years of experience, we can reject the null and state that the results are not likely due to chance. Other stress factors did not show statistical significance across varying levels of experience, so we fail to reject the null with those and accept that the results are likely due to chance.

Research Question #2

Do stress factors lead individuals to consider leaving their workplace or the profession, and do these intentions differ by demographic and positional characteristics?

Once respondents reflected upon and responded to the prevalence of stress factors in their work lives, they were asked if those stress factors have ever caused them to consider changing jobs or professions altogether. More than one half (52.1%) of respondents stated that they frequently or very frequently consider or have considered leaving their current workplace.

Further, almost all (89.2%) have considered leaving their current work location at one point or another.

Table 20

Frequency of Stress Factors Causing Educators to Leave the Workplace (n=…)

Stress factors have caused me to consider leaving workplace	Counts	% of Total	Cumulative %
Very Frequently	181	29.3 %	29.3 %
Frequently	141	22.8 %	52.1 %
Occasionally	142	23.0 %	75.1 %
Rarely	91	14.7 %	89.8 %
Never	63	10.2 %	100.0 %

In addition to reflecting on the frequency of their thoughts to leave the workplace, respondents were also asked if they had considered leaving the education profession altogether. The results are as follows:

Table 21

Frequency of Stress Factors Causing Educators to Leave the Profession (n=…)

Stress factors have caused me to consider leaving profession	Counts	% of Total	Cumulative %
Very Frequently	180	29.2 %	29.2 %
Frequently	134	21.8 %	51.0 %
Occasionally	162	26.3 %	77.3 %
Rarely	82	13.3 %	90.6 %
Never	58	9.4 %	100.0 %

As evidenced above, the results are similar to those reflected in the first question regarding turnover intentions in their current workplace. More than one half (51%) of

respondents shared that they frequently or very frequently consider or have considered leaving the education profession altogether. Furthermore, greater than 90% (90.6%) share that they have considered leaving the profession at one point or another.

These results were comprised of all respondents. After this overall review, the indicators assessing considerations for leaving were cross referenced individually with each of the demographic categories. Additionally, responses were coded into numerical values where a value of 5 correlated with the response "Very Frequently" and a value of 1 correlated with the response "Never." Means were calculated for each of the stress indicators overall and for each of the individual demographic categories. Results are displayed in the tables below.

Table 22

Leaving Intentions by All Educators, Gender/Sex

			Gender/Sex			
	All Educators		Male		Female	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Considering Leaving Workplace	3.46	1.32	3.1	1.41	3.52	1.3
Considering Leaving Profession	3.48	1.29	3.2	1.45	3.53	1.26
N	624		86		527	

Table 23

Leaving Intentions by All Educators, Race/Ethnicity

			Race/Ethnicity					
	All Educators		Black		Hispanic		White	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Considering Leaving Workplace	3.46	1.32	3.21	1.45	3.57	1.13	3.49	1.31
Considering Leaving Profession	3.48	1.29	3.35	1.46	3.71	0.95	3.49	1.28
N	624		69		7		531	

Table 24

Leaving Intentions by All Educators, School Level

			School Level			
	All Educators		Elementary		High School	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Considering Leaving Workplace	3.46	1.32	3.57	1.29	3.34	1.29
Considering Leaving Profession	3.48	1.29	3.64	1.23	3.33	1.36
N	624		260		134	

Table 25

Leaving Intentions by All Educators, Locale

			Locale					
	All Educators		Urban		Suburban		Rural	
	Mean	SD	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Considering Leaving Workplace	3.46	1.32	3.46	*1.38*	3.55	*1.3*	3.39	*1.32*
Considering Leaving Profession	3.48	1.29	3.47	*1.38*	3.48	*1.29*	3.51	*1.26*
N	624		104		256		253	

Table 26

Leaving Intentions by All Educators, Role in School

			Role			
	All Educators		Teachers		Administrators	
	Mean	SD	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Considering Leaving Workplace	3.46	1.32	3.45	*1.35*	3.72	*1.24*
Considering Leaving Profession	3.48	1.29	3.56	*1.28*	3.17	*1.37*
N	624		376		26	

Table 27

Leaving Intentions by All Educators, Years of Experience

			Years of Experience			
	All Educators		0-3 Experience		25+ Experience	
	Mean	SD	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Considering Leaving Workplace	3.46	1.32	2.94	*1.38*	3.25	*1.28*
Considering Leaving Profession	3.48	1.29	2.9	*1.4*	3.13	*1.29*
N	624		71		92	

Some notable discoveries from this study of responses are as follows:

1. Male participants' responses were more evenly distributed across the five options than those of females. Females indicated a higher mean of being more likely to leave the workplace or profession than that of their male colleagues.
2. Respondents who were older indicated they were less likely to consider leaving their workplace or the profession as opposed to their younger colleagues who reported they more frequently considered making a job or career change.
3. Administrators and classroom teachers showed the highest rates of consideration for leaving the workplace or profession. Coaches' responses were pretty evenly consistent across all options, making them the group least likely to consider leaving the workplace or profession.

A two tailed independent sample T-test was run to gather statistical data on research question one and note significant findings. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 28.

Table 28

T-Test for Between Group Mean Differences

	Female	Black	Hispanic	White	Elementary	High School
Considering Leaving Workplace	0.42**	-0.28	0.11	0.15	0.17	-0.17
Considering Leaving Profession	0.32*	-0.15	0.23	0.04	0.26*	-0.2
N	613	622	622	622	620	620

Note: ***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.1. All results of two-tailed t-tests, where identified group mean is compared to remaining sample mean.

Table 29

T-Test for Between Group Mean Differences (continued)

	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Teacher	Younger
Considering Leaving Workplace	-0.02	0.14	-0.13	-0.59***	-0.25
Considering Leaving Profession	-0.03	-0.02	0.03	-0.65***	-0.41**
N	613	613	613	623	623

Note: ***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.1. All results of two-tailed t-tests, where identified group mean is compared to remaining sample mean.

The demographic category of gender proved to be statistically significant as females proved to be more likely to consider leaving the workplace than their male colleagues. Therefore, we can reject the null and accept that these results are likely not due to chance. The same is true for the demographic category of job position, with those serving in teaching positions proving to be statistically significant when compared against respondents in the other job categories. Respondent results from all other demographic indicators did not prove to be statistically significant, so we fail to reject the null on these and can assert that the results are likely due to chance.

Research Question #3

How does workplace stress manifest itself among educators and do these reactions differ by demographic and positional characteristics?

Respondents were asked to consider how the workplace stress they experience manifests itself in their lives. Participants rated themselves in the areas of Emotional, Behavioral, and Fatigue Manifestations. Fatigue manifestations proved to be the most likely way employees' stress manifested itself. This category referenced things such as physical exhaustion, physical weakness, becoming fatigued in a short time, sleeping more than usual, and procrastination. 59.4% of our participants shared that they frequently or very frequently experience this. Coming

in a close second were emotional manifestations. 50.1% of our respondents indicated they frequently or very frequently experience these manifestations that are marked by feeling insecure, inability to cope, or feeling vulnerable, depressed, anxious, or angry. The Behavioral manifestations category that included things like calling in sick, using prescription or over the counter drugs, using alcohol, or shutting down garnered results that were almost opposite of the other two categories with only 22.9% stating they frequently or very frequently experienced this, and 60.4% sharing that they rarely or never saw their stress manifest in this way.

Table 30

Frequencies of Stress Displayed Through Emotional Manifestations (n=…)

	Counts	% of Total	Cumulative %
Very Frequently	146	23.6 %	23.6 %
Frequently	164	26.5 %	50.1 %
Occasionally	168	27.1 %	77.2 %
Rarely	102	16.5 %	93.7 %
Never	39	6.3 %	100.0 %

Table 31

Frequencies of Stress Displayed Through Behavioral Manifestations (n=…)

	Counts	% of Total	Cumulative %
Very Frequently	66	10.7 %	10.7 %
Frequently	75	12.2 %	22.9 %
Occasionally	103	16.7 %	39.6 %
Rarely	148	24.0 %	63.6 %
Never	224	36.4 %	100.0 %

Table 32

Frequencies of Stress Displayed Through Fatigue Manifestations (n=…)

	Counts	% of Total	Cumulative %
Very Frequently	198	32.0 %	32.0 %
Frequently	169	27.3 %	59.4 %
Occasionally	143	23.1 %	82.5 %
Rarely	63	10.2 %	92.7 %
Never	45	7.3 %	100.0 %

These results comprised of all respondents. After this overall review, the indicators assessing how stress manifests were cross referenced individually with each of the demographic categories. Additionally, responses were coded into numerical values where a value of 5 correlated with the response "Very Frequently" and a value of 1 correlated with the response "Never." Means were calculated for each of the stress indicators overall and for each of the individual demographic categories. Results are displayed in the tables below

Table 33

Stress Manifestations by All Educators, Gender/Sex

			Gender/Sex			
	All Educators		Male		Female	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Emotional Manifestations	3.45	*1.2*	3.04	*1.32*	3.52	*1.16*
Behavioral Manifestations	2.37	*1.36*	2.25	*1.4*	2.4	*1.35*
Fatigue Manifestations	3.67	*1.23*	3.37	*1.32*	3.72	*1.2*
N	624		86		527	

Table 34

Stress Manifestations by All Educators, Race/Ethnicity

			Race/Ethnicity					
	All Educators		Black		Hispanic		White	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Emotional Manifestations	3.45	*1.2*	2.96	*1.32*	3.29	*0.95*	3.51	*1.17*
Behavioral Manifestations	2.37	*1.36*	2.35	*1.46*	2.71	*1.38*	2.36	*1.35*
Fatigue Manifestations	3.67	*1.23*	3.24	*1.37*	3.71	*1.11*	3.72	*1.2*
N	624		69		7		531	

Table 35

Stress Manifestations by All Educators, School Level

			School Level			
	All Educators		Elementary		High School	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Emotional Manifestations	3.45	*1.2*	3.56	*1.19*	3.29	*1.12*
Behavioral Manifestations	2.37	*1.36*	2.48	*1.38*	2.22	*1.31*
Fatigue Manifestations	3.67	*1.23*	3.75	*1.2*	3.6	*1.26*
N	624		260		134	

Table 36

Stress Manifestations by All Educators, Locale

			Locale					
	All Educators		Urban		Suburban		Rural	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Emotional Manifestations	3.45	*1.2*	3.22	*1.16*	3.51	*1.19*	3.49	*1.2*
Behavioral Manifestations	2.37	*1.36*	2.32	*1.37*	2.35	*1.33*	2.44	*1.4*
Fatigue Manifestations	3.67	*1.23*	3.63	*1.22*	3.67	*1.22*	3.71	*1.22*
N	624		104		256		253	

Table 37

Stress Manifestations by All Educators, Role in School

			Role			
	All Educators		Teachers		Administrators	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Emotional Manifestations	3.45	*1.2*	3.49	*1.18*	3.2	*1.19*
Behavioral Manifestations	2.37	*1.36*	2.44	*1.39*	2.08	*1.26*
Fatigue Manifestations	3.67	*1.23*	3.74	*1.19*	3.52	*1.23*
N	624		376		26	

Table 38

Stress Manifestations by All Educators, Years of Experience

			Years of Experience			
	All Educators		0-3 Experience		25+ Experience	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Emotional Manifestations	3.45	*1.2*	3.31	*1.26*	3.04	*1.26*
Behavioral Manifestations	2.37	*1.36*	2.21	*1.43*	2.05	*1.22*
Fatigue Manifestations	3.67	*1.23*	3.54	*1.28*	3.43	*1.25*
N	624		71		92	

One notable discovery from this study of responses is that women reported having stress manifest itself in their lives more than men. This proved to be true across all three manifestation categories. Additionally, elementary employees had stress manifest itself more than secondary employees and teachers saw stress manifest more than those employees who served in other roles. Education employees who were earlier in their career proved to have stress to manifest itself more profoundly than that of late career employees.

A two tailed independent samples t-test was run to gather statistical data on research question one and note significant findings. The results of this analysis are presented in the following tables. As noted before, each group is compared to the non-group mean. For example, female educators are compared to non-female educators; Hispanic educators are compared to non-Hispanic educators. Middle school educators are not presented given no differences were significant and to maintain parsimony.

Table 39

T-Test for Between-Croup Mean Difference

	Female	Black	Hispanic	White	Elementary	High School
Emotional Manifestations	0.48***	-0.55***	-0.16	0.43**	0.20*	-0.2
Behavioral Manifestations	0.15	-0.02	0.35	-0.03	0.2	-0.19
Fatigue Manifestations	0.35*	-0.48**	0.05	0.37**	0.13	-0.08
N	613	622	622	622	620	620

Table 40

T-Test for Between-Croup Mean Differences

	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Teacher	Younger
Emotional Manifestations	-0.28*	0.1	0.07	-0.15	-0.47***
Behavioral Manifestations	-0.07	-0.06	0.1	-0.17	-0.37*
Fatigue Manifestations	-0.05	-0.02	0.05	-0.14	-0.27
N	613	613	613	623	623

The demographic category of gender proved to be statistically significant as females reported to be more likely than their male colleagues to have their stress manifest itself through emotional means. Therefore, we can reject the null and accept that these results are likely not due to chance. The same is true for the demographic category of ethnicity, with black and white employees proving to be statistically significant in the areas of emotional and fatigue manifestations when compared to those respondents in other ethnic groups. Because of this, we can reject the null and accept that these results are not likely due to chance. Statistical significance was also found among younger teachers and emotional manifestations. Respondent results from all other demographic indicators did not prove to be statistically significant, so we fail to reject the null on these and can assert that the results are likely due to chance.

Research Question #4

What actions can be taken to help individuals cope with or alleviate stress and do these techniques differ by demographic and positional characteristics?

The final section of the survey asked respondents to reflect upon ways they believe stress in the workplace could be alleviated. The participants responded to nine mechanisms that could potentially be used to alleviate stress for them as professional education employees. Of the nine indicators, the most highly rated indicator was that of "Making effective use of time/protecting planning time" garnering 85.2% of respondents who reported "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing"

with the concept. Next was "Increasing teachers' flexibility at work" with 81.7% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing with the indicator. Rounding out the top three was "Providing additional supports and resources in the classroom or work environment" with 79.6% agreeing or strongly agreeing with this alleviation technique. Closely behind in fourth place was "Having supervisors listen to concerns and offer solutions". 78.1% of respondents reported that they agree or strongly agree with this indicator as a possible option for alleviating stress within the workplace.

Table 41

Stress Alleviation Results (n=612.)

What could help alleviate stress?	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Provide additional supports in classroom or work environment	38.3%	41.3%	18.1%	1.8%	0.5%
Making Curriculum Changes	27.1%	27.9%	34.4%	8.8%	1.8%
Making effective use of time/ protecting planning or break time	49.2%	36.0%	12.0%	1.5%	1.3%
Increasing flexibility at work	46.3%	35.4%	15.9%	1.9%	0.5%
Having supervisors listen to concerns and offer solutions	41.3%	36.8%	18.8%	2.8%	0.3%
Utilizing recognition programs and positive reinforcement	29.8%	33.7%	28.2%	5.8%	2.4%
Increasing availability of personal and professional resources	31.2%	38.9%	24.7%	3.9%	1.3%
Training on how to cope with stress and handle situations	21.2%	23.8%	34.7%	13.5%	6.8%
Practicing yoga or exercise programs	18.5%	28.1%	34.1%	13.0%	6.2%

These results comprised of all respondents that participated in the study. After this overall review, the indicators assessing ways to alleviate stress were cross referenced individually with each of the demographic categories assessed in the study. Additionally, responses were coded into numerical values where a value of 5 correlated with the response "Very Frequently" and a value of 1 correlated with the response "Never." From this, means were calculated for each of the alleviation techniques overall and for each of the individual demographic categories. Results were compiled and are displayed in the tables below.

Table 42

Alleviation Techniques by All Educators, Gender/Sex

			Gender/Sex			
	All Educators		Male		Female	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Providing additional supports	4.15	*0.81*	3.87	*0.8*	4.2	*0.81*
Making curriculum changes	3.7	*1.02*	3.4	*0.89*	3.73	*1.03*
Protecting planning or break time	4.3	*0.83*	4.02	*0.9*	4.34	*0.82*
Increasing teachers' flexibility at work	4.25	*0.83*	4.06	*0.78*	4.28	*0.83*
Having supervisors listen to concerns and offer solutions	4.16	*0.85*	3.99	*0.85*	4.18	*0.85*
Utilizing recognition programs and positive reinforcement	3.83	*1*	3.77	*1*	3.83	*1.01*
Increasing availability of personal and professional resources	3.95	*0.91*	3.6	*0.95*	4.01	*0.9*
Training on how to cope with stress	3.39	*1.16*	3.25	*1.16*	3.42	*1.16*
Practicing yoga or exercise programs	3.4	*1.12*	3.25	*1.13*	3.43	*1.11*
N	624		86		527	

Table 43

Alleviation Techniques by All Educators, Race/Ethnicity

			Race/Ethnicity					
	All Educators		Black		Hispanic		White	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Providing additional supports	4.15	*0.81*	4.13	*0.96*	4.71	*0.49*	4.15	*0.79*
Making curriculum changes	3.7	*1.02*	3.74	*1.16*	4.14	*1.07*	3.69	*1*
Protecting planning or break time	4.3	*0.83*	4.28	*0.88*	4.14	*1.46*	4.3	*0.83*
Increasing teachers' flexibility at work	4.25	*0.83*	4.27	*0.93*	4.43	*0.79*	4.24	*0.82*
Having supervisors listen to concerns and offer solutions	4.16	*0.85*	4.04	*1.04*	4.43	*0.79*	4.17	*0.82*
Utilizing recognition programs and positive reinforcement	3.83	*1*	4.03	*1.04*	4.29	*1.11*	3.8	*0.99*
Increasing availability of personal and professional resources	3.95	*0.91*	4.03	*1*	4.57	*0.79*	3.94	*0.89*
Training on how to cope with stress	3.39	*1.16*	3.87	*1.05*	4.43	*0.79*	3.33	*1.15*
Practicing yoga or exercise programs	3.4	*1.12*	3.63	*1.07*	4.43	*0.79*	3.36	*1.11*
N	624		69		7		531	

Table 44

Alleviation Techniques by All Educators, School Level

			School Level			
	All Educators		Elementary		High School	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Providing additional supports	4.15	*0.81*	4.26	*0.82*	3.87	*0.84*
Making curriculum changes	3.7	*1.02*	3.86	*1.02*	3.34	*0.91*
Protecting planning or break time	4.3	*0.83*	4.32	*0.9*	4.29	*0.71*
Increasing teachers' flexibility at work	4.25	*0.83*	4.32	*0.81*	4.25	*0.76*
Having supervisors listen to concerns and offer solutions	4.16	*0.85*	4.18	*0.87*	3.96	*0.88*
Utilizing recognition programs and positive reinforcement	3.83	*1*	3.76	*1.06*	3.84	*0.92*
Increasing availability of personal and professional resources	3.95	*0.91*	4	*0.92*	3.8	*0.91*
Training on how to cope with stress	3.39	*1.16*	3.41	*1.19*	3.24	*1.13*
Practicing yoga or exercise programs	3.4	*1.12*	3.29	*1.17*	3.39	*1.09*
N	624		260		134	

Table 45

Alleviation Techniques by All Educators, Locale

			Locale					
	All Educators		Urban		Suburban		Rural	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Providing additional supports	4.15	*0.81*	4.19	*0.8*	4.16	*0.81*	4.13	*0.8*
Making curriculum changes	3.7	*1.02*	3.59	*1.02*	3.66	*1.02*	3.77	*1.01*
Protecting planning or break time	4.3	*0.83*	4.36	*0.8*	4.37	*0.79*	4.22	*0.87*
Increasing teachers' flexibility at work	4.25	*0.83*	4.27	*0.88*	4.33	*0.78*	4.18	*0.82*
Having supervisors listen to concerns and offer solutions	4.16	*0.85*	4.09	*0.9*	4.2	*0.86*	4.16	*0.79*
Utilizing recognition programs and positive reinforcement	3.83	*1*	3.88	*1.04*	3.8	*0.99*	3.83	*1*
Increasing availability of personal and professional resources	3.95	*0.91*	4.03	*0.95*	3.89	*0.92*	3.97	*0.88*
Training on how to cope with stress	3.39	*1.16*	3.63	*1.05*	3.31	*1.18*	3.37	*1.17*
Practicing yoga or exercise programs	3.4	*1.12*	3.46	*1.05*	3.39	*1.14*	3.38	*1.12*
N	624		104		256		253	

Table 46

Alleviation Techniques by All Educators, Role

			Role			
	All Educators		Teachers		Administrators	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Providing additional supports	4.15	*0.81*	4.15	*0.83*	4.08	*0.64*
Making curriculum changes	3.7	*1.02*	3.72	*1.07*	3.68	*0.85*
Protecting planning or break time	4.3	*0.83*	4.43	*0.73*	3.96	*0.68*
Increasing teachers' flexibility at work	4.25	*0.83*	4.36	*0.75*	3.88	*0.73*
Having supervisors listen to concerns and offer solutions	4.16	*0.85*	4.13	*0.86*	4.24	*0.72*
Utilizing recognition programs and positive reinforcement	3.83	*1*	3.77	*1.05*	4	*0.65*
Increasing availability of personal and professional resources	3.95	*0.91*	3.89	*0.94*	3.96	*0.93*
Training on how to cope with stress	3.39	*1.16*	3.26	*1.18*	3.76	*1.13*
Practicing yoga or exercise programs	3.4	*1.12*	3.36	*1.14*	3.56	*1.16*
N	624		376		26	

Table 47

Alleviation Techniques by All Educators, Years of Experience

			Years of Experience			
	All Educators		0-3 Experience		25+ Experience	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Providing additional supports	4.15	*0.81*	4.29	*0.76*	4.03	*0.89*
Making curriculum changes	3.7	*1.02*	3.57	*0.95*	3.64	*0.99*
Protecting planning or break time	4.3	*0.83*	4.28	*0.92*	4.24	*0.82*
Increasing teachers' flexibility at work	4.25	*0.83*	4.22	*0.97*	4.15	*0.83*
Having supervisors listen to concerns and offer solutions	4.16	*0.85*	4.1	*0.81*	4.08	*0.86*
Utilizing recognition programs and positive reinforcement	3.83	*1*	3.87	*0.99*	3.62	*0.92*
Increasing availability of personal and professional resources	3.95	*0.91*	4.19	*0.84*	3.63	*1*
Training on how to cope with stress	3.39	*1.16*	3.43	*1.14*	3.26	*1.08*
Practicing yoga or exercise programs	3.4	*1.12*	3.42	*1.23*	3.16	*1.14*
N	624		71		92	

Some notable discoveries from this study of responses are as follows:

1. Females responded more favorably to all alleviation methods when compared to males.

2. Elementary employees responded more favorably than secondary employees in all but two methods for alleviation.
3. The indicators of "Making effective use of time/ protecting planning or break time" and "Increasing flexibility at work" received the most favorable responses from teachers as opposed to those in other job categories (counselors, administrators, etc.) with 87.6% and 87.1% respectively reporting that they "strongly agree" or "agree" with these potential methods for stress alleviation.
4. The indicator "Providing additional supports in the work environment", while favorable overall, was especially favorable from administrators with 87.5% of them indicating that they "agree" or "strongly agree" with this as a potential way to alleviate stress in the workplace.

A two tailed independent samples T-test was run to gather statistical data on research question one and note significant findings. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 48 and Table 49.

Table 48

T-Tests for Between-Group Mean Differences

	Female	Black	Hispanic	White	Elementary	High School
Providing additional supports	0.33***	-0.02	0.57	-0.01	0.18**	-0.36***
Making curriculum changes	0.32**	0.05	0.45	-0.02	0.28***	-0.45***
Protecting planning or break time	0.32**	-0.02	-0.16	0.01	0.02	-0.02
Increasing teachers' flexibility at work	0.22*	0.02	0.18	-0.05	0.12	0
Having supervisors listen to concerns and offer solutions	0.2	-0.13	0.27	0.05	0.03	-0.25**
Utilizing recognition programs and positive reinforcement	0.06	0.23	0.46	-0.21	-0.12	0.01
Increasing availability of personal and professional resources	0.41***	0.09	0.63	-0.03	0.1	-0.19*
Training on how to cope with stress	0.17	0.53***	1.05*	-0.44**	0.03	-0.19
Practicing yoga or exercise programs	0.18	0.26	1.04*	-0.25*	-0.18*	-0.01
N	613	622	622	622	620	620

Table 49

Independent Samples T-Tests for Between-Group Differences, continued

	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Teacher	Younger
Providing additional supports	0.05	0.01	-0.04	0.15	-0.14
Making curriculum changes	-0.12	-0.06	0.13	-0.14	-0.07
Protecting planning or break time	0.06	0.11	-0.15*	-0.03	-0.07
Increasing teachers' flexibility at work	0.02	0.12	-0.13	-0.04	-0.11
Having supervisors listen to concerns and offer solutions	-0.09	0.06	-0.01	-0.07	-0.1
Utilizing recognition programs and positive reinforcement	0.07	-0.05	0	0.05	-0.25*
Increasing availability of personal and professional resources	0.1	-0.1	0.04	0.27*	-0.37***
Training on how to cope with stress	0.29*	-0.14	-0.03	0.04	-0.15
Practicing yoga or exercise programs	0.07	-0.01	-0.03	0.02	-0.27*
N	613	613	613	623	623

The demographic category of gender proved to be statistically significant as females proved to be more favorable on alleviation techniques of additional supports, curriculum changes, protecting planning time, and additional resources than their male colleagues. Therefore, we can reject the null and accept that these results are likely not due to chance.

The demographic category of ethnicity also proved to be statistically significant in one alleviation technique. Black and white respondents' preferences on conducting a training on how to cope with stress proved to be significant, therefore we can reject the null and assert that the result is likely not due to chance.

The demographic category of grade level proved to be statistically significant with three indicators. Elementary and secondary employees' responses on additional resources and curriculum changes proved to be significant. Additionally, high school respondents' thoughts on having supervisors listen proved to be significant as well. Because these three stress factors proved to be statistically significant in the demographic category of grade level, we can reject the null hypothesis and results are likely not due to chance. The remaining alleviation methods did not show statistical significance among grade level, so we fail to reject the null with those

categories as the results are likely due to chance.

In the demographic category of geographics, there was no statistical significance among any of the alleviation methods. Therefore, we fail to reject the null hypothesis for urban, suburban, and rural geographic areas and accept that the responses are likely due to chance.

In the demographic category of role/school position, there was no statistical significance among any of the stress factors. Therefore, we fail to reject the null hypothesis for different positions experiencing stress differently and accept that the responses are likely due to chance.

The demographic category of years of experience proved to be statistically significant in the area of availability of additional resources. More novice employees (0-3 years of experience) reported more favorably of this alleviation techniques than their more veteran (25+ years) colleagues. Therefore, with this technique and years of experience, we can reject the null and state that the results are not likely due to chance. Other alleviation methods did not show statistical significance across varying levels of experience, so we fail to reject the null with those and accept that the results are likely due to chance.

Respondent results from all other demographic indicators did not prove to be statistically significant, so we fail to reject the null on these and can assert that the results are likely due to chance.

Chapter V: Discussion

This chapter summarizes the overall research study and expands on the findings presented in Chapter Four. A summary of the study will be given, including the problem and purpose statements. Next, research questions explored by the researcher will be shared, and the methodology behind the study will be outlined. The chapter will close with the study's significance as well as its limitations. Major findings from the study in Chapter Four will be reviewed and cross analyzed with the data from the literature review in Chapter Two. Implications and recommendations for future research will also be shared.

Summary of the Study

Given the alarming rate of teacher turnover in Alabama, this dissertation aimed to identify the causes of high stress among teachers and also aimed to offer potential interventions to reduce teacher exits. Utilizing a survey of teachers in central Alabama, we worked to: (1) identify triggers for stress using Fimian's stress inventory and (2) identify potential alleviants to such stress. Individuals are leaving the education profession in record numbers, and approximately one half of new teachers are leaving the profession within the first five years (Aloe et al., 2014). Such high attrition rates affect student learning and school district management, and these combined factors are the basis for the problem by which the researcher developed this study. While these statistics have been reported by many across various medians throughout the years, it is important to explore and understand what factors might contribute to this alarming trend, leading researchers to engage with the topic more deeply. The purpose of this study was to identify sources of teacher stress, to identify at which points educators' have intentions to move from their current workplaces or leave the profession altogether, to examine

how educator stress manifests itself, and to identify strategies that will decrease stress for employees.

Research Questions

The research questions we sought to answer in an effort to meet the study's purpose are as follows:

1. What are the most pressing triggers for teacher stress, and do they differ by demographic and positional characteristics?
2. Do stress factors lead individuals to consider leaving their workplace or the profession, and do these intentions differ by demographic and positional characteristics?
3. How does workplace stress manifest itself among educators and do these reactions differ by demographic and positional characteristics?
4. What actions can be taken to help individuals cope with or alleviate stress and do these techniques differ by demographic and positional characteristics?

Methodology Review

A quantitative research study was completed to identify sources of stress in education employees in Alabama. In addition to identifying the sources of their stress in the workplace, we assessed their turnover intentions as a result of the stress, the ways in which the stress manifests itself, and how the stress could potentially be alleviated. The data collection instrument used in this study was a survey developed through Auburn Qualtrics. The survey was distributed to 2,900 certified employees across central Alabama. A link for the survey was emailed to superintendents in Autauga County, Elmore County, Chilton County, Coosa County, Montgomery County, Pike Road City, and Tallassee City Schools. From there, the district

leaders forwarded it on to their certified staffs as an “all users” email. The one exception to this was Montgomery County who sent it to their principals and asked them to distribute to the certified staffs in their buildings. Surveys were distributed beginning on October 6, 2022, and responses were received between October 6, 2022, and November 23, 2022. Responses were received from 773 individuals and 612 completed all questions, equating to a response rate of 21.1%. The JAMOVI software program (Version 2.3.18) was used to analyze the data.

Significance of Study

Educators are the cornerstone of our community and serve a vital role in developing our youth and our future. Unfortunately, education in our country is at a pivotal crossroads. With more employees leaving the profession than ever before and fewer coming into the work, the future is not as positive as it once was. Given the profession’s critical role in our society, we must proceed with efforts to uncover the reasons behind these unfortunate realities to secure a strong and viable future for students.

While the topic of stress among educators has been studied before, looking at which of those factors, if any, are resulting in them leaving the profession or considering leaving the profession will be a new contribution. Additionally, the gathering and sorting of data based on the unique geographic and demographic information we collected will also be a new addition to the research. The findings generated through this study are invaluable for our leaders when considering policy and procedure as well as legislation for the profession.

Major Findings

The data analysis conducted during this study was eye opening and confirmed much of what our research in chapter two showed to be true. Education employees are experiencing a great deal of workplace stress for many reasons, but the most notable ones that surfaced in our

study are multi-tasking/ having to do more than one thing at a time (77.3% of respondents indicating this is frequently or very frequently a problem), too much work to do (74.0% of respondents indicating this is frequently or very frequently a problem), too much paperwork (73.7% of respondents indicating this is frequently or very frequently a problem), not enough time to get things done (73.0% of respondents indicating this is frequently or very frequently a problem), and inadequate salary and/or benefits (70.6% of respondents indicating this is frequently or very frequently a problem). These top stressors for our respondents aligned directly with sentiments shared by teachers in the Stauffer and Mason study (2013) we referenced in Chapter two that stated 91% of teachers shared that instructional demands such as workload, responsibilities, time to accomplish teaching, and curriculum concerns brought about great stress for them in their work. Many shared that there is simply too much to do and too little time with which to do it. "Many of the stressors I feel as a teacher tend to fall under the heading of scheduling and required forms (activities, paperwork). Trying to fit everything in the allotted time we are given is the most difficult. This will cause panic, anxiety, and frustration" (p. 818). The results we gathered also aligned with work of Fernet et al. (2012), which cites that the most commonly reported triggers for stress among education employees relate to environmental factors within the workplace (p. 514).

After considering stress factors, respondents were asked to reflect upon their intentions to leave the workplace or profession. More than one half (52.1%) of respondents stated that they frequently or very frequently consider or have considered leaving their current workplace. Further, almost all (89.2%) have considered leaving their current work location at one point or another. Similarly, more than one half (51%) of respondents shared that they frequently or very frequently consider or have considered leaving the education profession altogether.

Furthermore, greater than 90% (90.6%) share that they have considered leaving the profession at one point or another. These statistics aligned with the work of Prilleltensky (2016) that was discussed in Chapter Two, which asserts that employees' stress is a direct link to the high attrition rates. (et al., 2016)

Respondents also considered how the workplace stress they experience manifests itself in their lives. Participants rated themselves in the areas of Emotional, Behavioral, and Fatigue Manifestations. Fatigue manifestations proved to be the most likely way employees' stress manifested itself. Of our participants, 59.4% shared that they frequently or very frequently experience this. Coming in a close second were emotional manifestations, as 50.1% of our respondents indicated they frequently or very frequently experience these manifestations. The Behavioral manifestations category garnered results that were almost opposite of the other two categories with only 22.9% stating they frequently or very frequently experienced this, and 60.4% sharing that they rarely or never saw their stress manifest in this way.

The final section of the survey asked respondents to reflect upon ways they believe stress in the workplace could be alleviated. They responded to nine mechanisms that could potentially be used to alleviate stress for them. Of the nine indicators, the most highly rated was that of "Making effective use of time/protecting planning time" garnering 85.2% of respondents "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing" with the concept. Next was "Increasing teachers' flexibility at work" with 81.7% agreeing or strongly agreeing. Rounding out the top three was "Providing additional supports and resources in the classroom or work environment" with 79.6% agreeing or strongly agreeing. Closely behind in fourth place was "Having supervisors listen to concerns and offer solutions" with 78.1% agreeing or strongly agreeing with this indicator. Much of the existing research supports these results as well. The 2018 study by Richards, Hemphill, and

Templin spoke to the importance of supplemental resources being available, including additional manpower. The same authors found that employees felt less stress when they worked in environments that were nurturing and supportive, further echoing the responses gathered in our study.

Each of the findings outlined in this section were overall findings that represented the entire response group as a whole. Additional data was collected by specific demographic categories as well, as outlined in Chapter Four.

Implications

Essentially, our education employees are stressed. The study proved this to be true and even gave some reasons behind their stress along with ways we can help to alleviate it. Furthermore, the stress plays a significant role in their decisions to stay in or leave the workplace or profession, but thankfully, there are some ways in which the stress can be potentially alleviated, making employees more likely to continue in their work.

This research expanded upon the literature presented in Chapter two. Some of our findings aligned with the previous research, and some went in a different direction. Results from our study aligned with the findings of Stauffer and Mason who cited instructional factors such as workload, excessive responsibilities, and time to get things completed were sources of stress for those in education. The same was true in our study. Ramas and Hughes (2020) also found workplace demands to be a source of stress and our findings aligned with their work as well. On the other hand, unlike the work conducted by Aloe et al. (2014), our research did not show evidence of student discipline being a top source of stress for employees. Although student discipline did prove to be a source of stress, it was not one of the top categories reported.

The study participants' responses regarding ways to alleviate stress were closely aligned with the relief mechanisms outlined by Stauffer and Mason (2013), as well. Protecting break time/ planning time as well as providing additional supports for employees were themes that emerged from both studies.

The study added valuable research to the field, especially through breaking down information by specific demographic categories, evaluating turnover intentions, and looking at how stress manifests itself in employees. While previous studies primarily focused on what causes stress and how it can be alleviated, our study took additional steps to contribute additional information to the current body of research. Some of the results we found by demographics included the following:

1. Classroom teachers rated the factors "too little time to prepare", "too much paperwork", "monitoring student behavior" and "discipline problems in the classroom" as a higher source of stress for them than did other job categories. On the other hand, administrators indicated that "multi-tasking/doing more than one thing at a time" as a higher stress factor than other categories of employees.
2. All school grade levels rated "too little time to prepare", "too much paperwork", "multi-tasking", and "not enough time to prepare" as a strong source of stress for them, as the "very frequently" selection was the top choice among all school types. The same was true for the "too much to do" indicator, although the greatest percentage was among those working in elementary schools.

3. The “school day being too fast paced” was more of a stress factor among middle/junior high teachers than it was for those at the high school or elementary level.
4. Student discipline and behavior was rated as more of a stress factor for elementary and middle school employees than it was for high school employees.
5. “Personal opinions not being aired” and “lack of control with decisions” showed to be more of a stress factor for elementary employees than it did for secondary employees.
6. The top five stress factors overall were all rated “very frequently” by a majority across all geographic school districts (urban, suburban, and rural)
7. Employees across all levels of experience considered “inadequate salary and benefits” a “very frequent” source of stress for them.
8. Early career educators indicated “lack of opportunities for improvement” as a concern for them more than that of veteran employees.
9. Employees across all experience levels indicated “poorly motivated kids” as a top stressor for them. The same was true for stress indicators of “not enough time to get things done”, “multi-tasking”, and “little time to relax.”
10. Males reported lower rates of stress around the areas of student discipline than females.

This information gives education employees, and specifically, education leaders great data by which to make policy and procedure decisions. Although school leaders did not make up the majority of the respondents, the information generated from this study is as important to

leaders as any other study. Leaders regularly face staff challenges and personnel vacancies. Being armored with this information helps them to lead schools and districts that are more aware of the stress involved with the work and alleviation methods that may be effective. This can assist them with planning as well as help them to create a climate that supports employees and increases retention. Based on the research obtained through our study, school decision makers should consider working diligently to try to minimize paperwork and additional duties, protect planning and break times for employees, support their efforts with a listening ear, and support employees with additional resources if possible. Specifically, leaders can:

- Protect employee planning or break time as much as possible. There are, of course, times when employees will need to be present for meetings with parents or colleagues, but limiting these as much as possible or shortening them so some of their break time is still preserved is a great idea. Additionally, leaders and schools may consider options where additional break/ planning times are built in to days when their scheduled break may not be available to them. For example, if employees are required to give up their planning time for a grade level meeting one day, maybe arrange for them to have a duty-free lunch in order to still give them a break at some point through the day.
- Limit paperwork when possible. Time that employees spend doing excess paperwork is time spent away from their students and their primary work. If a teacher has to complete an hour of paperwork at his or her desk, that's an hour less of high-quality instruction the students aren't receiving. Some paperwork is a necessary part of the work, but when possible, eliminating excess paperwork will benefit all parties.

Recommendations for Future Research

As a result of the findings of this study and a review of the relevant related research, the researcher makes the following recommendations for future research on the topic of stress in education employees:

1. Conduct this study in other geographical regions. This study was limited to central Alabama. Survey other areas in the state of Alabama, the state as a whole, or even the United States overall to see if results are different for education employees in other areas.
2. Potentially add in personal factors for employees to report on. Some of these may include having them report on their own self-efficacy, resilience, coping mechanisms, intrinsic or extrinsic motivation, or lifestyle information. Research asserts that employees' personal factors play into their levels of stress just as the contextual factors of their workplace do. It may be interesting to see those and compare.
3. Add in a stress indicator centered around high stakes testing as well as on regarding lack of support/appreciation for their work and allow for them to rate those as well. Fimian's (1988) model didn't include those so they weren't included in this study, but there is a lot of research that suggests these two factors are a source of stress for education employees and adding them in would likely make the study even stronger.

Conclusion

This study expanded on the existing research related to workplace stress in education employees. To put it simply, our education employees have, among other things, too much to do

and not enough time to do it. The levels of stress they're experiencing because of this is causing them to consider leaving their workplaces and the profession overall. They want their break times to be protected, extra supports in place to assist with their workloads, and leadership that will hear their concerns and respond with solutions.

While the findings were somewhat defeating, there was also great support for options that would make the workplace environments less stressful giving great options for moving forward. Often, educational structures are organized and trickled down to schools from the state level and district office putting them out of the control of local school administration, but there are also some things involving decisions within the building that school leaders can guide and influence to help alleviate stress for their teachers and staff. Several of the top ways our survey respondents said their stress could be alleviated are in that category of things the local school can control. Furthermore, transformational leadership styles have been shown to be successful in causing lower levels of stress for employees (Cemaloglu, 2011), so embracing those practices as a district or school level leader may be helpful in eliminating stress for the employees

References

Aloe, A. M., Shisler, S. M., Norris, B. D., Nickerson, A. B., & Rinker, T. W. (2014). A multivariate meta-analysis of student misbehavior and teacher burnout. *Educational Research Review*, *12*, 30–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2014.05.003

Benons, A. (2020). High School Principals' Behaviors in Title 1 and Non-Title 1 Schools that Retain Educators- A Comparative Case Study (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest (No. 27726370)

Boshoff, S. M., Potgieter, J. C., Ellis, S. M., Mentz, K., & Malan, L. (2018). Validation of the teacher stress inventory (TSI) in a multicultural context: The SABPA study. South African Journal of Education, 38(Supplement 2), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v38ns2a1491

Bowen, D. & Siehl, C. (1997). The Future of Human Resources Management: March and Simon (1958) Revisited. *Human Resource Management*, 36(1), 57-63.

Cemaloğlu, N. (2011). Primary principals' leadership styles, school organizational health and workplace bullying. (2011). *Journal of Educational Administration*, *49*(5), 495–512. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111159511

Deater-Deckard, K., Ivy, L., & Smith, J. (2006). Resilience in gene-environment transactions. *The handbook of resilience in children* (pp. 49-63). New York, NY: Kluwer.

El Helou, M., Nabhani, M., & Bahous, R. (2016). Teachers' views on causes leading to their burnout. *School Leadership & Management*, *36*(5), 551–567. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2016.1247051

Esther, A. & Viljayalakshmi, S. (2020). A Study on Stress Among Working Women. UGC Care Journal, 40(40). ISSN:2394-3114

Eyal, O., & Roth, G. (2011). Principals' leadership and teachers' motivation: Self-determination theory analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *49*(3), 256–275. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111129055

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, *39*(2), 175–191. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146

Fernet, C., Guay, F., Senécal, C., & Austin, S. (2012). Predicting intraindividual changes in teacher burnout: The role of perceived school environment and motivational factors. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *28*(4), 514–525. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.11.013

Fimian, M. (1988). *Teacher Stress Inventory*. Clinical Physchology Publishing Co. Brandon, VT.

Harry, J. (2020). Stress Management and Employee Performance. European Journal of Human Resource Management Studies, (4)1. http://www.oapub.org/soc doi:10.5281/zenodo.3732204

Hong, J. Y. (2012). Why do some beginning teachers leave the school, and others stay? Understanding teacher resilience through psychological lenses. *Teachers and Teaching*, *18*(4), 417–440. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2012.696044

Hom, P., Lee, T., Shaw, J., & Hauskenecht, J. (2017). One hundred years of employee turnover theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology 102*(3), 530-545.

Jordan, R. (2020). I'm not Alone: A Case Study of Teacher Retention and Professional Learning Communities in an Urban School District (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Marshall Digital Scholar.

Khojah, A. & Aaif, F. (2020). Mentoring Matters in the Workplace: The Impact of Formal Mentoring on Instructors' Performance. Journal of Education Administration, 13(4) https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n4p140

Kodavatiganti, K., & Bulusu, V. (2011). Stress Indicators and its Impact on Educators. *SIES Journal of Management*, *7*(2), 88–96.

Kourmousi, N., Darviri, C., Varvogli, L., & Alexopoulos, E. (2015). Teacher stress inventory: Validation of the Greek version and perceived stress levels among 3,447 educators. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 81. https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S74752

Parker, P. D., Martin, A. J., Colmar, S., & Liem, G. A. (2012). Teachers' workplace well-being: Exploring a process model of goal orientation, coping behavior, engagement, and burnout. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *28*(4), 503–513. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.01.001

Patterson, J. (2003). *Coming Even Cleaner About Organizational Change*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Prilleltensky, I., Neff, M., & Bessell, A. (2016). Teacher Stress: What It Is, Why It's Important, How It Can be Alleviated. *Theory Into Practice*, *55*(2), 104–111. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2016.1148986

Raja, S. & Kanagaraj, G. (2020). A Conceptual Study of Work Life Balance and

Stress Management Among Women Employees. International Journal of Management, 11(2). http://www.iaeme.com/IJM/issues.asp

Ramos, D. & Galleto, P. (2020). The Interplay Between Work-Life Balance Practices and Productivity Among Public Secondary School Teachers. American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development (AJMRD), 2(3). www.ajmrd.com

Ramos, G. & Hughes, T. R. (2020). Could more holistic policy addressing school discipline help Mitigate teacher attrition? eJournal of Education Policy, 21(1). http://doi.org/10.37803/ejepS2002

Richards, K. A., Hemphill, M. A., & Templin, T. J. (2018). Personal and contextual factors related to teachers' experience with stress and burnout. *Teachers and Teaching*, *24*(7), 768–787. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2018.1476337

Stauffer, S. D., & Mason, E. C. M. (2013). Addressing Elementary School Teachers' Professional Stressors: Practical Suggestions for Schools and Administrators. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *49*(5), 809–837. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X13482578

Wang, W. & Sun, R. (2018). Does organizational performance affect employee turnover? John Wiley & Sons. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6997-5752. DOI: 10.1111/padm.12648.

Zysberg, L., Orenshtein, C., Gimmon, E., & Robinson, R. (2017). Emotional intelligence, personality, stress, and burnout among educators. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *24*(Suppl 1), 122–136. https://doi.org/10.1037/str0000028