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ABSTRACT

Rosse-Richards, Kevin Andrew. Ph.D., Purdue University, December 2013. Understanding Teacher/Coach Role Stressors and Burnout. Major Professor: Thomas J. Templin.

Teaching has long been considered a stressful profession and is becoming even more stressful because of recent changes in state- and national-level educational policies that govern K-12 education. Teachers who take on additional, extracurricular roles, such as athletic coaching, may be even more prone to stress and burnout. Using occupational socialization theory and role theory, the purpose of this dissertation was to develop a more comprehensive understanding of role stressors, burnout, and resilience among teacher/coaches and non-coaching teachers. The study was divided into two phases. In phase one, 415 teachers (209 teacher/coaches, 206 non-coaching teachers) across a variety of academic disciplines in the American Midwest completed an online survey related to their feelings of role stressors, burnout, and resilience. These data were analyzed using factorial ANOVAs, exploratory and confirmatory factory analysis, multiple linear regression, and structural equation modeling. Results indicate that, while teacher/coaches and non-coaching teachers vary on some elements of role stressors, burnout, and resilience, the two groups share more similarities than differences. Structural equation modeling demonstrated that selected role stressors and components of
burnout influence teachers’ ability to develop resilient capacities. Finally, exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis resulted in the development and validation of a scale specifically intended to measure teacher/coach role conflict. In phase two, a subset of participants were invited to participate in interviews based on their perceived levels of role stressors and burnout. At the completion of this dissertation, phase two was still ongoing, but initial insights from the interviews are discussed. The results of this study speak to the importance of teachers’ cognitive and emotional wellbeing. Implications for reducing role stressors and burnout and for fostering resilience are discussed at length.
CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION

What was once primarily an interaction between students and teachers in the relatively self-contained and autonomous context of the classroom has been made increasingly complex by state and federal government mandates for teacher accountability in education (Kliebard, 2004). This is best exemplified by the No Child Left Behind Act (US Department of Education, 2002) which ushered high stakes testing and teacher- and school-level accountability into the national education discourse. These developments in education have had several significant and varied impacts on the roles played by teachers. For example, Michael Apple (1986, 2000) has noted that the increasingly bureaucratization and hierarchical structuring of education has led to the deskilling and proletarianization of teachers’ work. That is, as state and federal governments continue to take on an increased role in structure and function of classroom interactions, the teacher’s role diminishes into one with the primary responsibility for controlling and managing student interactions. During this process of deskilling, there is also evidence to indicate that teachers’ workloads are being increased as schools transform into capitalist entities that seek to get as much out of teachers as possible while minimizing wages in order to meet budgets (Sinclair, Ironside, & Seifert, 1996).

Importantly, changes in the structure of education have implications for the ways in which the role of school teacher is defined as well as the expectations key stakeholders have for the enactment of the teacher role. Teaching is not the same profession it was 20-
30 years ago and, as a result, the way that teachers are prepared and held accountable and rewarded for their role performance is also likely to change. To further complicate matters, beyond their primary instructional roles, teachers are also expected to engage in additional auxiliary roles (e.g., department chair, interscholastic sport coach) that may contribute to increased role stress, conflict, and burnout. This is especially true in the field of physical education in which teachers are often expected to take on extracurricular sport-supervision roles (Konukman, Agbuga, Erdogan, Zorba, & Demirhan, 2010). Combined with life challenges outside the school, varied roles and role stressors call for increased resilience (Gu & Day, 2007) and role balance (Marks & MacDermid, 1996). This is imperative given that teachers who have difficulty meeting the challenges of difficult workplace conditions often transition out of teaching (Ingersoll, 2001).

The theoretical perspective of role theory (Linton, 1936; Merton, 1957; Parsons, 1951) has been employed to describe and explain the role of school teacher (Merton, 1957; Parsons, 1961; Wilson, 1962). Role theory uses a theatre metaphor to help explain how individuals in particular social positions are expected to act and how they expect others to act (Hindin, 2007). Individuals are held accountable for their performance through internally and externally enforced norms and sanctions (B. J. Biddle, 1986; Turner, 2001). Among the key concepts of role theory are the role stressors of role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload. Role conflict occurs when the requirements of a single role (intra-role conflict) become overly stressful and difficult to perform, or when individuals occupy multiple roles (inter-role conflict) and lack the time, energy, or resources to perform them well (Hindin, 2007; Stryker, 2001). Role ambiguity occurs when the requirements for the performance of a role are too vague to appropriately guide
behavior (Conley & You, 2009). When a work role becomes overwhelming due to the number of responsibilities that it involves, role overload may occur (B. J. Biddle, 1986).

One particular application of role conflict in the physical education literature is the notion of teacher/coach (T/C) role conflict. T/C role conflict occurs as a result of combining the roles of teacher and athletic coach and is influenced by individual, school, and community factors (Richards & Templin, 2012). Previous research in this area has focused primarily on the experience of physical education T/Cs and has documented that inconsistencies in goal, reward, and accountability structures predispose T/Cs to role conflict (Konukman et al., 2010). As a result, when T/Cs are forced to make choices about role priorities, coaching is often preferred (Millslagle & Morley, 2004). While many T/Cs experience conflict, evidence indicates that certain individuals can thrive in both roles and achieve role balance (Pagnano & Griffin, 2005; Voydanoff, 2002).

The processes through which one learns to become a teacher as well as the socializing agents involved in such a process are important to understanding how individuals view and prioritize the different roles they play in and around the school. Although traditional, functional models of socialization positioned the teacher as a passive recipient of socialization (Merton, Reader, & Kendall, 1957), contemporary theory views teachers as active participants in a socialization process that is both individual and dialectical (Schempp & Graber, 1992; Zeichner & Gore, 1990).

Occupational socialization theory (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b; Templin & Schempp, 1989b) has been developed in the physical education literature to explain “all of the kinds of socialization that initially influence persons to enter the field of physical education and
that later are responsible for their perceptions and actions as teacher educators and teachers” (Lawson, 1986, p. 107).

Occupational socialization theory examines socialization occurring across three phases: acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization. In addition to helping researchers understand the ways in which teachers are drawn to and socialized into teaching, this theoretical framework also helps to explain the development of orientations toward teaching and coaching, which are related to the extent to which role conflict and burnout are experienced by T/Cs and non-coaching teachers (NCTs) in the school context (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Lawson, 1983b). Differences in role conflict and burnout in T/Cs and NCTs can also be examined and explained through the use of occupational socialization theory.

Related to role conflict and socialization is the construct of burnout. According to Maslach and Jackson (1986), burnout is a multidimensional syndrome marked by exhaustion and withdrawal from one’s work which results from prolonged exposure to stress. It has been found to consist of three dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach, Jackson, & Schwab, 1996). Individuals who experience higher levels of role conflict have been found to express lower levels of job satisfaction (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001; Netemeyer, Johnston, & Burton, 1990) and higher levels of burnout (Byrne, 1999; Drake & Hebert, 2002). While it is unclear whether or not T/Cs experience higher rates of burnout than NCTs (Drake & Hebert, 2002), moderate to high levels of burnout have been cited among T/Cs (Kosa, 1990). When T/Cs become dissatisfied with their work and burned out, they become more likely experience poor health (Guglielmi & Tatrow,
1998), emotionally withdraw from teaching (Day & Gu, 2009) and provide less effective instruction (Rudow, 1999; Shann, 1998).

**Statement of the Problem**

Research using role theory and occupational socialization theory in physical education has provided a wealth of information related to the development and socialization of NCTs and T/Cs in physical education. However, there are several gaps to still be filled. Significantly, it is important to learn more about the ways in which teachers outside of physical education experience T/C role conflict. Research on T/C role conflict has focused almost exclusively on physical education teachers to the neglect of teachers in other subjects. Since teachers across all disciplines coach, it can be expected that all will experience some degree of conflict. However, since reward and accountability systems are different for teachers of core subjects (e.g., math, English, science), it is likely that their experiences will differ from those of non-core subjects (e.g., physical education, art, music). Locke and Messengale’s (1978) findings provide initial support for this supposition by illustrating that classroom T/Cs experience role conflict, but to a lesser degree than their counterparts in physical education. Furthermore, the current literature does not provide insight into the ways in which role conflict among T/Cs compares to which manifests in NCTs.

In addition to developing a more comprehensive understanding of T/C role conflict, it is also imperative to more fully investigate the ways in which T/Cs experience burnout in relation to NCTs. While some research has been done related to burnout in T/Cs (Drake & Hebert, 2002; Kelley & Gill, 1993; Kosa, 1990), results for these studies are inconsistent and far from conclusive and no study has directly compared T/C burnout
to that in NCTs. Further, little information is available to help explain how teacher resilience and role balance are related to role conflict and burnout. It is probable that T/Cs and NCTs who are able to develop a strong sense of role balance and use resilience strategies effectively can avoid some of the negative consequences associated with role conflict and burnout.

**Purpose and Research Questions**

Using role theory and socialization theory, the purpose of this investigation was to examine the ways in which T/Cs who are affiliated with different academic subjects and also engage in a variety of sport coaching roles experience and navigate role conflict and burnout in comparison to NCTs. In particular, the study explored the constructs of role stressors, burnout, and resilience in T/Cs and NCTs from different school contexts who were teaching and coaching at different school levels. The following research questions guided the investigation:

1. How do T/Cs and NCTs compare on levels of role stressors, resilience, and burnout?

2. How do teachers of core subjects (e.g., mathematics, science) compare to those in non-core subjects (e.g., physical education, art) on levels of role stressors, burnout, and resilience?

3. How does coaching status (T/C or NCT) and subject assignment (core or non-core subject) interact in the experience of role conflict, burnout, and resilience?

4. How do role stressors, the components of burnout, and resilience vary by gender, teaching level, and teaching context?
5. How do role stressors relate to the components of burnout and resilience?

6. How do the components of burnout relate to resilience?

7. How do role stressors and the components of burnout collectively predict teachers’ ability to develop resilience?

8. How do organizational and personal factors influence role conflict and burnout?

9. How do T/Cs and NCTs compare in resilience to demanding professional and personal circumstance?

10. What strategies do TCs and NCTs use to regulate role conflict and burnout?

Research questions 1-7 will be addressed in phase one of the study and research questions 8-10 will be addressed in phase two. Based upon previous research grounded in role theory and occupational socialization theory, the following hypotheses are linked to the aforementioned research questions and informed the design of the investigation:

1. T/Cs of core subjects receive more support and accountability for their teaching and experience less role conflict than T/Cs of non-core subjects.

2. T/Cs of popular sports (e.g., football, basketball) will experience more conflict regardless of subject affiliation than those who coach sports that are associated with less community attention (e.g., tennis, track and field).

3. Male and female T/Cs will experience different levels of role conflict.

4. T/Cs and NCTs who experience higher levels of role conflict will also experience higher levels of burnout than those who experience lower levels of role conflict.
5. Higher levels of resilience and the experience of role balance will correlate with lower levels of role conflict and burnout.

6. T/Cs will report higher levels of role conflict and burnout than NCTs when accounting for other factors.

7. More experienced T/Cs and NCTs will express lower levels of role conflict and burnout than their less experienced counterparts.

Definition of Terms

Acculturation: The first phase of Occupational Socialization which begins at birth and continues until the individual makes a decision to enter formal professional preparation. During this period the individual begins to develop impressions of what it means to be a good teacher and learns by observing the actions of parents, teachers, and coaches (Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008).

Burnout: A multidimensional syndrome marked by exhaustion and withdrawal from one’s work as the result of prolonged stress (Maslach & Jackson, 1986). Burnout consists of three interrelated domains: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996).

Custodianship: A response to the environment of a school in which the novice internalizes the system that is in place without challenging the structures operating in the setting (Stroot & Ko, 2006).

Depersonalization: Teachers' unfeeling and impersonal response toward students or colleagues (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996).

Emotional Exhaustion: Feeling of being emotionally overextended and fatigued from teaching (Maslach & Jackson, 1986).
**Internalized Adjustment:** A strategy for approaching a new school in which a beginning teacher elects to adopt the policies and procedures operating in the setting and forfeits any previously held beliefs that conflict with those promoted by the setting (Skelton, 1990).

**Interrole Conflict:** “When a person plays roles that call for contradictory kinds of actions, such as kindness versus aggressiveness, openness versus scheming, or impartial judgment versus friendly or familial bias, we speak of interrole conflict” (Turner, 2001, pp. 245-246). In such a situation, it may be necessary for the individual to sacrifice performance to a degree in each role (Parsons, 1966).

**Intrarole Conflict:** Intrarole conflict occurs when internally contradictory expectations make the role complex and ambiguous. Intrarole conflict also ensues when the focal role is met with contradictory alter roles. Roles which incorporate multiple functions also lead to conflict. Limited time and resources often preclude equal attention being given to all functions (Turner, 2001).

**Occupational Socialization Theory:** “All kinds of socialization that initially influence persons to enter the field of physical education and later are responsible for their perceptions and actions as teacher educators and teachers” (Lawson, 1986, p. 107). Organizational socialization consists of the phases of acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization.

**Organizational Socialization:** The third phase of Occupational Socialization which is marked by socialization that occurs on the job and is the, “process by which one is taught and learns the ropes of a particular organizational role” (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 211).
**Professional Life Phases:** A teacher’s perceived effectiveness could be understood by examining teachers within and between six particular phases of their professional lives (Day, Sammons, Stobart, Kington, & Gu, 2007; 0-3; 4-7; 8-15; 16-23; 24-30; 31+ years of teaching). One’s workplace and personal life experiences interact in a non-linear way to create a variation in experience across life phases (Day & Gu, 2010; Day et al., 2007).

**Professional Socialization:** The second phase of Occupational Socialization which is marked by formal teacher training, typically in a university setting (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008).

**Overall Burnout:** A term used to refer to the onetime, self-reported assessment of aggregated emotional exhaustion, the core of the burnout process (Carson, 2006; Kalliath, O'Driscoll, Gillespie, & Bluedorn, 2000; Lee & Ashforth, 1996).

**Reality Shock:** “The collapse of missionary ideals formed during teacher training by the harsh and rude reality of everyday classroom life” (Veenman, 1984, p. 143). Reality shock is most likely to occur when teaching situations are different than those they were exposed to during teacher education (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009).

**Reduced Personal Accomplishment:** Diminished feelings of competence and successful achievement in teachers' work with people (Maslach & Jackson, 1986).

**Role:** The behaviors associated with a particular social status. Merton (1957) described a role as the dynamic aspect of a status, but contemporary authors have confused the terms and often use role and status interchangeably (Turner, 2001).
**Role Ambiguity:** Role ambiguity is a condition in which role expectations are too vague or are incomplete, which lessens to degree to which the role can guide behavior (B. J. Biddle, 1986).

**Role and Person Merger:** A situation in which a role becomes central to an individual’s sense of self (Stryker, 2001). An individual’s behavior is often evaluated based upon the norms applying to a particular status (Davis, 1966). Roles most closely tied to an individual’s identity are most predictive of individual behavior (Stryker, 1968).

**Role Balance:** Rather than only allowing for salience hierarchies, the theory of role balance emphasizes that individuals are most comfortable and happy when they are able to achieve a state in which they enjoy filling all roles (Marks & MacDermid, 1996). Rather than being hierarchial, roles can be arranged in relation to one another and temporal salience (e.g., work role during the day, parental role at night).

**Role Conformity:** Refers to a degree of compliance with a pattern of associated role behavior and often arises out of modeling and social imitation (B. J. Biddle, 1986). There is some disagreement as to whether conformity arises from norms, beliefs, or preferences for behavior.

**Role Consensus:** Denotes the assumption made by role theorists that an agreement in expectations is held by incumbents of specific roles (B. J. Biddle, 1986). Since universal expectations are held by all social actors in a particular role, the actors hold themselves and others accountable for the performance of that role via sanctions. Consensus is most likely to occur when individuals have been socialized in a similar way and/or have similar interaction experiences (Hindin, 2007).
**Role Conflict:** Occurs when the actor is exposed to conflicting sets of role expectations so that complete fulfillment of both is realistically impossible (B. J. Biddle, 1986). It provokes a confrontation between role incumbents and societal or cultural expectations (Hindin, 2007). This can be exacerbated when the element of conflict is present at level of institutionalized role expectations (Parsons, 1966). Role conflict can be divided into intrarole and interrole conflict.

**Role Overload:** Occurs when people play more roles than they have the time, energy, or resources to do properly (Hindin, 2007). Interrole and intrarole conflict go beyond role overload by requiring behavior in one role that violates the values in another (Turner, 2001).

**Role Persistence:** The tendency for role structures, once stabilized, to persist in spite of changes in the actors who play the roles (Turner, 2001). The group comes to depend on having someone perform each role’s function.

**Role Retreatism:** Occurs when the pressure and time restraints of teaching and coaching force the individual to prioritize one role over the others (Millslagle & Morley, 2004). Factors which contribute to role retreatism include time restraints, preference, role overload, role expectations, rewards systems, unavoidable conflict situations, role strain, and conflict between teacher/coaches and non-coaching teachers (Darst & Pangrazi, 2006; Millslagle & Morley, 2004; Templin, 1980b).

**Role-Set:** The complement of role relations in which persons are involved by virtue of occupying particular social statuses. A role-set is different than multiple roles. Multiple roles refers to the fact that individuals are involved in multiple social statuses (i.e., they play multiple roles), whereas role-set refers to the complex of roles associated
with a single status (Merton, 1957). A teacher has a role-set for the principal, school board, parents, children, etc.

**Role Strain:** Refers to the difficulty of meeting the normative expectations for roles in which an individual is involved (Hindin, 2007). Role strain results from the performance or fear of performance at a low level, from role overload, or from intrarole and interrole conflict. It is most intense when stemming from roles that have become merged with the actor’s identity (Turner, 2001).

**Role Theory:** Designed to help explain how individual in specific social positions are expected to act and how they expect others to act (Hindin, 2007). Role theory examines the actions and interactions of social actors through the use of a theatre metaphor: “the vision is of actors playing parts in scripts written by culture and shaped by evolutionary adaptation” (Stryker, 2001). Individuals behave in distinct and predictable ways depending upon their social identities and the situation (B. J. Biddle, 1986).

**Status:** Refers to one’s position within the social structure. Each status has an associated set of roles and role expectations from varying role-sets (Merton, 1957).

**Strategic Compliance:** A strategy for approaching the school setting in which a teacher makes a conscious decision to conform to the status quo of the school, but has personal reservations about doing so (Lacey, 1977).

**Strategic Redefinition:** A strategy for approaching the school setting in which a teacher sets out to change the policies and procedures operating in the school even though he or she may not have the formal power to do so (Scarth, 1987). This is typically
accomplished by convincing those with formal power to alter their interpretations of the status quo (Skelton, 1990).

**Teacher Attrition:** The term used to describe teachers who leave the profession of teaching and seek employment in another area (Ingersoll, 2001).

**Teacher Burnout:** Maslach’s (1982, 1993) three dimensions of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment will be used to examine and refer to teacher burnout.

**Teacher/Coach Role Conflict:** Role conflict resulting from the combination of the roles of school teacher and athletic coach. While some research indicates that individuals occupying both roles may be able to achieve a sense of role balance (O’Connor & Macdonald, 2002; Pagnano & Griffin, 2005), role conflict appears to be a common experience among teacher/coaches (Locke & Massengale, 1978; T. D. Ryan, 2008; Templin, Sparkes, Grant, & Schempp, 1994). Richards and Templin (2012) have proposed a multidimensional model of teacher/coach role conflict to account for variations in the degree to which individuals experience and navigate role conflict, which will be used to frame the present study.

**Teacher Resilience:** “The capacity to ‘bounce back’, to recover strengths or spirit quickly, and efficiently in the face of adversity” (Day & Gu, 2010, p. 156). Resilience is linked to the interactive impact of personal, professional and situated factors on teachers’ work and commitment (Gu & Day, 2007)

**Washout Effect:** A process in which the knowledge, skills, and dispositions instilled during undergraduate training fail to translate into the beginning teacher’s classroom (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981).
Limitations

Several limitations were identified prior to the start of the study that must be taken into consideration when interpreting the results. They included:

1. Participants in the study were recruited from three adjacent school districts in the American Midwest. This has potential implications for the generalizability of results beyond the Midwest as teachers from other regions of the United States may have different experiences with role stressors, burnout, and resilience.

2. All of the teachers in the study were currently employed at a school and, therefore, had not left the profession due to extreme emotional exhaustion. Thus, this study is more likely to capture feelings of burnout than actual burnout which results in attrition.

3. This study relied primarily on self-reported measures of burnout, role conflict, and resilience. It is possible that individuals may have flawed perceptions of these constructs and data may have been more accurate if it had been collected through direct measures and non-participatory observation.

4. Since some aspects of the study are retrospective, at times the investigator relied on teachers’ ability to recall events that happened in the past. Since individuals tend to process information and change their impressions of events over time (Brewer, Van Raalte, Linders, & Van Raalte, 1991), it is likely that different data would have emerged if the entire study had been conducted in real time.

5. Previous research related to T/C role conflict has indicated that the experiences of role conflict may vary according to whether or not the sport coached is in-season or out of season (T. D. Ryan, 2008). Since data collection was limited to a
specified period and one survey instance, it was not possible to definitively
determine the impact of season-status on teachers’ experience of T/C role conflict.

6. Teacher may have been attracted to the study because they enjoy talking about
their lived experiences or may have felt as if their principal wanted them to
participate. Thus, the participants may not represent a true random sample.

**Delimitations**

Several delimitations were identified. Caution should be used prior to making
claims of generalizability for the following reasons:

1. Data collected through qualitative methods may have limited generalizability to
teachers in other circumstances (Patton, 2002).

2. Participants for semi-structured interviews were chosen via stratified purposive
sampling techniques (Patton, 2002).

3. Teachers were recruited from within the surrounding area of West Lafayette, IN.

4. Indiana has adopted teacher accountability measures that include performance-
based pay incentives. Since this is likely to impact these teachers’ experiences of
role conflict and burnout, the results may have limited generalizability to teachers
in states that have not adopted similar assessment methods.

**Assumptions**

Several assumptions were made prior to the conception of this investigation.

These include:

1. Since surveys were distributed online, it is assumed that the teacher was the
person actually completing the questionnaires and that they were completed
truthfully and honestly.
2. Teachers responded to semi-structured interview questions openly and honestly.
3. Teachers would vary considerably in their levels of burnout and role conflict so that they could be categorized into grouping according to high, moderate, and low role conflict and burnout.
4. The teachers were assumed to be representative of a larger population of public school teachers in the American Midwest.

**Significance of the Study**

While several studies have investigated T/C role conflict among physical education teachers, few have sought to understand T/C role conflict in teachers of other subject areas. By extending T/C role conflict research to other subject areas, this study fills a significant gap in the literature as many T/Cs teach outside of physical education. This study also opens a new line of inquiry into the impact of teachers’ non-teaching responsibilities on their perceptions of role stressors and burnout. Since teachers often take roles other than and in addition to that of coach (e.g., department head, student organization supervisor, etc.), this study should open new lines of research related to the impact of auxiliary roles on role conflict and burnout. Furthermore, the study provides evidence toward better understanding the way in which T/C role stressors and burnout compares to role stressors and burnout among NCTs. Understanding the differences between T/Cs and NCTs is an imperative step as the results of this study provide evidence that may lead policymakers and school administration to question the assignment of multiple non-teaching roles to school teachers.
Broadly, this study is important because it provides information toward the understanding of the socialization and lived experiences of teachers. Such information, Day and colleagues (2007) note is important because Teachers matter. They matter to the education and achievement of their students and, more and more, to their personal and social wellbeing. No educational reform has achieved success without teachers committing themselves to it; no school has improved without the commitment of teachers; and although some students learn despite their teachers, most learn because of them – not just because of what and how they teach, but, because of who they are. (p. 1).

If we truly want to understand who teachers are, we need to understand their lives beyond the classroom; both within and outside of the context of schools. By exploring the ways in which the auxiliary role of coach impacts teachers’ lived experiences, this study takes an important step in this direction.

**Perceptivity and Biases**

When engaging in research, there is always the potential for the researcher’s perspective and biases to influence the investigation. While bias can never be totally eliminated, it is possible to manage it through reflecting on one’s position within the study and making methodological decisions to ensure trustworthiness (Patton, 2002). This section of the dissertation will serve to better position my own subjectivity within the study as a researcher of T/C role conflict in physical education. Steps taken to enhance trustworthiness and methodological rigor will be elaborated upon in the methods section of the dissertation (Chapter Three).
Prior to coming to Purdue University I completed a student teaching experience and received a bachelor’s of science in physical education from Springfield College (MA) and a license to teach physical education in the state of Massachusetts. After fulfilling my degree requirements in the spring of 2008, I immediately applied to and was accepted into the master’s degree program at Purdue University and began studying in the fall of 2008. I subsequently transitioned from the master’s program into the doctoral in the summer of 2010. As a result of my direct route from bachelors through Ph.D., I have never taught in the schools as a physical education teacher. Therefore, I do not have firsthand experience of what it is like to experience the multiple roles of teacher and coach or the role conflict and burnout that can result from such a position. All of the knowledge that I bring to this investigation related to teacher socialization and role theory come from my second hand, anecdotal observations of other teachers, primary research that I have completed as part of my master’s and doctoral programs, and my review of the literature. This has had a large impact on my perceptivity because I was not be able to precisely understand what participants experienced as T/Cs and NCTs operating in a school setting.

It should be noted that, even though I have never held a teaching position, I still have spent countless hours observing my own teachers as I matriculated through my elementary and secondary education experiences and continue to observe teachers in school settings on a weekly basis. I also coached high school baseball in Massachusetts for three years prior to completing my bachelor’s degree. Additionally, I have taken advantage of different teaching opportunities that have allowed me to continue interacting with students and improving my skills as a teacher. For example, for the last
several years I have worked at sport-oriented summer camps in which I have been responsible for teaching movement concepts and sport-related skills to children. Additionally, for the last six years I have been employed at Purdue as a teaching assistant and have been responsible for teaching multiple skills and methods courses for beginning physical education teacher education students. This position requires me to be cognizant of my teaching behaviors as I attempt to model best practices for my students.

Further, during my time as a graduate student I have been in positions that require me to juggle multiple responsibilities across various roles. At times, I have experienced roles stressors, including interrole and intrarole conflict. I have also experienced emotional exhaustion and depersonalization through my time as a graduate student and understand the value in finding a sense of personal accomplishment in my work. As a result, while I cannot relate directly to my participants in terms of T/C role stressors and burnout, I can understand what it is like to have more work than one has the time to complete and to be in positions that force you to prioritize certain roles or responsibilities over others. I also know the value of achieving role balance and the importance of being a resilient person. Over my time as a graduate student I have become increasingly adept at balancing my multiple roles and, in addition to being a resilient person myself, I have been fortunate to work in environments that support my research and teaching and have helped to build on my resilient capacity.

While my perceptivity helped me to focus my investigation, it is important to note that it simultaneously increased my bias as an investigator. That is, the experiences and beliefs I bring to the investigation influenced what I expected to find in the setting and how I interpreted what I saw. For example, I was initially drawn to studying T/C role
conflict because of my perception that the role of coach tends to interfere with that of teacher and, as a result, has a negative impact on student learning in physical education. It was my hope to more fully document the negative impact of coaching on the teacher role in order to make the case that the two roles are incompatible and that it is in the best interest of the physical education profession to separate itself from coaching.

However, my review of the literature and research in the area of T/C role conflict has helped me to reassess these preconceived notions and to come to the realization that, while coaching can contribute to role conflict in the T/C dual role, such conflict is not automatic. Rather, in some instances and with some people, the roles can balance one another and help to positively influence one’s sense of satisfaction and wellbeing. With this new perspective in mind, I approached this dissertation with the hope of developing a better understanding of the ways in which individuals are socialized into the roles of teacher and coach and the impact that such experiences have on their actions, interaction, and perceived role conflict and burnout. I was also interested in the ways in which T/Cs and NCTs manage role conflict and use resiliency strategies to maintain equilibrium and attain a sense of role balance.

In order for my investigation to be successful, I knew that it was important for me to constantly recognize and confront my biases throughout the process of data collection and analysis. In order to more fully address the issue of bias, I made a series of methodological decisions prior to the start of the investigation to help me to better manage my biases. One such decision was to keep a reflective researcher journal throughout the investigation. I planned to begin keeping a journal at the conception of my investigation and used it to force myself to examine my role as an investigator before and
after I entered school settings. For example, before entering a school to conduct interviews, I wrote down how I felt about the investigation and what I anticipated to learn during the interview. This allowed me to articulate my biases and then bracket them away from the investigation so I could maintain as neutral a stance as possible (Patton, 2002). Then I documented how I felt about what I heard during the interview after leaving the school. Keeping a running track of these emotions helped me to continually examine how I positioned myself relative to the settings and participants.

I also kept my biases in check by having informal discussion of my impressions of the data with my advisor and two colleagues. This helped me to continually examine my biases throughout the data collection and analysis phases of my research. Additionally, I asked my advisor to view the interview transcripts and my initial reactions to and impressions of the data. He is highly skilled in qualitative methods and was able to provide feedback as to whether or not my reactions were logically derived from the data.

**Overview of the Thesis**

This dissertation project has been written in a nontraditional format. Chapter Two represents a general literature review which draws upon two conceptual articles that had been published prior to the completion of the thesis (Richards & Templin, 2012; Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013) and one which was currently in review (Richards, Templin, & Graber, in review). Chapter Three includes the general methods for data collection and analysis for the entire dissertation study (Phases 1 and 2). Chapters Four, Five, and Six are written as standalone academic manuscripts. Chapter Four overviews the validation of a novel instrument intended to measure T/C role conflict and is currently being prepared for publication (Richards, Levesque-Bristol, & Templin,
in preparation). Chapter Five examines differences among T/Cs and NCTs who teach across a variety of academic subjects and is currently in the review process (Richards, Templin, Levesque-Bristol, & Blankenship, in review). Chapter Six examines group differences in role stressors, burnout, and resilience, and uses structural equation modeling to broadly examine the influence of role stressors and burnout on teachers’ ability to develop resilience. This manuscript is currently in the review process (Richards, Levesque-Bristol, Templin, & Graber, in review). Finally, chapter Seven draws conclusions across the three manuscripts and discusses the implications of the dissertation study. Initial insights gained from qualitative inquiry will also be shared in Chapter Seven. A comprehensive list of references is provided at the end of the dissertation.
CHAPTER TWO – REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Chapter One outlined the focus and justification for the study of role conflict and burnout in T/Cs and NCTs as well as the utility of role theory and occupational socialization theory for understanding and interpreting these experiences. This chapter presents a review of literature that focuses on teacher socialization, role theory and role conflict, burnout, and resilience and professional life phases. Specific attention will be paid to role theory and occupational socialization theory as theoretical perspectives upon which this study is built. In doing so, reference will be made to foundational literature in sociology as well as education and physical education. The chapter begins with a brief overview of the methods used to search the literature. The multidimensional perspective on teacher/coach (T/C) role conflict (Richards & Templin, 2012) will be outlined as a guiding framework for the study. The review begins with a discussion of role theory and T/C role conflict and then highlights occupational socialization theory as one framework for understanding socialization into work roles. Finally, the review will overview teacher burnout and resilience as important factors that relate to role stressors.

The Literature Review Methodology

This literature review was based on a framework relating to the broader goals of the research as well as the specific research questions. This led to a focus on the socialization of teachers, role conflict and role theory, burnout, and resilience and
professional life phases. Special attention was given to literature in physical education; however, when possible, connections are made between this literature and that of education more broadly. Following protocols suggested by Carr, McGee, Jones, McKinley, Bell, Barr, and Simpson (2000), both electronic and physical searches were made of journals, books, and reports deemed to be relevant to the framework of the review. Electronic searches were conducted using key terms that were identified during a preliminary planning session. The electronic databases employed include: SPORTDiscus, Academic Search Premier, Google Scholar, and ERIC.

A diverse range of national and international sources were located during this initial search. Copies were made of all materials deemed relevant to the framework for future study. The criteria used to select books, articles, and reports for review includes the following: materials related to teacher socialization, role theory and role conflict, burnout, and resilience and professional life phases with a focus on both general education and physical education; major review articles; and materials describing socialization and role theory. After completing an initial electronic search using these criteria, a follow up search was conducted using key references suggested by colleagues and supervisors, snowballing that resulted from references cited in papers from the initial review, and physical searches of key publications. To stay abreast of current trends in the literature, preference was given to recent publications whenever possible, but attention was also paid to older, seminal pieces of literature that would be considered foundational for this study.
Conceptual Framework Guiding the Dissertation

The research conducted in this dissertation was highly influenced by the multidimensional perspective of role conflict proposed by Richards and Templin (2012). This perspective is grounded in research driven by role theory and occupational socialization theory, the two theoretical perspectives in which the study is grounded. As can be seen in Figure 2.1, T/C role conflict in the five areas described by Locke and Massengale (1978) is positioned at the center and the influence of several factors that are believed to influence T/C role conflict surround the construct. These factors have been categorized based on whether they emanate from the individual (individual level factor), or are a product of the individual interacting with his/her social environment (socialization factors). In the remainder of this section, the model will be briefly overviewed and described. The remaining sections of this chapter will then discuss the theoretical constructs integral to the multidimensional perspective of T/C role conflict.

At the top of the model, eight individual level factors are listed, which describe the influence of the role incumbent’s identity and orientation toward teaching and coaching as well as the professional and personal characteristics. These factors emphasize the role of the individual T/C in navigating the role of teacher and coach and influence the degree to which role conflict is experienced. Included in this list are: orientation/identity as a teacher and coach, family and other personal factors, intrinsic rewards and expectations for performance, individual’s emotional response to role conflict, gender of the teacher/coach, personal career aspirations, years of teaching/coaching experience, and teaching area (PE or other academic area).
Figure 2.1: Conceptual model for the factors that influence teacher/coach role conflict and their interactions. Solid arrows display the influence of individual and socialization factors and intrarole conflict as a teacher and coach on the overall experience of T/C interrole conflict. The white arrows display the interaction of the factors in determining if conflict occurs and, when it does present, the degree to which it is experienced. From Richards, K. A. R., & Templin, T. J. (2012). Toward a multidimensional perspective on teacher-coach role conflict. *Quest*, 64, 164-176.
The socialization factors at the bottom of the figure highlight the influence of an individual’s interactions with others during acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization in influencing the degree of role conflict that is experienced. During acculturation, recruits are influenced by their parents, teachers, and coaches as well as the quality of their physical education and athletic programs as they develop identities as T/Cs. Professional socialization represents the influence of teacher educators, fellow recruits, and the quality of the teacher training program. Once a recruit takes a job as a T/C, organizational socialization factors display the influence of colleagues, administrators, and the community in providing support, accountability, and rewards.

Beyond individual level and socialization factors, the influence of intrarole conflict arising from the individual roles of teacher and coach is likewise shown through solid arrows. As has been noted, the roles of teacher and coach are complex and require significant commitment in their own right. Intrarole conflict that arises from an individual’s experiences in the separate roles of teacher and coach is likely to impact the overall conflict they experience as a T/C.

Although the categories of factors represented through the solid arrows are likely to individual influence T/C role conflict, the interaction between these factors (represented through white arrows around the perimeter of the model) is of additional significance to the experience of T/C role conflict. It is difficult to separate the individual life events and experiences one incurs while developing as a T/C. Early experiences or physical education and athletics during acculturation are likely to impact the degree to which one prioritizes teaching or coaching in their own lives. Similarly, it is likely that individuals influence the environments in which they work when creating a culture that
centers on teaching, coaching, or a combination thereof. Thus, the model portrays a complex web of factors that operate to influence one another and the T/C in order to determine if role conflict is experienced. Furthermore, it is unlikely that role conflict is experienced in a dichotomous fashion. Rather, it is likely that T/Cs experience varying degrees of conflict, which evolves over their lifetimes depending upon the contexts in which they work and changes to their personal identities.

**Role Theory and Teacher/Coach Role Conflict in Physical Education**

Physical education teaching and athletic sport coaching are separate occupational roles that each require specific skill sets and come with their own occupational demands (Konukman et al., 2010; Locke & Massengale, 1978). Although they do share some commonalities (Gilbert, 2010; O'Connor & Macdonald, 2002), the roles of physical educator and coach are not identical and it should not be assumed that they can be performed by the same individual without challenges (Konukman et al., 2010; Templin & Anthrop, 1981). This is especially true when unequal reward and accountability structures pressure the teacher/coach (T/C) to identify more with their role as coach than that of teacher (Kwon, Pyun, & Kim, 2010; Templin et al., 1994). Although T/C role conflict has not received much attention in the literature of the past 20 years, it was a heavily researched area in the 1980s and 1990s (Konukman et al., 2010). Grounded in role theory, this portion of the literature review will discuss research related to T/C role conflict and make the case that scholarship in this area has been conducted in a unidimensional manner, which ignores several significant role factors and the interactions between these factors that influence an individual’s response to the dual T/C role.
Role Theory

Role theory is designed to help explain how individuals in specific social positions are expected to act and how they expect others to act (Hindin, 2007). Generally, role theorists examine the actions and interactions of social actors through the use of a theatre metaphor: “the vision is of actors playing parts in scripts written by culture and shaped by evolutionary adaptation” (Stryker, 2001). Important constructs within role theory are those of status and role. While these terms are often confused and used interchangeably, early scholars (Linton, 1936; Merton, 1957) drew distinctions that have implications for understanding the premises of role theory. Specifically, a status is a particular pattern of behavior or position within the social (e.g., teacher, police officer, lawyer). A role is then the dynamic aspect of a particular status or the way in which the status is enacted. Each status has associated role-sets, which can be viewed as the relationships and interactions in which a person is involved by virtue of occupying a particular status (Merton, 1957). For example, a teacher has a role-set for stakeholders in the educational process such as the principal, school board, parents, children, etc.

Talcott Parsons (1951) and Ralph Linton (1936) were instrumental in the development and advancement of role theory. Parsons (1951) considered roles to be essential to understanding social action and structure. Actors are guided by a set of internalized or externally enforced expectations and are judged by how well they perform these expectations (Turner, 2001). This acts as a mechanism for accountability in the social structure. The assumption is made that individuals behave in distinct and predictable ways depending upon their social identities and the situation (B. J. Biddle, 1986). Katz and Kahn (1966) included the concept of role as central to the structure of
organizations and note that the roles which individuals enact link them to the organization of which they are a part.

Consensus refers to the assumption made by role theorists that incumbents of a specific role agree upon the expectations and responsibilities required of an individual in that position (B. J. Biddle, 1986). Since universal expectations are held by all social actors in a particular role, the actors conform to the socially defined version of the role and hold themselves and others accountable for performance through social sanctions. It should be noted that consensus is not a universally accepted tenant of role theory in that research has demonstrated that incumbents do not always adhere to shared definitions (B. J. Biddle, 1986). However, consensus is most likely to occur when individuals have been socialized in a similar way and/or have similar interaction experiences (Hindin, 2007).

Conformity describes incumbents’ compliance with the expectations for behavior in a role and often arises out of modeling and social imitation (B. J. Biddle, 1986). When one is socialized to view the responsibilities of a role in a particular way, they are more likely to enact those beliefs in their own portrayal of that role. In contrast, role ambiguity is a condition in which expectations are too vague or incomplete in order to properly guide behavior (B. J. Biddle, 1986). Role persistence is the tendency for role structures to persist in spite of changes in the actors who play the roles (Turner, 2001).

When people play more roles than they have the time, energy, or resources to do properly, or the responsibilities for a single role become too challenging for the individual; role overload may arise (Hindin, 2007). Overload is usually mediated by benefits that are accrued through multiple roles. However, role conflict may ensue when the requirements of a role go beyond that which individuals can perform (Turner, 2001).
Role conflict occurs when the actor is exposed to conflicting sets of role expectations so that complete fulfillment of both is realistically impossible (B. J. Biddle, 1986). It provokes a confrontation between role incumbents and societal or cultural expectations (Hindin, 2007) and has been associated with various instances of malintegration, such as poor job performance, lower levels of commitment, and higher rates of accidents and resignations (Hom & Kinicki, 2001; Stryker & Macke, 1978). Role conflict can be divided into intrarole and interrole conflict.

Intrarole conflict refers to role conflict that arises because of expectations placed on a particular social status. This is particularly important for teachers who are expected to perform a number of different responsibilities such as completing paperwork, managing students, providing instruction, participating in school committees, monitoring hallways and lunch periods, among others (Schempp, Sparkes, & Templin, 1993). As the number of varied responsibilities increases, as does the propensity for role conflict (Katz & Kahn, 1966). Intrarole conflict also ensues when the focal role expectations are met with contradictory alter role expectations. This is the case in the teaching profession as teachers often receive varied expectations from different role-sets. For example, students may expect teachers to behave in a certain way while principals and parents hold different expectations. Such was the case in Biddle, Rosencranz, Tomich, and Twyman’s (1966) study which highlighted the fact that various role-sets have significantly different expectations for teachers’ behavior.

Related to the teacher role, Schempp and colleagues (1993) confirmed that managing different expectations from various role-sets can lead to role conflict for physical educators. Merton (1957) adds that individuals are most likely to act in
accordance with the expectations of the role-sets that are most salient or important to them. Additionally, the degree to which a role is observable by a particular role-set likewise increases an individual’s fidelity to that role-set’s expectations for performance. Teachers spend most of their time isolated in classroom working primarily with children (Lortie, 1975); this helps to explain why students play such an important role as socializing agents and why PE teachers often report adjusting their expectations and activities to meet students’ expectations (Curtner-Smith, 1997; Smyth, 1995).

Wilson (1962) performed a sociological analysis of the teacher role and found that teachers are susceptible to multiple sources of intrarole conflict in addition to those derived from diverse obligations and varying role-set expectations. Specifically, the marginal status of some teachers can lead to role conflict. Since physical education (PE) has traditionally been identified as a marginal subject (Eldar, Nabel, Schechter, Talmor, & Mazin, 2003; O'Sullivan, 1989), this type of role conflict has particularly important implications for PE teachers. Wilson (1962) also hypothesized that inadequate support for teachers within schools could lead to role conflict. This is manifest in situations in which physical educators report limited support from their principals and colleagues, which has been linked with intensified feelings of marginalization (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009; Solmon, Worthy, & Carter, 1993).

Related to, but distinct from, role conflict is the construct of role ambiguity, which has been defined as a condition in which expectations are too vague or incomplete in order to guide behavior (B. J. Biddle, 1986). This can lead to dysfunction as the individual does not have clearly defined guidelines to follow in the performance of the given role. High levels of role ambiguity have been linked to decreased job satisfaction
and increased propensity to leave the profession (King & King, 1990; Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970). Some research indicates that the goals and accountability structures for PE teachers can be ambiguous, which can lead to feelings of marginalization and decreased effort to perform well (Hardin, 1999; Herbert, 2007).

Interrole conflict refers to a situation in which an individual occupies multiple roles that are incompatible due to time restraints or conflicting expectations. For example, if an individual occupies too many roles for what is manageable, or inhabits one role which requires kindness and another characterized by aggression, interrole conflict may arise (Hindin, 2007). This is especially true when the roles that are combined are complex and time consuming. It may become necessary to sacrifice performance in each role or prioritize one role over the other. As explained by Parsons (1966), this type of role conflict is most pronounced when the boundaries between roles are difficult to define and become blurred.

There may be limited possibilities for avoiding role conflict by redefining the situation as well as evasion of the roles (Parsons, 1966). However, role conflict often results in role retreatism, which involves devoting additional time and commitment to one role at the expense of others. The role that is chosen can often be predicted by the way in which an individual prioritizes roles (Getzels & Guba, 1954; Gross, Mason, & McEachern, 1958). Related to prioritization, role and person merger involves a role becoming central to an individual’s sense of self (Stryker, 2001). Roles are arranged in a loose hierarchy from most to least important to the individual’s identity. Actors tend to prioritize performance in the roles that are higher on their personal hierarchy (Parsons, 1966; Turner, 2001). Roles most closely tied to an individual’s identity are most
predictive of behavior (Stryker, 1968). For example, a T/C who identifies most as a coach may exhibit behavior indicative of that role outside of the coaching context.

The Dual Role of Teacher/Coach

Flowing from role theory and occupational socialization theory, a significant body of literature has accumulated that focuses on interrole conflict that arises when the roles of physical education teacher and athletic coach are combined. The general premise that underlies much of this work is that the roles of teacher and coach are complex and distinct from one another and, therefore, are incompatible in many ways (Konukman et al., 2010). Due to this incompatibility, it has been suggested that the roles are difficult to perform concurrently. Toward this end, research evidence related to the differences of teaching and coaching will be addressed followed by an examination of role conflict and role retreatism that result from these differences and strains that are placed upon individuals who inhabit the dual role of T/C.

Differences between teaching and coaching. There is some degree of overlap between the roles of teacher and coach. A focus on teaching, skill instruction, physical movement, and extensive contact with children and adolescents are common to both roles (Gilbert, 2010; O'Connor & Macdonald, 2002). However, as noted by Konukman and colleagues (2010), the roles of teacher and coach also have some very different characteristics and require different abilities. Locke and Massengale (1978) point out that there are inconsistencies in the relevance of role performance to career advancement; amount of daily preparation that is required; frequency, explicitness, and publicness of evaluation and accountability; level of consensus in each field relative to what constitutes desirable performance; extent of contact with clients; heterogeneity of clientele; degree to
which client participation is voluntary; motivation of the clients; and the size of the group of clients encountered, among others. The two roles also have differences in learning objectives and group and task characteristics (Chelladurai & Kuga, 1996; Konukman et al., 2010). Although these and other differences have been noted in the current literature, the degree to which the roles vary and the influence of these differences depends in part upon the context in which the T/C works. Factors such as grade level, socioeconomic level of the students, support for teaching and coaching, and accountability for teaching and coaching performance will likely influence one’s perceptions of their roles. Equally, it must be recognized that individual identity and commitment to each role may vary, which will impact the degree to which differences are experienced. The following sections will outline the current research related to the compatibility of the roles of teacher and coach and address areas in which additional attention to context and individual characteristics is merited.

Goals and objectives. O’Connor and Macdonald (2002) note that coaching and physical education vary according to desired outcomes. In physical education, the development of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor competencies as well as an affinity for lifelong physical activity are typically cited as objectives, while athletics seeks to develop students who are talented in a specific sport and to produce winning teams (Kwon et al., 2010). As noted by Millslagle and Morley (2004), coaches at the high school level often “need to win to keep their jobs. Individuals who coach because of its opportunity to teach young people are forced out of coaching because of the pressure to win” (p. 121). Although standards have been developed to emphasize more holistic coaching outcomes (NASPE, 2006), winning in high school varsity sports remains
important due to intense community interest (Rees, 1997). In some cases, the competitive ethos of these sports may be comparable to adult competitive versions (Kirk & Gorely, 2000). However, the degree to which winning is emphasized over other outcomes is highly dependent upon factors such as the grade level; school context; sport being coached; and the dispositions of the coach, administrators, athletes, and community members. One would expect differences to arise when contrasting the focus on winning in football in settings such as a large, urban city school in Texas with one in a small, rural New England community.

**Characteristics of the clientele.** Although few states require physical education during every year of the educational experience, most do have some requirements (National Association of Sport and Physical Education & American Heart Association, 2010). Thus, physical education is, at least part of the time, a compulsory subject in the school curriculum (Kwon et al., 2010; O'Connor & Macdonald, 2002). In contrast, participation in extra-curricular athletics is primarily voluntary (O'Connor & Macdonald, 2002). The fundamental difference between these two settings dictates that each will draw a different clientele. In athletic programs the typical student is there because he or she chooses to be, but the physical educator is likely to interact with students who are required to be there and hold a wider variance of dispositions and motivation toward physical activity (S. J. H. Biddle, 2001). There is evidence indicating that it is difficult for T/Cs to effectively deal with differences in the learners who are found in each setting (Aicinena, 1999). However, this also depends upon the context of the school and characteristics of the clientele. Some schools have built a community ethos around physical activity and promote participation in all forms of physical activity. In others
where physical education and physical activity are not valued, children may be more prone to holding negative dispositions toward physical education.

The physical education teacher must also provide instruction to a large number of children with varying levels of skill and motivation, while coaches instruct a relatively small number of highly motivated student-athletes (Aicinena, 1999; Kwon et al., 2010; O’Connor & Macdonald, 2002). It is not uncommon to find physical education classes that are larger than what is typical in classrooms as many states do not mandate that class sizes in physical education be comparable to those of other subjects (NASPE & AHA, 2010). For example, Hardin (1999) found the average student-teacher ratio of the T/Cs in his sample to be 30:1, while the average coach-athlete ratio was 4:1. Again, this varies across contexts. Some states and local districts require similar student-teacher ratios in all classes, while others schedule larger class sizes in physical education. Similarly, athletic programs that do not allow players to be cut will likely have larger coach-athlete ratios than those with highly team selection processes.

Accountability. In some school settings, T/Cs may be held accountable for performance in the role of coach, but not in that of teacher. Administrators may demand success on the athletic field, but not in the classroom (Chelladurai & Kuga, 1996). As noted by Massengale (1981) “they are seldom fired for teaching inadequacies; however, teaching experience seldom substitutes for losing” (p. 23). Hardin (1999) found that T/Cs feel as if they are held accountable more for their role as coach than that of teacher, even though they were hired as a teacher first. Sage (1987) noted that “there is typically little public evaluation of teachers or their students, and organizational evaluations tend to be sporadic and ambiguous” (p. 218). For example, participants in Herbert’s (2007) study of
dual role teacher and basketball coaches indicated that they believed their job was to win basketball games, but were not as clear about how they were held accountable while teaching. Self-imposed, internal (e.g., school board, principal), and external (e.g., parents, community) pressure to achieve also appear to be higher in coaching than in teaching (Templin, 1980a). However, administrators and community members who value physical education as well as the individual orientation of the T/C may influence accountability structures. Some T/Cs may be held accountable for performance in each role equally, while other may be evaluated more heavily in one role than the other. Similarly, T/Cs who identify more with their role as coaches may hold themselves to a higher standard while coaching than teaching, and the converse would be true of those with teaching orientations.

**Rewards.** T/Cs are often caught in a complex and unequal reward system (Massengale, 1981). Administrators may reward T/Cs for performance in the coaching arena while neglecting to reward teaching excellence (Chelladurai & Kuga, 1996; Templin, 1980a). Many teachers, especially those in physical education, receive only limited contact with administration and the quality of their teaching goes largely unnoticed (Chelladurai & Kuga, 1996). For example, teachers in a study conducted by Stroot, Faucette, and Schwager (1993) believed that they did not have any support for their teaching and that they were not rewarded for quality teaching. However, this is not the case in all settings or with all administrators. Some principals sincerely value physical education and maintain a regular presence in the gymnasium. It will be interesting to examine the impact of the current trend toward pay for performance on the rewards
structure of the T/C as role incumbents may receive direct compensation of their teaching performance.

According to Locke (as cited in Templin & Anthrop, 1981), due to differences in the roles of teacher and coach, “the two roles may not be equally attractive or compatible and when linked together, it is not unexpected that one would become the preferred role, leading perhaps, to dysfunction in the non-preferred role” (p. 183). Although context and individual disposition play a role in influencing the experiences of the T/C, some degree of role conflict may be inevitable. Massengale (1981) reinforces this position by suggesting that the unique nature of the dual T/C role along with the expectations associated with it places many T/Cs in a position of “unavoidable conflict” (p. 23).

**Role Conflict and Role Retreatism in T/Cs**

Some evidence indicates that certain T/Cs are able to juggle the responsibilities and differences that arise between the two roles and may avoid conflict (O'Connor & Macdonald, 2002; Pagnano & Griffin, 2005). It has been noted that T/Cs can achieve positive role balance (Voydanoff, 2002) in which they are mindful of and actively engaged in all roles. For others, it becomes difficult to make sense of their work as they move across roles (O'Connor & Macdonald, 2002) and research has found role overload, role ambiguity, and role conflict to be common experiences for T/Cs (Drake & Hebert, 2002; Locke & Massengale, 1978; T. D. Ryan, 2008; Templin et al., 1994).

Grace (1972) introduced a model of role conflict in education that articulates three areas of conflict observed in classroom teachers: value conflict, status conflict, and self/other conflict. Locke and Massengale (1978) added the dimensions of load conflict and T/C conflict and applied Grace’s model to T/Cs. They also examined conflict over a
number of subgroups of T/Cs including gender, T/C level (college, high school, junior high school), years of experience, teaching area (physical education or classroom), educational background, level of career aspiration, and student socioeconomic level. Results indicated that female T/Cs experienced more conflict than males, physical education teachers experienced more than their classroom counterparts, and middle-career teachers experienced more than veterans. Role ambiguity also resulted in conflict being perceived more than it was experienced.

It was out of this seminal work by Locke and Massengale (1978) that research related to T/C role conflict in physical education grew. Templin (1980a) reported that T/Cs are particularly susceptible to role conflict in the areas of load, values, and status. Wirszyla (2002) found that T/C role conflict was a strong inhibitor to change in a curricular reform project. Felder and Wishnietsky (1990) noted gender differences in the experience of role conflict, with females experiencing greater conflict. T/Cs in Rovengo’s (1994) study relied on teaching sports they coach during their seasons in order to reduce preparation time required for teaching. O’Connor and Macdonald (2002) found that Australian T/Cs experienced role conflict, but the impact of the consequences were lessened by the perception of a positive and rewarding work environment. Similarly, a couple of teachers in Napper-Owen and Phillips’ (1995) sample perceived limited benefits of the dual role. However, tension between the roles has been cited as a reason for why physical education teachers decide to leave the profession (Macdonald, 1999). Although the majority of the work on role conflict has been conducted in the United States, studies in Singapore (Kwon et al., 2010) and Australia (O’Connor & Macdonald,
2002) indicate that T/C role conflict may be an international phenomenon. When role conflict becomes too much for the T/C to cope with, role retreatism may follow.

Role retreatism results when the pressure and time restraints of teaching and coaching force the individual to prioritize one role over the other (Millslagle & Morley, 2004). Factors which contribute to role retreatism include time restraints, role preference, role overload, role expectations, rewards systems, unavoidable conflict situations, role strain, and conflict between T/Cs and non-coaching teachers (Darst & Pangrazi, 2006; Millslagle & Morley, 2004; Templin, 1980b). When individuals who occupy multiple roles decide how to spend their time, the decision is informed by which role offers the greatest rewards and recognition (Millslagle & Morley, 2004). Again, in the case of the T/C, coaching typically receives the top priority as social support and rewards are perceived to be higher than in teaching (Chu, 1984; Millslagle & Morley, 2004). This is supported by evidence which indicates that T/Cs may not be as committed to the teacher role as they are that of coach (Chu, 1984; Drake & Hebert, 2002; Sage, 1987).

Through this process, T/Cs redefine coaching as more important than teaching (Locke & Massengale, 1978; Sage, 1987). Also, as was the case for Joe in Templin et al.’s (1994) life history of a T/C, significant others, such as fellow T/Cs, administrators, and community members, help T/Cs to develop their identities around coaching by praising coaching prowess without concern for quality teaching. This may occur as often as 76% of the time for male T/Cs and 46% of the time for female (Segrave, 1980). However, such prioritization is dependent upon individual characteristics of the T/C as well as the context into which the role incumbent is socialized. Nevertheless, evidence
indicates that when the prioritization of coaching over teaching occurs, it often results in decreased teacher effectiveness (Aicinena, 1999; Aicinena, Steffen, & Smith, 1992).

**A multidimensional model of T/C role conflict.** The current body of literature related to T/C role conflict makes the compelling argument that the dual role of T/C is challenging if not unrealistic for many role incumbents. However, the majority of the literature appears to fall short of examining the various factors that contribute to role conflict in the T/C as well as the way in which these factors interact. The subgroups analyzed in Locke and Massengale’s (1978) seminal paper point toward many of these factors (e.g., T/C level, TC gender, student socioeconomic status, school context), but only the categories of T/C level and gender have received additional attention in the literature. Instead, most of the research related to T/C role conflict has been conducted in a unidimensional manner that seems to assume that individuals who both teach and coach are at risk for role conflict without acknowledging the individual agency of the T/C as well as the social contexts in which they operate. For example, very few studies acknowledge that some T/Cs are able to overcome the challenge of multiple roles and develop a level of resiliency to conflict (Napper-Owen & Phillips, 1995; O'Connor & Macdonald, 2002). Such research indicates that T/C role conflict is not automatic and that individual’s experience their teaching and coaching responsibilities differently based on their personal dispositions and the environments in which they work.

**T/C Role Conflict Research beyond Physical Education**

Research on T/C role conflict has focused on physical education teachers to the neglect of teachers in other subjects. Since teachers across all disciplines coach, it can be expected that all will experience some degree of conflict. However, since reward and
accountability systems are different for teachers of core subjects (e.g. math, English, science), it is likely that their experiences will differ from those of non-core subjects (e.g., physical education, art, music). Locke and Messengale’s (1978) findings provide initial support for this supposition by illustrating that classroom T/Cs experience role conflict, but to a lesser degree than their counterparts in physical education. Furthermore, the current literature does not provide insight into the ways in which role conflict among T/Cs compares to which manifests in NCTs. The current study will seek to provide information toward filling these gaps in the literature by sampling T/Cs and NCTs across subject matters and coaching areas.

**Summary of Research Related to Role Theory and T/C Role Conflict**

The current literature relative to T/C role conflict provides insight into the experiences of T/Cs that lead to conflict situations. In some situations, T/Cs develop role conflict associated with simultaneously occupying both roles which can lead to the prioritization of one role over another. Due to status, reward, and accountability structures, when a priority is made it is usually that of coach over teacher. However, some evidence also indicates that T/Cs can achieve a state of role balance in which they are able to manage the responsibilities associated with both roles. While there is a plethora of research related to T/C role conflict in the physical education literature, little is known about the ways in which teachers in other subjects experience the dual role of T/C. This study aimed to provide some insight into filling this void in the literature.

**Occupational Socialization Theory**

Individuals learn to perform the roles within which they are cast as well as the expectations other hold for role performance through socialization (Turner, 2001).
Beginning with the seminal works of Lawson (1983a, 1983b) and Templin and Schempp (1989b), much has been written in the physical education literature about the ways in which the profession recruits, trains, and socializes its teachers. Most of this research can be traced to seminal research in the sociology of education by scholars such as Waller (1932), Lortie (1975), Lacey (1977), and Zeichner and Gore (1990). The field of physical education has learned about a wide array of topics such as the background characteristics of physical education recruits (Hutchinson, 1993; Schempp, 1989; Templin, Woodford, & Mulling, 1982), the effectiveness of teacher education programs (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Lawson, 1986; Solmon & Ashy, 1995), and the influence of induction assistance in aiding new teachers in the transition to the school setting (Banville & Rikard, 2009; Napper-Owen & Phillips, 1995; Richards & Templin, 2011).

Beginning with Lortie (1975), models for socialization into the teaching profession have adopted a three phase approach to socialization that was borrowed from medicine and law. The three phases, which include recruitment, professional education, and workplace socialization, were applied to the study of physical education teachers through Lawson’s (1983a, 1983b) two paper commentary published in the *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*. The model, which has come to be referred to as occupational socialization theory, was later defined by Lawson (1986) as including “all of the kinds of socialization that initially influence persons to enter the field of physical education and that later are responsible for their perceptions and actions as teacher educators and teachers” (p. 107). Lawson’s perspective was expanded upon in Templin and Schempp’s (1989b) edited text, *Socialization into Physical Education: Learning to Teach*. Broadly speaking, research in this area has attempted to understand the personal
and contextual factors that shape individuals’ orientations toward teaching and influence the types of teachers they become. Although Lawson (1986) proposed five types of socialization (societal, sport, professional, organizational, and bureaucratic), the majority of the research in this area has embraced the three phase approach, which includes acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization. Figure 2.2 depicts a path model used to illustrate the relationship among the phases of socialization. Directional arrows in the model illustrate the way in which different elements of socialization interact and influence teacher identity and responses to socialization. The following sections of this review will examine the elements depicted in the model.

A Dialectical Perspective on Socialization

Traditional views of socialization operated from a functionalist perspective and posited that individuals passively adopted the behaviors and attitudes valued by members within a particular social group (Templin & Schempp, 1989a). For example, Merton, Reader, and Kendall (1957) defined socialization as “the process by which people selectively acquire the values and attitudes, the interests, skills, and knowledge – in short, the culture – current in groups to which they are, or seek to become, a member” (p. 278). Such a perspective assumes that it is the responsibility of the individual to adapt to fit within the existing social structure while the structure itself remains relatively unaltered. However, along with the rest of the functionalist movement, functionalist approaches of socialization have been criticized in recent years. Specifically, they have been deemed inadequate because of evidence indicating that some teachers actively resisted the messages of teacher education and workplace socialization (Templin & Schempp, 1989b). As a result, contemporary approaches to understanding socialization have
adopted a dialectical approach to explain the interchange between the social actor and the socializing agents (Zeichner, 1979; Zeichner & Gore, 1990).

The term “dialecetic” traces its roots to the work of philosophers such as Plato, Kant, and Hegel. According to Hegel, each world view has a rival and the contention between the two results in a struggle for power. The result of this power struggle is that each view is altered which results in the synthesis of the two (Loewenberg, 1929). As it relates to socialization, when the teacher assumes the lead role in determining what social practices will be adopted and which will be rejected – “a contest of social thesis against individual antithesis” – the process is dialectical (Schempp & Graber, 1992, p. 331). Such a perspective embraces constructivist theories of learning, which view reality as socially constructed and value the role of the learner’s personal biography in shaping new knowledge (Lawson & Stroot, 1993). Teachers are able to negotiate the adoption of beliefs and knowledge with socializing agents as opposed to passively absorbing them. As a result, messages that tend to align with teachers’ previous experiences and worldviews are often incorporated into their beliefs and behaviors, while those that do not fit with existing perspectives tend to be filtered out and ignored (Schempp & Graber, 1992; Templin & Schempp, 1989a).
Figure 2.2. A path model showing the direct and indirect impact of various elements of the socialization process on a teacher’s identity development and response to socialization. Arrows in the model depict directional relationships supported by the current research evidence. The dialectics of the socialization process and a teacher’s sense of agency underlie the model. From Richards, K. A. R., Templin, T. J., & Graber, K. (in review). The socialization of teachers in physical education: Review and recommendations for future works. Kinesiology Review.
Importantly, the dialectical process highlights the fact that, while socializing agents have some impact on the teacher, the teacher has a reciprocal impact on the agents (Zeichner, 1979). The result is that both worldviews are changed and move closer toward one another. However, it should also be recognized that the power relationships in a dialectical exchange are often not equal. Typically, the organizational structure exerts power over the teacher and is resistant to change. Thus, the teacher may be reshaped more in the exchange than the organization (Schempp & Graber, 1992). Additionally, since individuals often do not have the formal power to challenge socializing structures, at times they are forced to use covert tactics in order to assert their sense of agency and resist socialization (Curtner-Smith, 1997). Nevertheless, the key message is that individuals are not passive recipients of socialization, but play an active role in the shaping of their own experiences and perspectives.

**Acculturation: Deciding to Become a Teacher**

The first phase of occupational socialization theory, acculturation, which is sometimes referred to as pretraining, explains the ways in which physical education teachers are socialized into teaching prior to their formal entrance into teacher preparation programs (Lawson, 1983b). Acculturation begins at birth and continues to the point at which an individual makes the decision to enter formal teacher training (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). Research has pointed to the potency of acculturation in influencing teachers’ careers above and beyond the impact of teacher training (Zeichner & Gore, 1990). As noted by Curtner-Smith and colleagues (2008), acculturation is “the most potent type of socialization experienced by PE teachers” (p. 99). Needless to say, the importance of teacher biography cannot be understated when conceptualizing the ways in
which individuals teach (Bullough, Knowles, & Crow, 1991; Templin et al., 1982).

Especially important is the ways in which teachers’ early experiences as pupils form the basis for their role identities, or the way in which they envision themselves as teachers (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001). These role identities constitute filters through which future experiences in teacher education and the workplace are scrutinized (Lortie, 1975; Schempp & Graber, 1992).

Apprenticeship of observation. Lortie (1975) used to term apprenticeship of observation to describe the ways in which experiences as a pupil influence one’s impressions of the teaching profession. During this time, recruits participate in the anticipatory socialization process during which they interact with teachers, coaches, parents, counselors, and others both within and outside of the school context who influence their decision to choose physical education as a career (Lawson, 1983b; Templin et al., 1982). As a result of spending upwards of 13,000 hours in schools observing teachers and coaches, recruits develop very strong impressions of what constitutes quality pedagogical practices (Lortie, 1975). These early impressions may or may not be accurate, but they have a traceable impact on recruits and exert a strong influence on their practices as teacher education students and teachers (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Schempp, 1989).

The subjective warrant. According to Lortie (1975), “it is instructive to know what people think is required for success in a given work role, for this indicates the subjective filters associated with the occupation – its ‘subjective warrant’” (p. 29). Thus, the subjective warrant can be conceptualized as an individual’s perception of the requirements of a given profession along with a self-evaluation of one’s abilities to meet
those demands. This concept is analogous to a combination of Richardson and Watt’s (2006) concepts of task demands and self-perception. People develop subjective warrants for a multitude of fields and, although there is no guarantee that an individual’s subjective warrants accurately represent the demands of particular occupations, they are important in determining an individual’s chosen profession (Lawson, 1983b). A strong subjective warrant for physical education means that the individuals believe they are well equipped to meet the demands of the profession, whereas those with a weak subjective warrant would be less likely to see physical education as an option (Templin et al., 1982).

**Teaching and coaching orientations.** Participation in the apprenticeship of observation and the subjective warrant that recruits develop predispose them to differing views of the purpose of physical education that relate to teaching and coaching. Lawson (1983a, 1983b) posited that recruits enter physical education primarily for two reasons. The first is that they want to teach physical education and see this as their primary role. The second is that they want to coach extracurricular sports and view teaching physical education as a career contingency for involvement in their primary role as a coach. Some evidence indicates that recruits may feel as if physical education is their only choice for a career if they want to be involved in coaching (Schempp & Graber, 1992). Other authors (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Richards & Templin, 2012) note that recruits’ orientations are better thought of as lying along a spectrum that represents commitment to teaching and coaching. Recruits who develop coaching orientations are more likely to be male, involved in traditional team sports, and achieved in sport at a high level. Conversely, recruits who are female and participated in non-traditional sports are more likely to
develop a teaching orientation (Bain & Wendt, 1983; Curtner-Smith, 2001; Lawson, 1983b).

Of additional importance is the type of physical education the recruit was exposed to during acculturation. Those who are involved in high quality physical education may be more predisposed to developing teaching orientations whereas those who participate in more traditional forms of physical education may be led more toward coaching orientations (Curtner-Smith, 1997; Richards & Templin, 2011). While a significant amount is known about physical education teaching and coaching role orientations, comparatively less is known about the ways in which teachers from other subjects develop orientations toward teaching and coaching that influence their socialization and the ways in which they teach. This dissertation will attempt to shed some light on this topic by including both physical education and non-physical education teachers as participants.

**Professional Socialization: Learning to Teach**

Professional socialization, or preservice training, begins when a recruit makes the decision to enter teacher preparation, typically in a university setting (Lawson, 1983b, 1986). During this phase, recruits are taught the knowledge, skills, and dispositions deemed by teacher education faculty to be important in the teaching physical education in school setting (Lawson, 1983b). Zeichner and Gore (1990) note that there are typically three main components of teacher education: general education and academic courses taken outside the department, methods and foundational courses completed within the department, and field-based experiences carried out in local schools and classrooms. Functionalist perspectives of professional socialization believe that it fills three primary
functions: disseminating a shared technical culture and professional ideology, taking the first step toward induction by providing students with a new self-image, and acting as gatekeepers by only allowing access to suitable recruits (Lawson, 1983b). It is also assumed that teaching practice will be improved when all three of these factors are coordinated effectively.

While once the dominant model for explaining socialization, the functionalist perspective fails to account for the agency of the recruit and the dialectics of socialization. In fact, it is during professional socialization that the dispositions and orientations developed during pretraining socialization become important. Schempp and Graber (1992) note that it cannot be assumed that recruits will accept all of the messages given during teacher training without question. Rather, many come to professional socialization with strong subjective warrants that are difficult to influence (Graber, 1989). This highlights the dialectical nature of the socialization process as recruits often work to negotiate the curriculum and resist information that does not fit with the subjective filters developed during acculturation (Lortie, 1975; Templin & Schempp, 1989a). This draws attention to the importance of the individual teacher’s characteristics (Cheng & Pang, 1997) and biography (Curtner-Smith, 1997; Zeichner & Grant, 1981) in teaching.

Recruits come to physical education teacher education programs with content, curricular, and training expectations influenced by acculturation that cannot be overlooked (Graber, 1989). In order to effectively socialize recruits, teacher educators must acknowledge that recruits have these expectations and be willing to negotiate and dialogue about them (Schempp & Graber, 1992).
The limited impact of professional socialization. In the general education literature, Zeichner and Gore (1990) noted that teacher education courses do not effectively alter the beliefs and dispositions toward teaching that recruits bring with them from acculturation. In some cases, recruits may twist the messages of professional socialization to reinforce their preconceived notions about teaching they developed during acculturation (Doolittle, Dodds, & Placek, 1993). Writing from the general education literature, Brouwer and Korthagen (2005) confirm the limited impact of teacher education, especially when compared to the influence of organizational socialization.

The limited impact of professional socialization has also been discussed extensively in the physical education literature (Curtner-Smith, 1999; Lawson, 1986; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009). For example, Placek (1983) found that, while teacher educators tried to teach preservice teachers to emphasize student learning, the students were not oriented toward such a perspective and were more concerned with keeping their students “busy, happy, and good.” As a result of findings that point to the limited impact of professional socialization, several calls have been made for revisions to teacher education curricular in education (Cheng & Pang, 1997; Feiman-Nemser, 2001) and physical education (Lawson, 1986) in order to better address the socialization of recruits. Some authors note that this will be essential for preservice training to adequately prepare recruits for the realities of teaching and to have a true impact on teaching practice (Liston, Whitcomb, & Borko, 2006; Stokking, Leenders, Jong, & Tartwijk, 2003).

Maximizing the impact of teacher education. While much has been written about the limited impact of professional socialization, it is important to note that not all teacher education is ineffective. For example, Brouwer and Korthagen (2005) describe a
comprehensive, innovative teacher education program that produces some demonstrable impact on recruits’ competence as they transition into the teaching profession. In one of very few longitudinal accounts of the impact of teacher education, Graber (1998) noted that, while skills taught during preservice training were not particularly helpful to the beginning teacher she followed, the teacher had been provided with principles of good pedagogy and continued to try to teach well. Physical education teacher education has also been found to be more effective when physical education teacher education faculty are viewed as credible, confront faulty beliefs and values, have undergone specialty training in physical education and do not coach, supervise field-based experiences closely, and are engaged in a shared technical culture (Curtner-Smith, 1997, 2001; Graber, 1996; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009). Smith and Schmidt (2012) also note the importance of understanding the influence of recruits’ favorite teachers, which provides insight into beliefs developed during acculturation, in maximizing the impact of physical education teacher education.

Lortie (1975) introduced the concept of a shared technical culture in which teacher education faculty express relative agreement over the skills, knowledge, and dispositions required to teach effectively. These beliefs are then manifested in a consistent approach to teacher education students across the preservice training curriculum (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). In such situations, recruits receive consistent messages about teaching physical education, which has been found to have a positive impact on their induction into the profession (Curtner-Smith, 1996; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Richards & Templin, 2011). Conversely, when teacher educators fail to develop a shared technical culture, it is more likely that recruits will use contradictions
within the program to reaffirm their own beliefs. The message to many is that there are multiple correct ways to teach physical education and that recruits’ own approaches are just as relevant and valuable as those promoted by teacher educators (Lawson, 1986). Unfortunately, early evidence indicated that the development of a shared technical culture is difficult as many teacher educators have their own view about teaching physical education and the views expressed within a department can vary significantly (Lawson, 1983b, 1986).

**The influence of teacher role orientation.** One factor which appears to have particular salience in determining whether or not teacher education has an impact on physical education teacher recruits is the degree to which they are oriented toward teaching or coaching. Lawson (1983b) hypothesized that students who were primarily oriented toward coaching would be less receptive to the messages of preservice training than their peers who are oriented toward teaching. This notion has been studied by Curtner-Smith and his colleagues (Curtner-Smith, 1996, 1997, 2001; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009) as well as Richards and Templin (2011) among others. This line of research has found that recruits with strong coaching orientations are generally unaffected by teacher education, but that a well-structured teacher education program can have an impact on students who come to teacher education with moderate coaching orientations.

Also as predicted, recruits primarily oriented toward teaching tend to be receptive to the messages of teacher education and are more likely to have their value orientations shift toward those promoted by the program. Since sport education tends to align with the value orientations of preservice teachers with coaching orientations, Curtner-Smith and Sofo (2004) recommend this curricular model as one possible way to turn physical
education recruits from “the darkside” (Curtner-Smith, 1996) and a life of non-teaching. However, in studying the ways in which role orientation interacts with the delivery of the sport education model, Curtner-Smith and colleagues (2008) note that teachers with teaching orientations are more likely to use the full model while those with coaching orientations tend to employ watered down or cafeteria-style applications.

**Early field experiences and student teaching.** In the general education literature, numerous studies have been conducted to determine the socializing influence of early field experiences and student teaching. The work of Zeichner and colleagues (Zeichner, 1980; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1983, 1985) pointed to the ways in which dialectics impacts the student teaching process. In their research, some student teachers internalized and adopted the perspectives of the school, while others pushed back and asserted their sense of agency. Stout (1989) found that student teachers were encouraged to develop general reflective skills during student teaching. Similarly, Hough, Smithey, and Evertson (2004) found that reflection during student teaching was enhanced through the development of virtual communities in the form of web-based conferences.

Cooperating teachers (Rajuan, Beijaard, & Verloop, 2007) and students (Conkling, 2003; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990) have been found to be particularly potent agents of socialization for preservice teachers participating in early field experiences and student teaching.

During student teaching, recruits may be faced with role conflict as they are required to navigate differing expectation from teachers, students, administrators, and parents (White, 1989). The degree to which student teachers are able to navigate these role expectations may partly determine their success in student teaching. School-community partnerships in which teacher educators partner with local school districts
have been promoted as an effective means of socializing preservice teachers while also providing professional development to inservice practitioners (B. Johnson, Wetherill, & Greenebaum, 2002). In well-structured partnerships both the school and university benefit and teacher education students receive more intensive and focused supervision and support. Nugent and Faucette (2004) also reported positive results when examining a school-university partnership with physical educators.

In writing about research related to professional socialization in physical education, Stroot and Williamson (1993) noted that “the impact of general education courses and methods and foundations courses have been generally ignored” (p. 339). However, the authors note that “slightly more attention has been paid to the socialization of field experiences” (p. 340). This claim remains true in the more recent research literature as, while scant attention has been paid to the influence of general education and content courses as socializing experiences, several studies have examined the influence of early field experiences and student teaching. While student teaching tends to be viewed as the most important type of field experience, scholars also point to the potential socializing power of early field experiences, many of which are imbedded within methods courses (Dodds, 1989). Extrapolating from the general education literature, Lawson (1983b, 1986) noted that early field experiences would be most successful when faculty recruit students who are oriented to teaching rather than coaching, take care to emphasize the importance of quality physical education instruction, hold recruits accountable for appropriate teaching behaviors, and mold appropriate teaching behaviors in their own practice.
Curtner-Smith and colleagues have noted success in their efforts to socialize recruits to adopt effective teaching behaviors and to focus on student learning and engagement when using sport education as well as the multiactivity model during field experiences (Curtner-Smith, 1996; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2005; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009). The authors note field experiences are most impactful when they take place in schools that reinforce the messages of physical education teacher education, are closely supervised by university faculty and trained cooperating teachers, are linked to on-campus methods courses, focus on evidence-based teaching skills, and include assignments in which students collect data on their own teaching. Solmon and Ashy (1995) found that the value orientations of students participating in an early field experiences changed throughout the semester and shifted in the direction of the instructor.

Similar to its conceptualization in general education, in physical education student teaching is viewed as a culminating event or “the flagship of field experiences” during perservice teacher preparation (Schempp & Graber, 1992, p. 339). As in the classroom literature, the cooperating teacher and students are seen as important socializing agents during student teaching (Dodds, 1989; Schempp & Graber, 1992; Templin, 1979). Tinning and Siedentop (1985) note the importance of cooperating teachers in helping neophytes to learn teaching behaviors as well as organizational and social tasks within the school setting. Zeichner and Gore (1990) note that, since teachers are usually alone with students in the classroom, they serve a particularly important socialization function. Templin (1979, 1981) found similar results in physical education and noted that
interacting with non-compliant students shifts the student teacher’s perspective away from student learning and achievement to pupil control and compliance.

**Organizational Socialization: Teaching in the Context of Schools**

Writing from the perspective of organizational theory more broadly, Van Maanen and Schein (1979) developed a theory of organizational socialization, which has been highly influential for understanding the ways in which researchers in physical education have viewed workplace socialization. Specifically, the authors note that “organizational socialization is a jejune phase used by social scientists to refer to the process by which one is taught and learns the ropes of a particular organizational role” (p. 211). Important to the way in which Van Maanan and Schein (1979) defined organizational socialization is the notion that the socialization process is ongoing and continues to shape one’s experience throughout the organizational career.

Writing from the perspective of physical education teacher socialization, Lawson (1989) described the school’s organizational culture as “largely unwritten. It consists primarily of deeply embedded assumptions, which are accepted and professed by veteran and powerful school personnel. The organizational culture has two functions. It helps the school and its members meet external environmental demands, and it facilitates the internal integration of diverse school workers” (p. 152). Lawson (1983a) noted that, in response to the organizational culture, teachers tend to take on a custodial approach to teaching upon entry into the school that perpetuates the knowledge and behaviors valued within the school setting.

**Socializing agents and the organizational context.** Understanding the influence of socializing agents is particularly important in understanding the day to day lives of
teachers and why they adopt particular approaches to teaching (Schempp & Graber, 1992). Colleagues are one source of socialization that can be particularly potent through the institutional press (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1983). The institutional press is the method through which teachers are taught about a particular schools’ culture as well as the knowledge and behaviors needed to be accepted by veterans in the specific context. This process of culture transmission tends to favor the status quo (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). As a result of its emphasis on preserving current practices in the school setting, the institutional press often contradicts professional socialization (Lawson, 1983a). However, Templin et al. (2011) reinforce the dialectical nature of socialization and call attention to teacher agency when considering the institutional press. Teachers are not passively socialized by the institutional press and some overtly and covertly resist in an effort to attempt to alter the status quo by asserting their sense of agency. Nevertheless, the institutional press is a strong, custodial force in schools and should not be overlooked.

Physical educators often report feeling pressured by colleagues to teach certain ways that may run counter to their espoused beliefs (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009; Curtner-Smith, 1999; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Graber, 1998). This can be exacerbated when teachers feel as if they are not able to develop effective relationships with their colleagues (Eldar et al., 2003).

The role of principals as socializing agents has been highlighted in the education and physical education literature (Watkins, 2005). Related to physical education, principals are most likely to be viewed favorably when teachers perceive that they support physical education (Eldar et al., 2003; Macdonald, 1995; Richards & Templin,
Conversely, when principals are viewed as non-supportive, teachers can get frustrated and feel increasingly isolated (Solmon et al., 1993). Students have long been seen as important socializing agents, especially since teachers spend most of their time interacting with students in class settings (Lortie, 1975). Prolonged interaction with students has been found to shift teachers’ pupil control ideology from humanistic to custodial in general education (Haller, 1967; Hoy, 1969) and physical education (Templin, 1978). In physical education, the socialization impact of children is so important that teachers have been observed to change or make concessions in their expectations or curricular goals in order to align with students’ expectations (Curtner-Smith, 1997; Smyth, 1995; Solmon et al., 1993). Parents are viewed by many physical educators as important resources, especially when they are supportive of physical education. Unfortunately, many physical education teachers view parents as unwilling to get involved or generally unsupportive (O’Sullivan, 1989).

**Reality shock and the washout effect.** When making the transition from student of teaching to teacher of student, recruits are often faced with a significant amount of anxiety because of the need to take on a full complement of teaching duties (Banville & Rikard, 2009; O’Sullivan, 1989). In fact, in most cases, beginning teachers are expected to fulfill the same responsibilities as colleagues with 20 or more years of experience in schools (Lortie, 1975; T. M. Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). In some cases, the transition into schools can be so traumatic for teachers that they may experience reality shock. Reality shock, also referred to as praxis shock and practice shock, refers to “the collapse of missionary ideals formed during teacher training by the harsh and rude reality of everyday classroom life” (Veenman, 1984, p. 143). The ordeal seems to stem from
unrealistic expectations on the part of beginning teachers combined with the general
difficulties associated with teaching (O'Sullivan, 1989). Lawson (1989) noted that reality
shock may also be related to the washout effect in that it is strongest when beginning
teachers are caught between contradictions in the perspectives promoted by teacher
education and those embraced in the school context.

Reality shock is most severe when there are incongruences between what teachers
expect and the realities of classroom life in the particular school in which they teach
(Eldar et al., 2003; Rust, 1994; Stroot & Ko, 2006). Evidence indicates that when reality
shock is high teachers are more likely to leave the profession; however, research notes
that both reality shock and teacher attrition can be reduced through induction assistance
and mentoring (Ingersoll, 2001; T. M. Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Stokking et al., 2003).
Additionally, reality shock is likely to be less severe when the environment in which
beginning physical education teachers are inducted is similar to their personal
backgrounds and support the values and messages associated with preservice training
(Macdonald, 1995; Napper-Owen & Phillips, 1995). Lawson (1983a) also noted the
importance of the role that teacher preparation plays in stemming the effects of reality
shock by adequately preparing beginning teachers for the realities of school life.

Related to the concept of reality shock is that of the washout effect. As noted
previously, the messages and values of the school culture into which one is inducted is
not always congruent with those emphasized in schools. In such situations, there can be
significant pressure exerted upon beginning teachers to abandon the knowledge, skills,
and dispositions formed during teacher training in favor of the custodial orientations
emphasized in the school. In their analysis of school culture, Zeichner and Tabachnick
referred to this process as the washout effect and noted its salience in maintaining the status quo in the school environment. School are, according to Lawson (1983a), “custodial bureaucracies” that employ both formal and informal mechanisms to perpetuate themselves, even if it means preventing innovation and change (p. 6). The result is that “pedagogical practices and perspectives learned during PETE which are incompatible with a school’s culture are often ‘washed out’” by the realities of school life (Curtner-Smith, 2001, p. 82).

On the one hand, several studies have noted the impact of the washout effect on beginning physical education teachers (Schempp et al., 1993; Smyth, 1995; Stroot et al., 1993). On the other hand, research has demonstrated that washout is not an all or nothing process and that certain elements of teacher training may be lost to the workplace while others are supported and solidified (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009; Graber, 1998; Macdonald, 1995). Specifically, the authors noted that a combination of workplace, political and economic, situational, and personal-social factors determine the extent to which washout will occur. Again, this reflects the dialectical nature of socialization. Similarly, Richards and Templin (2011) found that a supportive school environment that connected a beginning teacher with content she learned during professional socialization helped to prevent washout.

**Teacher professional life phases.** Integral to teacher socialization is the concept of teacher professional life phases. As teachers matriculate through their careers they experience numerous personal and professional challenges that shape their lives (P. J. Burke, Christensen, Fessler, Mcdonnell, & Price, 1987). The way in which they respond to positive life events as well as challenges largely shapes their experiences in schools.
Important to any conceptualization of teachers’ professional life phases are the socializing influences of the work context and teachers’ sense of agency (Templin & Schempp, 1989b). Organizational contexts exert a large influence on one’s ability to develop as a teacher.

Supportive environments can nurture teachers as they work toward developing and implementing best practices, while unsupportive contexts can make it challenging for teachers to implement the type of instruction they believe to be best for their students (Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013). While the influence of socializing agents is important, it is also critical that teachers’ sense of agency in navigating their careers is not overlooked (Schempp & Graber, 1992). Some teachers may resist the status quo while others may choose to go along with the expectations of colleagues and administrators even if they disagree with them. As a result, the dialectical relationship between agent and agency cannot be overlooked as individuals and role-sets continuously (re)construct the role of teacher over one’s career.

Fessler and Christensen (1992) developed a non-linear model of teachers’ career phases that outlines eight career phases teachers move through that are impacted by various life events in their personal and organizational environment (see Figure 2.3). The first phase of the model, preservice, covers the time individuals spend learning to become teachers during formal teacher preparation. Next, in the induction phase teachers get their first position teaching in schools and begin the process of being socialized or inducted into the context in which they are working. According to Fessler and Christensen (1992) it takes approximately six years for beginning teachers to become grounded in the context and culture in which they work, which includes learning expectations for performance
related to the new role. Teacher induction will be covered more completely in a subsequent section of this chapter.

Following induction, teachers move through six career phases in a non-linear format. These phases include 1) competency building – teacher is motivated to improve teaching skills and abilities and pursue new teaching methods, 2) enthusiastic and growing – teacher has developed a high level of professional competence and is continuing to learn and grow, 3) career frustration – teacher begins to question career choice and becomes discouraged with teaching, 4) career stability – teacher fulfills the responsibilities associated with his/her job, but does not go beyond expectations, 5) career wind-down – teacher is preparing to retire or otherwise transition out of the profession, and 6) career exit – teacher retires or otherwise leaves the profession (Fessler & Christensen, 1992).

While the progression through one’s career may appear linear, teachers can move in and out of various career phases depending upon the personal and organizational factors that impact their life experiences (P. J. Burke et al., 1987). Family, critical events, and individual dispositions are examples of personal environmental factors that can influence a teacher’s career path whereas public trust, state and local contexts, and societal expectations are examples of incidents in the organizational environment. Specifically, nurturing and supportive incidents in teachers’ personal and professional lives can assist them in working toward more positive and supportive career progressions while negative incidents can cause them to have adverse turns in their career path (Fessler & Christensen, 1992). In this way, the teacher career cycle model represents a fluid, cyclic conceptualization of teachers’ movement through various career phases.
Figure 2.3. Teacher Career Cycle Model showing the influence of personal and organizational environmental factors that impact a teacher’s progression through the stages. Progression through the preservice and induction years are typically linear, but teachers work their way through the remaining phases in individual ways depending upon the influence of the personal and organizational environment (figure adapted from Fessler and Christensen, 1992).
Related to the work of Fessler and Christensen (Fessler & Christensen, 1992), Day and colleagues (2007) proposed a way for conceptualizing teachers’ professional life phases. Specially, the authors found that a teacher’s perceived effectiveness could be understood by examining teachers within and between six particular phases of their professional lives (0-3; 4-7; 8-15; 16-23; 24-30; 31+ years of teaching). One’s workplace and personal life experiences interact in a non-linear way to create a variation in experience across life phases (Day & Gu, 2010; Day et al., 2007). As a result, beginning teachers can experience similar challenges to those of a mid-career or late-career teacher and vice versa. Integrating the professional life phase model is integral to this research as it will help to comment on the variability of role conflict and burnout across teachers’ careers.

**Teacher induction and induction assistance.** While Lawson (1989) hypothesized that the transition from student to teacher should be relatively seamless, the reality is that many beginning teachers experience difficult starts to their careers that are characterized by frustration and dissatisfaction (Stroot & Ko, 2006; Veenman, 1984). This has been compounded by the fact that, historically, the teaching profession has not had any formal mechanisms through which to induct or initiate its new members (Lortie, 1975; Waller, 1932). Rather, many teachers were left largely to sink or swim on their own and many were “lost at sea” (S. M. Johnson, 1990). This relative isolation coupled with the fact that most beginning teachers are required to take on the same roles and responsibilities as their experienced counterparts has led some to characterize teacher as a profession that “cannibalizes its young” (T. M. Smith & Ingersoll, 2004).
Some evidence indicates that the transition into teaching physical education may be even more difficult as teachers experience the increased effects of marginalization, physical and intellectual isolation, and the pressure to take on additional, non-teaching responsibilities such as coaching (Macdonald, 1995; A. Sparkes, Templin, & Schempp, 1993; Stroot & Ko, 2006). At least in part due to these difficult transitions, the teaching profession has long been plagued with high attrition rates, with some estimates as high as between 35- and 50-percent of beginning teachers leaving within their first five years (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996; T. M. Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). These numbers are consistent with those reported in physical education (Ingersoll, 2001).

As a result of the negative experiences reported by many beginning teachers and the high attrition rates, many states and local school districts have designed and implemented induction assistance programs in an effort to ease the transition and bridge the gap from student to teacher (T. M. Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). While induction assistance comes in many shapes and forms, common components of programming include: mentoring, documentation and assessment, seminars with other beginning teachers, internal and external support networks, common planning time with other teachers in the same discipline, and regular communication with administrators. Less common forms include a reduced teaching schedule, a reduced number of preparations, and the assignment of a teaching assistant (Banville & Rikard, 2009; T. M. Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Stroot & Ko, 2006).

Research on teacher induction is plentiful and provides a great deal of information about the impact of such programming. Most of the literature suggests that involvement
in induction has an impact on teachers’ beliefs, but few capture its effect on teaching practice and student achievement (J. Wang, Odell, & Schwille, 2008). Smith and Ingersoll (2004) note that induction assistance programs have a positive impact on teacher retention and that impact is intensified when teachers are given multiple forms of support beyond mentoring. Other studies note that beginning teachers appreciate induction assistance and find it helpful in their transition into the workplace (Cherubini, 2007). Principals are seen as critical in the induction process as teacher who perceive principal support are more likely to flourish (Quinn & Andrews, 2004; Watkins, 2005). While mentoring has been established as an important tool in the induction of teachers, research demonstrates that it is more effective when mentors teach in the same content area as the beginning teacher and are trained and supported in the fulfillment of their duties (Feiman-Nemser, 2003; T. M. Smith & Ingersoll, 2004).

Kelchtermans and Ballet (2002) note that the induction experience is more than about learning to teach and interact with students and colleagues and also involves navigating the political aspects of the school environment. Similarly, the workplace culture has been found to be instrumental in understanding the induction experience as teachers who are inducted into collegial and positive cultures often have smoother beginnings than those who are not (Kuzmic, 1994; Rosenholtz, 1989). Beyond the context of the school, Achinstein, Ogawa, and Speiglman’s (2004) work demonstrates how beginning teachers are impacted by changing state-level policies and the ways in which schools interpret and implement such policies.

Although not as plentiful as the research on induction in general education, scholars in physical education have begun to investigate. Stroot and Ko (2006) and
Banville and Rikard (2009) published reviews of teacher induction and induction assistance research in physical education, respectively. Stroot and Ko (2006) noted that while there is research evidence to indicate that teacher education programs are beginning to emphasize the induction process, situational factors restrict teachers’ ability to implement what they learned during preservice preparation in the contexts in which they teach. Additionally, factors associated with a heavy workloads, marginalization, and isolation impact the experiences of beginning physical educators. Related to induction assistance, Banville and Rikard (2009) note that very little research has been published on effective induction assistance in physical education. However, extrapolating from the general education literature, the authors note that the following components should be included in an induction assistance program for physical educators: mentoring, support networks, seminars, and documentation and assessment.

**Teacher socialization strategies.** Related to the socialization tactics and teacher responses discussed by Van Maanen and Schein (1979), Blumer (1969) described socialization strategies that individuals may draw upon when becoming integrated into the existing culture of an institution. Lacey (1977) expanded upon Blumer’s perspective and discussed three strategies that teachers may use when integrating into the existing culture of a school: strategic compliance, internalized adjustment, and strategic redefinition. The conceptualization of social strategies is attractive from a dialectical perspective because it positions teachers as “sculptures of their own destiny” (Williams & Williamson, 1998, p. 78). As emphasized by Sparkes (1989), teachers take an active role in their own socialization. This active role is manifested through teachers’ ability to comply with or resist the social structure depending upon their personal biography,
training, and the context of the school. While some teachers may comply, other may covertly or overtly resist and even take direct, targeted action toward change.

Strategic compliance occurs when “the individual complies with the authority figure’s definition of the situation and the constraints of the situation, but retains private reservations about them” (Skelton, 1990, p. 389). This is most likely to occur when teachers recognize that they have views that conflict with those emphasized by the institution, but feel powerless in their ability to confront or change the school policies. Teachers may comply with institutional messages when entering schools because they perceive it will best facilitate their transition into teaching. However, this strategy also implies that teachers will maintain their individual beliefs and only continue compliance until they feel empowered to resist the status quo of the school structure (Hawkey, 1996). Evidence from the physical education literature confirms that teachers who embrace the content and pedagogy taught during their preservice training, but feel powerless to implement it on the job, sometimes decide to strategically comply and wait until they feel more empowered to resist. In fact, strategic compliance may be the most common stance taken by new teachers who don’t agree with the school culture as the formal mechanisms for them to elicit change are often unclear on non-existent (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Schempp et al., 1993; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009; Williams & Williamson, 1998).

As explained by Skelton (1990), internalized adjustment occurs when the “individual complies with the constraints and believes that the constraints of the situation are for the best” (p. 389). By using this strategy, the individual adopts all of the policies and procedures operating in that situation and forfeits any previously held beliefs that are in contrast to those advocated by the system. Teachers may adopt this stance because
they believe that doing so is “in the best interest of all” (Scarth, 1987, p. 247). In many ways, the internalized adjustment strategy is analogous to Van Maanen and Schein’s (1979) stance of custodianship in that the new teacher makes little effort to alter the infrastructure of the school. Rather, the neophyte assimilates into the school culture by adopting all of the beliefs it emphasizes.

The final strategy Lacey (1977) describes for assimilating into the school culture is referred to as strategic redefinition. When using this strategy, teachers set out to change the status quo in their school, even though they may not have the formal power to do so (Scarth, 1987). This is typically accomplished by causing those who have the formal power (e.g., department head or principal) to change their interpretation of what is happening in the school environment (Skelton, 1990). In this way, individuals recognize that the status quo is in conflict with their ideals and actively challenge it by attempting to bring about change. This reinforces the dialectical nature of socialization in that teachers are capable of “realizing their own educational values and persuading others with formal power of their legitimacy” (Skelton, 1990, p. 389). Strategic redefinition allows teachers to maintain their values and advocate for the adoption of those values by the system in place at the school.

**Isolation and marginalization.** In the United States and abroad, the purpose of education tends to revolve around cognitive growth and academic learning. As a result, higher levels of status and rewards are allocated for school subjects that align with the academic missions of schools. Such a division of subjects is strongly rooted in the mental-manual labor dichotomy which is reflected in the different statuses accorded to white- and blue-collar labor (Hoyle, 1986; Schempp et al., 1993). White-collar labor is
associated with achievement and dependent upon academic success while blue-collar labor is often looked down upon as less important because it requires less cognition and more physicality. This general attitude toward white- and blue-collar labor is reflected in the school and creates an unequal status structure among teachers. This results in some teachers being viewed as having a central role in the education of youth while others are seen as marginal (A. Sparkes et al., 1993).

Within the context of schools, physical education is often viewed as a marginal subject and the physical education teacher as a marginal educator. As noted by Sparkes and colleagues (1993) “physical educators teach a subject that tends to be defined as peripheral to the central functions of the school; that is, PE is a marginal subject” (p. 387). Such a status has significant implications for the professional and personal experiences of physical education teachers. It has a traceable impact on the way in which they view themselves and their work, interact with colleagues and students, and feel a part of the school culture. Moreover, marginalization appears to be a somewhat universal experience for physical education teachers that is not experienced by educators in core subjects (e.g., math, science, language arts) and thus makes socialization into physical education a unique experience (A. Sparkes et al., 1993).

In many schools, physical education is perceived to be “last in line” when equipment, resources, and funding are being allocated (Graber, 1998). While physical education teachers are sometimes given recognition within the school culture, this is usually for their ability to manage students rather than their teaching effectiveness (O'Sullivan, 1989; Schempp et al., 1993). Further, academic learning is typically not seen as a primary goal of physical education from the perspective of administrators, teaching
colleagues, students, and parents (Smyth, 1995; Templin et al., 1994). In many cases, physical educators are forced to defend grading and evaluation practices that go beyond dress and participation. An extreme example of this comes from the work of O’Sullivan (1989) in which a physical education teacher was told by a parent that to fail a student in physical education is analogous to failing them in lunch or recess. Similarly, a teacher in Smyth’s (1995) study was told that “anyone can teach physical education. Just play games. Basically, she was told ‘not to take it so seriously’” (p. 205).

Related to the concept of marginalization is the fact that physical education teachers are often physically and intellectually isolated from their peers. All teachers experience some degree of isolation because of the cellular organization of schools which positions teachers as the only adults in classes filled with children (Lortie, 1975). However, some evidence indicates that isolation may be more prominent among physical educators, because of the status of their subject, but also because there may not be many other physical education teachers in the school (Macdonald, 1995; Stroot & Ko, 2006). Isolation and marginalization appear to be common experiences for physical educators, especially at the elementary level and among teachers who travel between buildings (Richards & Templin, 2011; Solmon et al., 1993; Williams & Williamson, 1998).

Elementary physical educators are usually the only physical education teachers in their buildings, which makes collaborating with colleagues problematic. Similarly, teachers who travel may not feel as if they are part of the culture in any of the schools they visit. The physical location of the gymnasium, which is usually at one end of the building or in a separate structure all together, likewise promotes physical isolation from colleagues (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Stroot & Ko, 2006). Additionally, the structure of the
school day provides teachers with opportunities to interact informally before and after school, but rarely permits the space for professional dialogue, which increases intellectual isolation (Stroot & Ko, 2006). This may be exacerbated for physical education teachers who may not be required to meet to discuss curricula and common exams in the way teachers in core-subjects are, which highlights the interaction between marginalization and isolation (Smyth, 1995). Teachers who actively seek opportunities for professional development and try to implement innovative practices may inadvertently perpetuate isolation as they may be viewed with skepticism by more experienced colleagues (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Schempp et al., 1993; Williams & Williamson, 1998).

**Summary of Literature related to Occupational Socialization Theory**

In summary, the literature on teacher socialization demonstrates the impact of each of the three phases of socialization in shaping individuals’ beliefs about teaching and coaching as well as impacting the type of teacher they become. Important to this process is the notion that teachers are not passively socialized into the profession and are able to exercise their sense of agency via the dialectical nature of socialization. Interestingly, the research to date seems to suggest that acculturation and organizational socialization have profound influences on teachers in general and physical education, but also points to the limited impact of professional socialization and teacher training. This highlights the profound importance of school cultures in perpetuating traditional, custodial practices and resisting change.

**Burnout**

Related to the construct of role conflict is that of teacher burnout. The term burnout was first coined by Freudenberger (1974) as a specific type of demoralization,
disenchantment, and disillusionment found among human service workers. The original premise was that individuals who occupy social statuses that are structured around serving others were more likely to generate feelings of stress, overload, role conflict, and frustration over time. Freudenberger’s (1974) seminal research and theory has been highly influential in the development of burnout research as well as models for predicting and explaining burnout.

While several models of burnout have been proposed and studied, the one that has received the most attention in the literature is that which has been forwarded by Maslach and colleagues (Maslach, 1982, 1993; Maslach & Jackson, 1986). Maslach and Jackson (1986) defined burnout as a multidimensional syndrome marked by exhaustion and withdrawal from one’s work as the result of prolonged stress. The Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996) posits that burnout occurs along three interrelated dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment.

Emotional exhaustion refers to a state in which individuals feel as if they have expended all of their emotional resources or are emotionally overextended (Maslach & Jackson, 1986). Depersonalization relates to the development of negative attitudes towards others in the work environment that manifest through impersonal or callous interactions (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996). Finally, reduced personal accomplishment relates to diminished feelings of competence and successful achievement (Maslach, 1993). This typically manifests through the tendency to criticize and negatively view one’s own work with clients. Taken together, these dimensions represent an emotional, interpersonal, and undesirable response to working with and in
service to others (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996). Burnout has been associated with decreased job performance, health consequences, and an increased propensity to leave the profession among service workers in a variety of fields, including teaching (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001).

**Teacher Burnout**

Despite some criticisms of Maslach’s (1996) conceptualization of burnout (Friedman, 1993; Shirom, 1989), it has been used extensively in the research literature and has been adopted in the study of teachers. Given the substantial physical and emotional investment required to teach (Jackson, 1968; Lortie, 1975) as well as the repetitive nature of daily events, restricted interaction with other adults, and limited opportunities for reflection (Fullan, 2007), it should not be surprising that teaching has attracted such attention. Generally, research has confirmed the notion that teaching is a profession that is characterized by high levels of burnout and emotional exhaustion (Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006).

High burnout levels among teachers have been tied to teacher shortages through attrition (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996; T. M. Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Equally as important, teachers who are experiencing high levels of burnout, but remain in the teaching profession may teach less effectively, which can harm classroom practices (Olivier & Venter, 2003). Carson (2006) found that burnout may be an emotional state for teachers and that feelings of emotional exhaustion may vary throughout the day. Maslach, Jackson, and Schwab (1996) created a teacher-specific version of the Maslach Burnout Inventory that has been used to conduct much of this
research. This research has shown that several personal and workplace characteristic correlate with burnout.

**Personal Correlates to Burnout.** Research on burnout in teachers has produced a plethora of results that inform what we know about teachers’ lived experiences and that help to explain why teachers leave the field at such high rates. Research investigating differences based on teacher gender produced mixed results with some evidence indicating that males experience greater burnout (Borg & Riding, 1991), with others finding no differences between the genders (Ito & Toda, 2002). However, research has consistently found that males experience more depersonalization than females (Pierce & Mallory, 1990). Generally, younger teachers are more likely to experience burnout than their older colleagues, except for in the area of decreased personal accomplishment which is less clear (Russel, Altmaier, & Van Velzen, 1987). Interestingly, the same linear pattern found with age does not hold for years of experience. Rather, the relationship seems to take on the shape of a parabola as beginning and veteran teachers have both been found to have higher levels of burnout than teachers in the middle of their careers (Benham Tye & O'Brien, 2002; Zabel & Zabel, 2001).

In line with the more general research related to burnout in the human service industry is marital status (R. Burke, Greenglass, & Schwarzer, 1996) and marital satisfaction (Greenglass, Fiksenbaum, & Burke, 1994). Both appear to play significant roles in understanding teacher burnout, with unmarried individuals and those who are unsatisfied with their marriages expressing higher levels of overall burnout. Similarly, teachers with children tend to express lower levels of burnout (Pierce & Mallory, 1990). While previous research has attempted to establish a link between burnout and beginning
teachers’ academic ability (as measured via standardized testing), no such link has been established and it appears as if preservice teachers who score higher on educational achievement tests are as likely to experience burnout as their lower scoring counterparts (Chapman, 1984).

**Workplace Correlates to Burnout.** Beyond individual-level correlates of burnout, several workplace factors have been found to correlate with burnout. Related to school subject, it appears as if teachers of different subjects experience burnout in different ways. Specifically, physical education teachers appear to experience lower than average levels of burnout (Koustelios, 2003; D. Smith & Leng, 2003) whereas special education teachers (Fore, Martin, & Bender, 2002) and music education teachers (Hamann & Gordon, 2000) have been found to have higher levels. Interesting, results related to dual role T/Cs have been inconsistent with some studies indicating moderate to high levels of burnout among T/Cs and others finding that they experience burnout less than NCTs (Drake & Hebert, 2002; Kelley & Gill, 1993; Kosa, 1990).

Research examining school level has overwhelmingly found that teachers in elementary schools are less likely to experience burnout than their high school counterparts (Gold, Roth, & Michael, 1991). Despite the temptation to assume that burnout may vary significantly by school locale, research has found it to be an issue across suburban (Faber, 1984) and rural (Rottier, Kelly, & Tomhave, 1983) schools as well as private schools (Dorman, 2003). However, it should be noted that this research has found that teachers experience burnout differently in different settings. While teachers in urban and rural schools tend to experience burnout because of student
discipline issues, burnout among teachers in suburban school experience comparatively more burnout from job characteristics such as extensive paperwork.

As can be imagined, teachers who have more favorable physical features in their workplace (e.g., new computers; enough classroom space, books, and desks for their students) experience less burnout than those who believe they work in old buildings or do not have adequate equipment or supplies (Carson, 2006; Tatar & Yahav, 1999). Workload has also been found to correlate with burnout. Specifically, teachers who perceive work overload in their jobs are more likely to report stress and burnout than their colleagues who are satisfied with the amount of work they are asked to perform (Chan, 2003). Conversely, teachers who describe their workplace as supportive are more likely to experience lower levels of burnout than those who feel isolated and unsupported (Greenglass, Fiksenbaum, & Burke, 1996).

There is strong evidence to indicate that there is a connection between role conflict and burnout. Specifically, teachers who report high levels of role conflict also tend to report higher levels of burnout (Lee & Ashforth, 1996). Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter (2001) note that job related stressors, including role conflict, correlate more highly with burnout than client-related stressors, such as problems interacting with clients. Beyond global measures of burnout, teachers who experience role conflict are also more likely to report higher levels of emotional exhaustion (Pierce & Mallory, 1990). As a result, several theoretical models for explaining burnout include role conflict as a predictor variable (Byrne, 1994).
Summary of Research Related to Teacher Burnout

The current research related to teacher burnout has demonstrated that burnout is comprised of three interrelated constructs: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. Numerous personal and structural factors have been shown to correlate with burnout and burnout itself is related to withdrawal from work and, in extreme cases, attrition. Important to the current investigation, burnout has been found to correlate highly with role conflict and several models that have been proposed to explain or predict burnout include role conflict as a construct.

Resilience

Teaching is a demanding job. As schools continue to diversify and the role of school teacher becomes increasingly complex, it is important for teachers to become resilient if they are to survive in the context of schools (Gu & Day, 2007). Resilience is defined as an adaptive process related to negative or unpleasant experiences (Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000) and is seen as “the capacity to ‘bounce back,’ to recover strengths or spirit quickly, and efficiently in the face of adversity” (Day & Gu, 2010, p. 156). While the stressors that teachers encounter in their daily lives are well documented, only recently have researchers began to ask questions related to what helps teachers thrive in the profession (Beltman, Mansfield, & Price, 2011). Specifically, there has been a shift away from focusing on the aspects of teachers’ work that are considered stressful toward the individual and contextual factors that help teachers survive and thrive in schools (Gu & Day, 2007). Rather than studying stress as a mechanism that causes teacher attrition, the field appears to be focusing on resilience as a way to reduce or prevent early career exit (Yonezawa, Jones, & Singer, 2011).
While the study of resilience in teaching is still developing, those investigations that have been conducted highlight the potential role of resilience in the management of teacher stress (Day & Gu, 2009, 2010; Le Cornu, 2009; Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000; Nieto, 2003a). Resilience is linked to the interactive impact of personal, professional, and situated factors on teachers’ work and commitment (Connor & Davidson, 2003). Nieto (2003a) notes that higher levels of resilience fuels teachers with the positive energy needed to overcome stressful working conditions and hardship. For example, resilience has been cited as an important variable in helping teachers overcome the challenges associated with working in difficult contexts, such as urban environments (Yonezawa et al., 2011). Characteristics such as love, hope, and engagement in an intellectual community contribute to teachers’ ability to persevere despite the odds (Nieto, 2003b). Insight, independence, relationships, initiative, creativity, humor, morality, persistence, determination, optimism, and self-reflection have also been cited as characteristics of resilient teachers (Gupton & Slick, 1996; Whatley, 1998; Wolin & Wolin, 1993).

There has been rich debate in the research literature as to whether resilience should be conceptualized as a process that is developed over time or as an innate, individual personality trait (Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000; Yonezawa et al., 2011). While initial studies of resilience examined the characteristics of resilient people (Masten & Gramezy, 1985), more recent studies tend to focus on the adaptive process that helps individual develop resiliency (Sammons et al., 2007). This dissertation takes that stance that, while resilience likely has some innate qualities, the degree to which individuals are capable of exercising their resilient capacity is based, in part, upon the nature of the
contexts in which they work, the people with whom they interact, and their intrinsic motivation to overcome adversity (Gu & Day, 2007).

Bobek (2002) described resilience as a “process of development that occurs overtime” involving “the ability to adjust to varied situations and increase one’s competence in the face of adverse conditions” (p. 202). Yonezawa and colleagues (2011) conceptualized resilience “as a dynamic construct that emerges within the interplay between individuals’ strengths and self-efficacy and social environments in which they live and work” (p. 916). In their study, connections with external educator networks helped urban teachers develop as caring, reflective, and resilient practitioners. Since resilience is conceptualized as a process as opposed to an end product, it can be examined in relation to the ways in which teachers interact with one another and their environments (Pearce & Morrison, 2011). Therefore, certain environmental features related to the way in which the role of teacher and/or coach are socially constructed may have implications for the development of teacher resilience.

Research generally supports the notion that certain elements of the work environment may predispose individuals to resilience while others threaten their ability to be resilient (Benard, 2004; Tait, 2008). Examples of resources that support resiliency include time, professional development opportunities, adequate equipment and materials, caring collegial relationships, high expectations, and opportunities for shared decision making (Benard, 2003). Pearce and Morrison (2011) found that supportive environments helped a beginning teacher build resilience through interactions with his colleagues. Mansfield, Beltman, Price, and McConney (2012) proposed a four dimensional
framework of resilience that includes profession-related, social, emotional, and motivational factors that may encourage or prevent the development of teacher resilience.

The elements of the environment in which teachers work have implications for and are related to ways in which the roles of teacher and coach are defined. School environments that provide clearly defined expectations and reward for performance and are conscious of teachers’ stress and burnout levels may help NCTs and T/Cs develop resilient capacities by fostering role balance (Marks & MacDermid, 1996). In contrast, environments that do not provide adequate resources, prioritize performance in one role over the other, and do not support NCTs and T/Cs may lead to the development of status hierarchies which can cause increases in role stressors and burnout (Stryker, 1968). As such, the role stressors and burnout have implications for individuals’ ability to develop resilient capacities. This dissertation seeks to explore these relationships.

Important in understanding teachers’ resilience is the ability to quantify the construct so that it can be measured and correlated with other variables. Connor and Davidson (2003) developed the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC) as a measure of resilience. Born out of their work with victims suffering from posttraumatic stress disorder, the CD-RISC has become a widely used instrument for measuring resilience in a variety of different adult populations. The original 25-item version of the CD-RISC measured resilience in five interrelated domains: persistence/tenacity, self-efficacy, emotional and cognitive control under pressure, adaptability/ability to bounce back, control/meaning, and meaning (Connor & Davidson, 2003). Since the publication of the initial instrument, other factor structures have been proposed. One of these structures included ten of the original items and measures a single latent factor of
resilience (Campbell-Sills & Stein, 2007). This unidimensional version of the CD-RISC is called the CD-RISC 10 and has been used with individuals from various occupations, including teachers (L. Wang, Shi, & Zhang, 2010). Both the CD-RISC and the CD-RISC 10 have demonstrated sound psychometric qualities in numerous investigations (Connor & Davidson, 2003; L. Wang et al., 2010). The present investigation adopted the CD-RISC 10 as a measure of resilience.

**Summary of Teacher Resilience**

Teacher resilience is best conceptualized as the ability to bounce back and remain resolute in the face of adversity and hardship. While early conceptualizations of resilience viewed it as an innate, individual characteristic, more recent research has viewed it as a process that is molded and shaped through interactions individuals have with their environments. Numerous environmental factors shape teachers’ resilience and it is likely that role stressors and burnout have important implications for understanding teachers’ ability to develop and exercise resilient capacities. Connor and Davidson (2003) created the CD-RISC which has been adapted to the CD-RISC 10. Both psychometric instruments provide valid and reliable measures of resilience in a variety of occupations, including educators. The CD-RISC 10 will be used as a measure of resilience in the current investigation.

**Chapter Summary**

This review has provided a conceptual framework for understanding teacher role conflict, burnout, and resilience. Through this review it has been found that the sociological construction of the role of schoolteacher as well as the stressors of role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload have significant implications for
understanding teachers’ experiences. It has also been shown that occupational socialization theory provides a framework for understanding socialization into the roles of teacher and coach as well as the propensity for many physical educators to seek out coaching roles. This is especially true for acculturation and organizational socialization, whereas the socializing effects of professional socialization have been found to be less potent. Key to the socialization process is the concept of dialectics, which accounts for teachers’ sense of agency in navigating the socialization process. Burnout was discussed as an important variable that has been found to correlate with role stressors in teaching populations. Finally, resilience was described as an important construct in maintaining energy throughout the potentially stressful work life of a teacher. In sum, the review of theory and literature supports the multidimensional perspective of T/C role conflict that will be used as a conceptual framework in this investigation.
Chapter Two provided a review of literature that focused on teacher socialization, role theory, and burnout, with a particular focus on the way in which these constructs have been studied in the physical education literature. This literature review was set in the framework of the multidimensional perspective on teacher/coach (T/C) role conflict proposed by Richards and Templin (2012). Building off of the literature review presented in Chapter Two, this chapter outlines the general methods used to conduct the current investigation. This chapter broadly overviews the setting, participants, research procedures, data collection and analysis methods, and strategies incorporated to promote the trustworthiness of qualitative data. Specific method sections also accompany each of the standalone academic manuscripts that follow.

Overview of the Research Design

In order to answer the research questions and test the hypotheses posed in Chapter One, the researcher collected and analyzed a variety of quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data were collected in phase one of the study in the spring of 2013 to answer research questions 1-7. Specifically, multiple survey measures were distributed at one time point to collect cross-sectional data (Neuman, 2003). Data were examined using both descriptive and inferential statistics, which allowed for the numerical description of relevant data as well as an indication of the strength and direction of relationships among
study variables (Witte & Witte, 2001). Analyses included bivariate correlations, Factorial ANOVAs, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), and Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) Regression Analysis.

During phase two of the study, the researchers took a stratified random sample of survey participants based on role conflict and burnout levels and invited them to participate in face-to-face interviews. Phase two has been conceptualized as a follow up to phase one in that several of the findings gleaned through quantitative data analysis are reexamined qualitatively. While the methods used in phase two will be reported in this study, results from the study will not be presented in this dissertation. However, Chapter Seven will provide insight into the results of initial qualitative data analyses. The timeline for data collection is outlined in Table 3.1.

**Phase One**

Phase one of the study used a variety of quantitative data collection and analysis procedures to address research questions 1-7. A broad overview of the methods used in phase one follows. Methods specifically used in each of three studies that relate to phase one will be provided in Chapters Four, Five, and Six.

**Participants and Setting**

Participants included 415 teachers (121 male, 294 female) from three adjacent school districts in the American Midwest. All three school districts were located in the same county. One district served a rural area (N=213), while a second was located within a small city (N=154), and the third in a college town (N=48). Of the 415 teachers who participated in the study, 206 (32 male, 174 female) had never coached a sport and 209
(89 male, 120 female) had some coaching experience. The vast majority of the participants were Caucasian (N=400; 96.4%). Fewer of the participants were Hispanic (N=7; 1.7%), African American (N=4; 1.0%), Native American Indian (N=1; 0.2%), Mixed Race (N=1; 0.2%), and Other (N=2; 0.5%). The average participant had been teaching for 16.90 years (SD=11.43), had completed a master’s degree (N=231, 55.7%) and had taught in an average of 3.13 schools (SD=2.20). Subject affiliations for all teacher/coaches (T/Cs) and non-coaching teachers (NCTs) are reported in Table 3.2. The total number of teaching roles is more than the total number of participants because many participants taught in multiple subject areas. For classification purposes, the role in which the participants spent most of their time was considered their primary teaching position. Based on this classification format, 63.1% taught core subjects (e.g., mathematics, language arts, elementary education), 29.9% taught non-core subjects (e.g., physical education, art), and 7.0% taught a combination of core and non-core subjects.

Participants taught in elementary (38.1%), middle (21.7%), and high (34.0%) schools, with a small percentage (6.3%) teaching across multiple levels. The teachers spent an average of 5.35 hours per day teaching class (SD=1.17) and had 23.99 students per class (SD=8.37). The teachers had approximately 52.20 minutes each day during school to prepare for their teaching assignment (SD=20.40) and spent a total of 3.01 total hours per day preparing their lessons (SD=1.72). On a five-point Likert-type scale perceived administrative support for teaching was high (M=4.21, SD=0.92) and perceived parental support was slightly lower (M=3.26, SD=1.06). Motivation for teaching was moderate-to-high (M=3.61, SD=0.93) and 19.3% (N=80) of teachers reported that they would definitely or probably leave teaching in the near future.
Table 3.1

Time-line summary of Phases 1 and 2 of the research design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 (Spring 2013)</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td>• Initial contact with district-level administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Begin meetings with district-level administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue meetings with district-level administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February 2013</td>
<td>• Initial contact with school-level administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meetings with potential study participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review informed consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review study requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td>• Continue meetings with potential study participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review informed consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review study requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 2013</td>
<td>• Send first follow up email to consented participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Send second follow up email to consented participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td>• Send final follow up email to consented participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Close online survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Begin analysis of quantitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June-July 2013</td>
<td>• Analyze quantitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify participants for Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 (Fall 2013)</td>
<td>August 2013</td>
<td>• Initial email to potential interview participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Follow-up email to potential interview participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September-October 2013</td>
<td>• Conduct initial interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November-December 2013</td>
<td>• Conduct Follow Up Interviews (as needed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>NCTs</th>
<th>T/Cs</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Wellness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music/Band/Choir</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Technology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Science</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal/Administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>206</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beyond teaching, the average participant reported engaging in an average of 2.51 ancillary roles ($SD=1.43$; e.g., department chair, athletic coach, student club supervisor).

Teachers who reported some coaching experience had spent an average of 8.53 years coaching ($SD=7.96$) and coached 2.81 sports during their careers ($SD=1.77$).

Approximately half of the participants ($N=104, 48.8\%$) coached only low profile sports (e.g., baseball, field hockey, lacrosse), while the remaining T/Cs coached at least some high profile sports (i.e., men’s basketball, women’s basketball, football). Coaching assignments were distributed among elementary ($N=22$), middle ($N=44$), and high school placements ($N=47$), with the majority of participants coaching at multiple levels during their careers ($N=96$). For participants who coached at the high school level, 28.5% ($N=37$) coached at the junior varsity level, 17.7% ($N=23$) coached at the varsity level, and 53.8% ($N=70$) coached at both levels. T/Cs coached at an average of 2.01 school during
their careers (SD=1.11) and 48.8% (N=102) reported that they spent at least some time coaching for a school different than the one in which they taught. T/Cs spent an average of 1.78 hours per day preparing to lead their practices (SD=0.97).

Just over half of the T/Cs coached in only paid positions (N=121, 57.9%), while far fewer held only volunteer positions (N=7, 3.3%). The remaining participants held a combination of paid and volunteer positions during their coaching tenure (N=81, 38.8%). On a five-point Likert-type scale, T/Cs reported moderate-to-high levels of support for coaching from administrators (M=3.81, SD=1.03) and parents (M=3.72, SD=0.86). Motivation for coaching was also moderate-to-high (M=3.95, SD=0.52) and 39.70% of T/Cs (N=83) reported that they would definitely or probably give up some coaching roles in the near future. Related to role preference, 47.85% of T/Cs (N=100) preferred teaching, 18.2% preferred coaching (N=38), and 34.0% (N=71) preferred both roles equally.

**Research Procedures**

Initial contact with school districts was made through the office of the superintendent in three adjacent school corporations in the American Midwest. Specifically, an email (Appendix A) was sent to each school district’s research coordinator explaining the study and requesting an initial contact meeting. Following the email, meetings were scheduled with the research coordinator for each school district. During these meetings the researcher explained the purpose of the study and requested permission to collect teachers’ email addresses using publically available school websites. Once permission was obtained from the central administrative office of a school district, the researcher visited the school district’s website and collected the names
and email addresses for all teachers in the district. The research coordinator for the school corporation also forwarded an email (Appendix B) from the researcher to all school building administrators within that school district explaining the study. The research coordinator in one school district also gave the researcher permission to address teachers in the district during a regularly scheduled staff meeting. This request was not deemed feasible in the other two school districts as schools did not hold regular staff meetings.

In the one school that granted permission, the researcher traveled to schools and met with teachers during the first or last 15 minutes of a regularly scheduled faculty meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to provide an overview of the study as well as the procedures teachers would be asked to complete. Teachers were told that if they participated in the study they would be asked to complete an online survey (using Qualtrics) that collected demographic information and contained surveys related to their experiences of job satisfaction, burnout, and role conflict (see data collection procedures). All teachers that the researcher met with during these meetings received a handout that provided an overview of the study (See Appendix C).

After the researcher visited the teachers in the one school district or the school administrators forwarded the researcher’s email to the teachers in the other two school districts, the researcher emailed the teachers inviting them to participate in the study. Included in the email was the information overviewed in Appendix C as well as a link to an online survey administered via Qualtrics survey software. The researcher received a waiver of written consent from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Purdue University, so the participants were not required to sign physical consent forms. Rather, the first page of the survey included the information typically included in a written
Participants were instructed to read the consent form and told that by clicking the “next” button at the bottom of the page they were providing informed consent. Through the email and informed consent form participants were ensured that they had the right to refuse participation and that there would not be any negative consequences for choosing not to participate. Individuals could opt out of participation by ignoring the researcher’s email or by clicking an “unsubscribe” button included at the bottom of all email correspondence. The email sent to potential participants is included in Appendix E.

Following the initial email, the researcher sent between three and five follow up emails to potential participants. These follow up emails were sent between two and four weeks apart and were intended to remind participants of the study and to encourage participation. After the final follow up email the researcher closed the online survey and downloaded the responses for analysis. Across the three school districts, 1,325 teachers were invited to participate in the investigation. A total of 676 participants provided partial responses to the survey for a response rate of 51%. However, when the researcher conducted preliminary data screening it was determined that some respondents only completed a few questions and did not provide any usable data. Of the 676 responses, 445 answered enough questions to merit further screening. Thus, the adjusted response rate was 34%. Following further screening, 30 additional responses were deleted because the participants failed to complete numerous items that were integral to the investigation. Therefore, the final sample that was used in the study consisted of 415 teachers, which is a final response rate of 31%.
Research Measures

All participants were asked to complete a teacher background questionnaire as well as several survey scales related to constructs of interest to the present investigation. The background questionnaire and survey scales were all included in the online survey administered using Qualtrics survey software.

Teacher background questionnaire. The Teacher Background Questionnaire (Appendix F) was adapted from the work of Carson (2006) as a way to collect information relative to T/Cs’ and NCTs’ background characteristics, school contextual factors, and teaching and coaching responsibilities. Qualtrics’ selective display function was used to ask teachers who reported that they coached, additional questions about their coaching responsibilities. Data collected through the Teacher Background Questionnaire was used to classify teachers according to school level and teaching subject matter, and allowed for the differentiation of T/Cs from NCTs. Additionally, this questionnaire was used to ascertain teachers’ professional life phases.

Teacher role stressors. Role stressors were evaluated using the Teacher Role Stressors Survey (TRSS; Conley & You, 2009). The TRSS measures the role stressors of role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload in teachers (see Appendix G). Participants were asked to respond to the nine-item TRSS by rating the degree to which each statement was accurate relative to their personal experiences. Responses were recorded on a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (very inaccurate) to 7 (very accurate). Example questions included: “I feel certain about how much authority I have” (role ambiguity; reverse coded), “I often work under incompatible policies and procedures” (role conflict), and “I am rushed in doing my job” (role overload). Internal consistency
has been demonstrated in previous research applications (Conley & You, 2009) and was adequate to good in the current investigation (Cronbach’s α ranged from 0.77 to 0.82).

**Teacher/coach role conflict.** After surveying the literature, it was determined that a valid and reliable measure of T/C role conflict was not available so the research decided to validate a measure. Qualtrics display logic was used to request that teachers who reported coaching roles answer a specific set of questions related to T/C role conflict. The new scale was named the Interrole Conflict Scale-Teacher/Coach (ICS-T/C). Twenty-four items that included a combination of the questions administered by Ryan (2008) and Austell (2010) were administered for potential inclusion in the ICS-TC (see Appendix H). All items were set to a seven-point, Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). These items were selected because they had been utilized in previous research and are specific to T/C role conflict. Many of the items were derived from preexisting instruments that measure interrole conflict between other occupational roles (Hom & Kinicki, 2001; Kopelman, Greenhaus, & Connolly, 1983; Rizzo et al., 1970) and appeared promising for the measure of T/C interrole conflict. Validation of the ICS-T/C is outlined in Chapter Four.

**Teacher burnout.** Burnout was measured using the MBI-ES (Maslach, Jackson, & Schwab, 1996). The MBI-ES measures burnout in educators along the dimensions of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. This study used a modified version of the MBI-ES developed by Carson (2006). The survey can be found in Appendix I. Participants were asked to respond to 34 burnout-related questions that asked them to consider how often they feel the way suggested in the prompt on a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (every day). Example questions
include: “I can easily understand how my students feel about things” (personal accomplishment), “I feel I treat some students as if they were impersonal objects” (depersonalization), and “I feel emotionally drained from my work” (emotional exhaustion). Internal consistency for the MBI-ES has been demonstrated through previous research (Maslach, Jackson, & Schwab, 1996). In the current investigation internal consistency ranged from adequate to very good (Cronbach’s α=0.74 to 0.90).

**Teacher resilience.** Resilience was measured using the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC; Connor & Davidson, 2003). While all 25 questions were administered, the researcher opted to use the 10-item version of the CD-RISC (CD-RISC 10; Campbell-Sills & Stein, 2007). The CS-RISC 10 (see Appendix J) reflects one latent factor of resilience and has been used with individuals from a variety of occupations, including teachers (L. Wang et al., 2010). Participants were asked to respond to the 10 items by indicating how much they agreed with the items as they applied to them over the last month. Responses were set to a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (not true at all) to 4 (true nearly all the time). Example questions include: “I am able to adapt when changes occur,” “I tend to bounce back after illness, injury, or other hardships,” and “during times of stress/crisis, I know where to turn for help.” Internal consistency for the CD-RISC 10 has been demonstrated previously (Campbell-Sills & Stein, 2007; L. Wang et al., 2010) and was good in the current investigation (Cronbach’s α=0.81). Information gathered through the CD-RISC will be used to compare the resilience levels among T/Cs and NCTs generally, as well as those who have varying levels of role conflict and burnout.
Data Preparation and Analysis

This section aims to provide a broad overview of the various data analysis procedures used in phase one of the study. Specific information related to each procedure is covered in more detail in the manuscripts that following Chapters Four, Five, and Six.

Preceding statistical analysis, all quantitative data were screened for accuracy, representation, and quality. Diagnostics were performed using stem and leaf plots and box plots to identify any potential outliers. Following standard procedures for preliminary data screening (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), descriptive statistics were calculated to examine hypothesized associations among variables. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis procedures were used in the validation of the ICS-T/C. To examine research questions 1-3 related to group differences among T/Cs and NCTs, Factorial ANOVAs were used. Research question 4 was examined using one-way ANOVAs and research questions 5 and 6 were addressed using multiple regression analyses. Research question 7 was examined through the use of structural equation modeling. All quantitative data analyses with the exception of confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modeling were performed with SPSS 21.0 (IBM Corporation, 2012). Confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modeling were conducted through the latent variable analysis program, LISREL 9.1 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2013).

Phase Two

Phase two of the study was conceptualized as a qualitative follow up to phase one, which utilized quantitative data collection and analysis procedures. Following the completion of phase one, the researcher took a stratified random sample of survey participants based on role conflict and burnout levels and invited them to participate in
face-to-face interviews. Preliminary results from phase two along with initial interpretations are presented in Chapter Seven.

**Research Procedures**

Following phase one of the study, the researcher used a stratified random sampling procedure to identify participants for phase two. Specifically, participants who scored high and low on measure of role conflict and burnout were identified as potential participants. In order to identify the subset of participants who would be invited to participate in phase two, the researcher ran descriptive statistics for both role conflict subscale from the TRSS (Conley & You, 2009) and emotional exhaustion subscale of the MBI-ES (Maslach, Jackson, & Schwab, 1996). The standard deviation was added to the mean of each variable to identify the lower bound for the high burnout and role conflict groups, and the standard deviation was subtracted from the mean to identify the upper bound for the low role conflict and burnout groups. Table 3.3 displays the descriptive statistics and cut-points for high and low role conflict and burnout groups.

**Table 3.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Upper Bound of Low Group</th>
<th>Lower Bound of High Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaust</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Emotional exhaustion was used as an indicator of burnout

Once upper and lower bounds had been identified, the researcher recoded the continuous role conflict and burnout variables into binaries variables that were coded 0=low and 1=high. Participants whose scores on the role conflict and emotional exhaustion subscales were between the upper bound for the low groups and the lower
bound for the high groups (i.e., individuals whose values feel within +/-1 SD of the mean on each scale) were omitted from further analyses. Next the researcher ran a cross-tabulation on low and high burnout and role conflict levels, which led to the identification of 89 potential interview participants who had some combination of high and low role conflict and burnout. Table 3.4 depicts the cross-tabulation. Note that there are far fewer participants represented in the low role conflict/high burnout and high role conflict/low burnout groups than the high/high and low/low group. This relates to the strong association between levels of role conflict and burnout. Two of the 89 participants were dropped because they did not provide contact information for interviews leaving a pool of 87 potential interview participants.

The pool of potential participants included more female teachers (N=62) than male teachers (N=25) and more teachers from the urban (N=41) and rural (N=41) schools than from the suburban schools (N=8). The teachers were evenly split among core (N=47) and non-core (N=40) subjects, as well as NCTs (N=45) and T/Cs (N=42). More teachers taught at the elementary school level (N=39) than the middle (N=22) or high school levels (N=19), and some teachers participants taught at multiple levels (N=7)

Table 3.4

Cross-tabulation used to identify participants who had some combination of high and low role conflict and burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low RC</th>
<th>High RC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low EE</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High EE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: EE=emotional exhaustion, RC=role conflict
Participants chosen through the sampling procedure outlined above were then contacted by the investigator and asked to participate in face-to-face interviews. Specifically, individuals selected for participation in the interviews were sent an email invitation (Appendix K) with a link to a poll set up through an online scheduling assistant. Participants were offered $20.00 Amazon gift cards as compensation for their time in phase two of the dissertation. Up to three reminder emails were sent to T/Cs and NCTs asking them to participate in face-to-face interviews. Failure to respond after the third reminder email was considered refusal to participate in interviews and these individuals were not contacted further for interviews. Once T/Cs and NCTs responded to the online survey, face-to-face interviews were scheduled at a time and place convenient for the participants.

The researcher traveled to the participants’ school for interviews or met them at another preferred location. Participants in phase two of the study were asked to read and sign informed consent paperwork (Appendix L) and were asked to sign a form acknowledging receipt of the $20.00 Amazon gift card (Appendix M). Based on responses to questions in the first interview, selected participants were asked to participate in a second face-to-face interview using the invitation email included in Appendix N. T/Cs and NCTs who are identified for these follow up interviews were contacted using the same procedures described in the above section on face-to-face interviews. No additional incentive was offered for participation in the follow up interviews.
Participants and Setting

Participants in phase two of the study included 28 teachers (11 male, 17 female). The majority of the participants (86%) identified as Caucasian. Five teachers taught at the high school level, six in middle school settings, 14 in elementary schools, and two at multiple school levels. Teachers’ years of experience ranged from 1 to 39 years, with the average teacher having spent 19.98 years in the classroom ($SD=11.19$). Participants were evenly split between core ($N=13; 46.43$) and non-core ($N=15; 53.57$) subjects and 11 of the participants (39.29%) reported participation in coaching roles. Perceived support from administrators ($M=4.00; SD=1.39$) and parents ($M=3.46; SD=1.07$) was moderate to high. Motivation for teaching was moderate ($M=3.31; SD=1.23$) Given that 87 potential participants were contacted for inclusion in phase two and that 28 agreed to participate, the response rate for this phase of the research was approximately 32%.

Table 3.5 provides a breakdown of the final group of participants based on role conflict and burnout levels (as noted previously, emotional exhaustion was used as a singular indicator of burnout). As is shown in the table, most of the participants had high role conflict and high ($N=14$) or low role conflict and low emotional exhaustion ($N=13$). One participant perceived high emotional exhaustion and low role conflict, and none reported high role conflict and low emotional exhaustion. There were more females ($N=11; 73.34$%) than males ($N=4; 26.67$%) in the high burnout, high role conflict group. These participants were evenly split among core ($N=8; 53.34$%) and non-core ($N=7; 46.67$%) teaching assignments and had been teaching an average of 20.21 years ($SD=10.85$). Participants in the high burnout, high role conflict groups included 10 NCTs (66.67%) and 5 T/Cs (33.34%). Participants in this group perceived low to moderate
levels of support from administrators ($M=3.14; SD=1.41$) and parents ($M=3.00; SD=.88$), and had relatively low levels of motivation for teaching ($M=2.43; SD=.85$).

In the low burnout, low role conflict group there was a more even split between male ($N=7; 58.33\%$) and female ($N=6; 41.66\%$) participants. Participants had been teaching for an average of 20.23 ($SD=12.50$) and taught evenly across core ($N=6; 50.00\%$) and non-core ($N=6; 50.00\%$). The distribution of NCTs ($N=7; 58.34\%$) and T/Cs ($N=5; 41.67\%$). Participants in the low role conflict, low burnout group perceived greater administrative support ($M=5.00; SD=.00$) and parental support ($M=4.09; SD=1.04$), and were also more motivated to teach ($M=4.45; SD=.52$) than their counterparts in the low role conflict, low burnout group.

**Table 3.5**

Cross-tabulation used to identify participants who had some combination of high and low role conflict and burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low EE</th>
<th>High RC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low RC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High EE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* EE=emotional exhaustion, RC=role conflict

**Data Collection**

**Initial Interviews.** All participants in phase two of the dissertation took part in interviews that focused on conflict, burnout, and resilience to better understand the ways and extent to which participants navigate these phenomena in their professional and personal lives. Interviews proceeded using a semi-structured format (Patton, 2002) through which the researcher had an interview guide in order to frame the discussion, but had the flexibility to deviate from the script in order to address relevant topics introduced by the interviewees. The interview protocol used to guide the discussion can be found in
Appendix O. All interviews were audio recorded for transcription. Interviews lasted for between 45 minutes and one hour.

**Follow-up Interviews.** Based on the information gathered during the first round of interviews, additional interviews were scheduled with specific participants. These interviews largely aimed to delve deeper into information gathered during the first round of interviewing and, thus, were specific to each interviewee. As a result, no uniform interview protocol guided these discussions as specific questions were crafted for each participant. However, Appendix P contains potential follow-up interview topics. These interviews also presented an opportunity to conduct member checks with participants. As with initial interviews, all follow up interviews were audio recorded for transcription and lasted between 45 minutes and one hour.

**Data Analysis and Trustworthiness**

All qualitative interview data were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim using a word processing program. Interviews were then labeled with a date and the participant’s pseudonym. Qualitative analyses proceeded using the constant comparative method and a combination of inductive and deductive analysis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The constant comparative method focuses on reducing data, identifying emergent themes, and extracting the essence of what is being communicated through the data (Patton, 2002). Themes are units that have been derived from patterns that emerge in the data. Examples of themes include recurring activities, conversation topics, and feelings (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984). Themes are identified by “bringing together components or fragments of ideas or experiences, which often are meaningless when viewed alone” (Leininger, 1985, p. 60). Through constant comparison, themes were identified, further developed,
challenged, and rewritten as the data analysis process unfolded. This allowed the researcher to continuously code new data into themes that emerged and redefine or adjust the themes, which eventually resulted in a series of themes that best communicated the meaning derived from the data.

Inductive analysis refers to a process through which themes are allowed to emerge from the data as opposed to the use of an a priori classification system. Conversely, deductive analysis uses a predetermined coding system or theory in order to guide analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The present study used both inductive and deductive analysis by using occupational socialization theory and role theory to scan the data for relevant themes while also maintaining an open stance with regard to themes that emerged from the data. This allowed the researcher to position the results within the identified theoretical frameworks while also searching for new meaning to extend and challenge theory. In this way, themes that emerged from T/Cs and NCTs stories were pieced together to create a comprehensive picture of their experiences with role conflict and burnout as well as the degree to which they remained resilient on the job.

Qualitative analyses were conducted with the assistance of the qualitative data analysis software, NVivo 9 (QSR International, 2010). According to Patton (2002), “computers and software are tools that assist analysis…[they] facilitate data storage, coding, comparing, and linking – but human beings do the analysis” (p. 442). For the current investigation, the analysis of the data was enhanced through the investigator’s ability to organize and code using NVivo 9. With that said, it is important to note as Patton (2002) did, that qualitative data analysis software “can’t provide the creativity and intelligence that makes each qualitative analysis unique” (p. 442). Therefore, even with
the use of qualitative software, the investigator was still responsible for coding, organizing, and analyzing the data generated through the investigation.

As opposed to traditional measures of validity and reliably utilized to insure the quality of quantitative analyses, qualitative researchers use terms such as trustworthiness and credibility. In the quantitative paradigm measures that confirm the reliability and validity of research are often assigned to the instrument used to collected data. However, since the instrument used in qualitative inquiry is the inquirer, one must appraise the methods used by the researcher in conducting the investigation (Patton, 2002). Lincoln and Guba (1985) explained that trustworthiness is composed of four elements: credibility (the degree to which the data reflects what the participants reported), transferability (the degree to which the results of the study are applicable to individuals in other contexts), dependability (the degree to which the research’s methods and analyses are deemed appropriate), and confirmability (the degree to which the results of the investigation can be confirmed). Patton (2002) reaffirmed Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) notion of trustworthiness and recommended that qualitative research adopt the new language for establishing credibility as opposed to attempting to conform to the positivist ideals of objectivity, reliability, validity, and generalizability. Thus, the quality of the qualitative research that has been conducted is intricately tied to its credibility, which is established through methods of increasing the trustworthiness of the research design (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

In approaching the issue of trustworthiness, Lincoln and Guba (1985) asked, “How can an inquirer persuade his or her audience (including self) that the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to, worth taking account of?” (p. 290). In the present
investigation, the researcher made several methodological decisions in order to increase the quality of the study design and promote trustworthiness. Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Patton (2002) describe several different techniques that can be used. The ones that are most relevant to the current investigation include: member checks, triangulation, peer debriefing, a search for negative cases, and maintaining an audit trail. First, member checks were performed in person and through email by asking participants follow up questions to confirm emergent findings. Participants were also given the chance to review interview transcriptions and emergent findings and provide commentary. Second, the researcher used triangulation by combining qualitative and quantitative data sources in deriving final meaning from the data. Triangulation was also promoted through the interviewing of multiple participants about the same phenomenon and the comparisons that were made between T/Cs and NCTs.

Peer debriefing was accomplished through the involvement of an outside researcher in the data analysis process. Specifically, as themes begin to emerge, the researcher shared initial findings and example codes from the data with a researcher not directly involved in the project who was asked to comment upon and confirm or refute the researcher’s initial impressions. Next, while the findings were presented through themes, the researcher made a concentrated effort to find and highlight information from the data set that contradicted those themes. This allows for readers of the final report to understand that, while the themes were derived from the data, they are not universal truths. Finally, an audit trail was maintained throughout the data collection and analysis process in order to help keep the researcher on track and allow for the creation of research memos related to the unfolding analysis process.
Chapter Summary

Through the use of quantitative and qualitative data, this investigation sought to develop a more comprehensive understanding of role conflict and burnout among T/Cs and NCTs. Phase one of the study involved the collection of quantitative data through self-report survey measures. After the data collected in phase one were analyzed, a stratified random sample of participants was selected that accounted for teachers’ levels of role conflict and burnout. Individuals included in this subsample were invited to participate in in-depth qualitative interviews related to their experiences with role stressors, resilience, and burnout. While the qualitative data were collected as part of this study, it is not reported upon in the results of the dissertation. However, insight into the results of initial qualitative analyses will be provided in Chapter Seven.
CHAPTER FOUR – MANUSCRIPT ONE

Toward a Validated Measure of Teacher/Coach Role Conflict:

The Interrole Conflict Scale – Teacher/Coach (ICS-T/C)

Working in the context of the complex, bureaucratized American educational system can be a taxing career choice. The micropolitical subculture that surrounds physical education (PE) teachers can cause it to be even more difficult. Often marginalized and isolated, the PE teacher must learn to survive life in schools that do not always embrace the role their discipline plays in the educative process (Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013). Many PE teachers choose to simultaneously fill the role of athletic coach, which can further complicate their occupational landscape (Konukman et al., 2010). Dating back to the seminal work of Locke and Massengale (1978) much has been written about potential problems that can arise when the role of teacher and athletic coach are combined (Millslagle & Morley, 2004; Richards & Templin, 2012; T. D. Ryan, 2008). Predominant in much of this scholarship is the notion that concurrently filling both teacher and coach roles will result in a conflict so intense that it is perceived to be unavoidable (Konukman et al., 2010; Locke & Massengale, 1978).

While some evidence suggests that PE teachers feel compelled to take on coaching roles (Konukman et al., 2010), the anticipatory socialization of PE recruits may also predispose them to seek coaching roles. Many recruits have a history of sport
participation and hope to continue involvement in sport through coaching (Curtner-Smith, 2009). Lawson (1983b) was among the first to suggest that recruits enter physical education teacher education programs for primarily two reasons: interest in coaching and interest in teaching PE. Curtner-Smith (2009) has found that individuals who are male and involved in traditional team sports tend to be oriented toward coaching while those who are female and involved in non-traditional team sports tend to favor teaching. Teacher education programs tend to be more effective in socializing recruits with teaching orientations as the perspectives of teacher educators tend to be more in line with their value orientations than those of coaching oriented recruits (Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013).

Although currently filling teaching and coaching roles is not inherently problematic, the dual role structure can become problematic when it evolves into teacher/coach (T/C) role conflict. T/C role conflict is marked by instances in which individuals perceive conflicting expectations for performance between the teacher and coach roles and feel as if they do not have the time, energy, or resources to fill the responsibilities of both roles (Richards & Templin, 2012). When role conflict is high, individuals may engage in role retreatism, a process through which they prioritize one role to the detriment of the alter role (Millslagle & Morley, 2004). Role conflict can be explained through the theoretical lens of role theory.

**Role Theory as a Guiding Framework**

Role theory (Merton, 1957) explains the ways in which individuals are expected to act and how they expect others to act based upon the statuses they fill within society. A theatre metaphor is often employed to depict the notion of social actors playing out roles
intended to guide behavior (Stryker, 2001). Social actors occupy specific positions within the social hierarchy referred to as statuses (Merton, 1957). At one time an individual can simultaneously occupy multiple statuses. For example, an individual may simultaneously occupy the statuses of father, spouse, community volunteer, and teacher.

Each status that an individual occupies has an associated social script that directs the way in which the status is to be enacted. These social scripts are the dynamic aspect of statuses and are referred to as roles. Roles relate to the way in which one performs a role and are guided by internally or externally enforced guidelines for behavior within their particular social statuses. Each social status also has associated role-sets, which includes the relationships and interactions in which a social actor is engaged by virtue of their status position (Merton, 1957; Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013). Role-sets can be conceived as categories of individuals in other statuses that have a vested interest in the way in which a status-incumbent performs a particular role. For example, a teacher may have a role-set for students, parents, colleagues, and administrators.

When actors within a particular social setting agree upon expectations for behavior (i.e., role consensus), the social system is at its most efficient state and actors avoid conflict with one another (Hindin, 2007). While role consensus may be more likely when actors share similar socialization experiences, evidence indicates that it is far from a universal principal (Stryker, 2001). When disagreement occurs, the role stressors of role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload may become more prominent (Conley & You, 2009). Role ambiguity is defined as perceived uncertainty about how to carry out one’s work role and role overload as incompatibility between work demands and time allotted to fill those demands. Role conflict relates the perception of different groups of persons
holding differing expectations for one’s performance. This can lead to incongruences in
performed and expected patterns of behavior (Richards & Templin, 2012).

**Role Conflict**

Role conflict occurs when role-sets hold expectations for performance that differ
to the extent that fulfillment of all expectations is a realistic impossibility (Turner, 2001).
In situations marked by role conflict the actor is exposed to a confrontation between
individual and social or cultural expectations for performance (Hindin, 2007). Role
conflict can be exacerbated when the element of conflict is present at level of
institutionalized role expectations (Parsons, 1966). Since the conflicting expectations are
institutionalized, they can all be considered legitimate, which makes the correct patterns
of behavior difficult to discern. Linked to the notion of role overload, role conflict can
also occur when individuals are asked to perform so many role-related responsibilities
that they are not able to meet all of the expectations (Richards & Templin, 2012). Role
conflict has been cited as an antecedent of burnout (Drake & Hebert, 2002) and has been
linked to conditions such as malintegration in the workplace, poor job performance, and
decreased occupational commitment (Hom & Kinicki, 2001). Scholars tend to
differentiate between interrole conflict and intrarole conflict.

Intrarole conflict refers to role conflict that occurs within a single status position
for example, individuals who occupy the role of university faculty member are typically pulled in multiple directions related to the university missions of teaching, research, and service. When the number of varied responsibilities within a status increases, so does the likelihood of role conflict. Limited time and resources often preclude equal attention
being given to all of the role functions (Turner, 2001). Intrarole conflict also occurs when
expectations for role performance are contradictory and ambiguous (Richards & Templin, 2012). Different role-sets often hold differing expectations for role performance. Merton (1957) posited that individuals are most likely to perform in accordance with the expectations of the role-sets that they view as being most salient. The extent to which role performance is observable by a particular role-set also impacts a status-incumbent’s fidelity to that role-set’s expectations for performance.

Whereas intrarole conflict occurs within the performance of a single role, interrole conflict occurs when an individual plays multiple roles which conflict with one another. Conflict can present itself in the form of insufficient time to meet all role expectations or in instances in which patterns of behavior required for role performance are drastically different. Turner (2001) explained that interrole conflict occurs “when a person plays roles that call for contradictory kinds of actions, such as kindness versus aggressiveness, openness versus scheming, or impartial judgment versus friendly or familial bias” (245-246). When roles are well compartmentalized within an individual’s life or the social structure, interrole conflict may be reduced. However, when the boundaries between roles becomes blurred, role conflict may be more likely to occur.

When multiple roles conflict, it may be necessary for individuals to sacrifice the performance of all roles or to prioritize some over others (Parsons, 1966). Stryker (1968) postulated that individuals arrange roles in a hierarchy of salience based upon those with which they most identify. Roles at the top of an individual’s hierarchy are more predictive of behavior than those which are afforded less salience (Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013). Marks and MacDermind (1996) acknowledge the existence of status hierarchies, but promoted a theory of role balance as a more adaptive way to handle the
performance of multiple roles. Individuals can find balance by performing roles according to temporal salience. Priority is given to the role that is most salient at a given time. Richards and Templin (2012) noted that factors such as the support system and context in which one works likely influence the degree to which role balance is possible.

The Dual role of Teacher/Coach

The dual role of T/C is derived from the notion that PE and athletic coaching share so many commonalities that they should be performed by the same individual (Konukman et al., 2010). There is a degree of overlap between the roles, such as a focus on skill development, physical movement, and extensive contact with children (O'Connor & Macdonald, 2002). However, the roles also require differing patterns of behavior, performance goals, and reward and accountability structures (Locke & Massengale, 1978; Richards & Templin, 2012).

In PE, the development of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor competencies as well as an affinity for lifelong physical activity are typically cited as goals, while athletics seeks to develop talented performers and produce winning teams. Athletics are optional, extracurricular activities whereas PE, when part of the school curriculum, is compulsory. There are also differences related to participant motivation and the heterogeneity of PE classes compared to the relative homogeneity of athletic teams which can create conflict (Richards & Templin, 2012). T/C behavior has also been found to vary across settings. Kwon, Pyun, and Kim (2010) found that students perceived more opportunities to respond, better instruction, and more positive feedback during athletic participation than in PE classes.
Reward and accountability structures often differ across teaching and coaching roles. In PE, status-incumbents are rarely fired because of inadequate teaching performance, but coaches may lose their jobs for not producing winning teams (Konukman et al., 2010). Accountability structures may also be less clear for PE teachers than they are for athletic coaches. Sage (1987) explained that “there is typically little public evaluation of teachers of their students, and organizational evaluations tend to be sporadic and ambiguous” (p. 218). Similarly, T/Cs are often caught in a contradictory and unequal reward system. T/Cs may feel that, while they were hired as a teacher first, their true objective is to cultivate winning teams (Konukman et al., 2010). Goals associated with coaching may be easier for the T/C to identify and the coach may also be more likely to perceive consensus among role-sets (Richards & Templin, 2012). Differences in expectations, accountability, and rewards for role performance across the roles of teacher and athletic coach present several inconsistencies, which presents the opportunity for role conflict when the roles are performed in tandem.

**Teacher/Coach Role Conflict and Role Retreatism**

T/C role conflict is a type of interrole conflict that can occur when individuals simultaneously play roles associated with school teacher and athletic coach (Locke & Massengale, 1978; Richards & Templin, 2012). Due to inconsistencies in role performance across the teacher and coach roles, conflicting expectations for performance from various role-sets, limited time to perform the vast and varied responsibilities related to role performance, and individual preference for one role over the other, research has found role conflict to be problematic for dual role T/Cs (Drake & Hebert, 2002; Locke & Massengale, 1978; T. D. Ryan, 2008).
Previous research has documented some of the issues that arise when T/Cs experience role conflict. Wirszyla (2002) found that T/C role conflict inhibited teachers from becoming fully invested in a curriculum reform project. In her study, Rovengo (1994) noted that T/Cs relied on teaching sports they coached during coaching seasons in order to reduce teaching preparation time. Felder and Wishnietsky (1990) found gender differences in the experience of T/C role conflict, with females experiencing greater conflict. Tension between the roles has also been cited as a reason for why PE teachers decide to leave the profession (Macdonald, 1999). In some cases, the experience of T/C role conflict can become overwhelming for the status-incumbent. When this occurs, T/Cs often respond by prioritizing one role over the other based on their personal salience hierarchy (Richards & Templin, 2012). This prioritization is often associated with role retreatism, which occurs when T/Cs invest the majority of their time in one role while neglecting the alter-role (Millslagle & Morley, 2004). When T/Cs must decide how to spend their time, the decision is typically made based on the role for which they are held more accountable and are offered greater rewards and recognition (Millslagle & Morley, 2004). The coaching role typically becomes dominant as social support and rewards are perceived to be higher than in teaching (O'Connor & Macdonald, 2002; Sage, 1987). Since role retreatism has implications for the neglected role, performance of the teaching role tends to suffer when individuals prioritize coaching (Richards & Templin, 2012).

Some evidence indicates that certain T/Cs are able to navigate the dual role structure effectively by finding a sense of role balance between teaching and coaching. Ryan (2008) found that teachers who achieved role balance reported lower levels of role conflict and were more content with their work life. Teachers in O’Connor and
Macdonald’s (2002) study experienced role conflict, but the consequences were lessened by a supportive and rewarding work environment. Teachers in Napper-Owen and Phillip’s (1995) study likewise perceived limited benefits associated with the T/C dual role. With the notion of role balance in mind, Richards and Templin (2012) proposed a multidimensional approach to conceptualizing T/C role conflict. This model accounts for the influence of personal- and socialization-level factors in determining the degree to which role conflict will be problematic for the T/C. The authors propose that work environments that support and reward the T/C in both roles equitably will lead to fewer instances of role conflict than those which prioritize the performance of one role over the other.

**Measuring Teacher/Coach Role Conflict**

At least two instruments for evaluating T/C role conflict have been proposed in the literature. Locke and Massengale (1978) expanded on a model of teacher role conflict proposed by Grace (1972) to measure T/C role conflict. Grace’s model articulates three areas of role conflict observed in teachers: value conflict, status conflict, and self/other conflict. Locke and Massengale (1978) added the dimensions of load conflict and T/C conflict. Results indicated that T/Cs were particularly susceptible to conflict related to the dimensions of load, value, and status. However, Cronbach’s α was not reported as a measure of internal consistency and the five factor structure has not been subjected to Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) or Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). Further, the five dimensions of T/C role conflict were not correlated with similar measures to evaluate construct validity.
Ryan (2008) measured T/C role conflict using a 10-item, modified version of Kopelman, Greenhaus, and Connolly’s (1983) instrument for evaluating work/family interrole conflict. This instrument included two factors that measured the extent to which teaching interfered with coaching and the extent to which coaching interfered with teaching. Austell (2010) employed a modified version of Ryan’s (2008) T/C role conflict scale that included additional items on each of the initial factors in addition to a measure of T/C job satisfaction. While Cronbach’s $\alpha$ was reported in both studies, the internal consistency was not satisfactory in Austell’s (2010) investigation ($\alpha=0.369$ to $0.694$). Further, neither Ryan (2008) nor Austell (2010) validated their measures using EFA or CFA, and construct validity was not evaluated in either study.

While attempts have been made to quantify T/C role conflict, the literature still lacks a valid and reliable instrument. Since T/C role conflict is still viewed as an inhibitor to quality teaching practices by many in the PE field, the need for such an instrument is great. The purpose of this investigation, therefore, was to validate a psychometric instrument intended to measure role conflict among dual role T/Cs referred to as the Interrole Conflict Scale-Teacher/Coach (ICS-T/C). A secondary purpose was to evaluate the relationship between T/C role conflict and the teacher intrarole stressors of role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload. Due to theoretical similarities in the measured constructs, it was hypothesized that T/C role conflict could be positively correlated with teacher intrarole stressors.
Method

Participants

Participants were 194 T/Cs (87 male, 107 female) across three adjacent school districts in the American Midwest. Most of the participants (59.30%) had completed master’s degrees and the average T/C had been teaching for 17.11 years ($SD=10.97$).

T/Cs taught in a variety of school settings including elementary schools (23.20%), middle schools (28.30%), high schools (42.30%), and multiple levels (6.20%). T/Cs taught a variety of academic subjects with 64.4% reporting core subject affiliation (e.g., mathematics, science, elementary education) and the remainder of the sample identifying with a non-core subject (e.g., PE, art, music). T/Cs reported coaching at a variety of levels including elementary (8.2%), middle school (21.60%), high school (22.70%), and multiple levels (47.40%). The average T/C reported participating in 2.74 non-teaching duties (e.g., athletic coach, student club supervisor, committee member; $SD=1.37$) and coached an average of 2.85 ($SD=1.78$) sports during their careers.

Procedures and Instrumentation

After receiving Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval to conduct the investigation, the superintendents at three school corporations surrounding the researchers’ university were contacted and asked for permission to conduct the investigation. Following district approval, the researchers emailed all of the teachers in the three school districts and invited them to participate in the study. Teachers who were interested in participating were directed to a follow a link to an online survey that was administered via Qualtrics survey software. All participants completed a demographic
questionnaire in addition to instruments intended to measure T/C role conflict and teacher role stressors.

**Teacher/coach role conflict.** Qualtrics display logic was used to request that teachers who reported coaching roles answered a specific set of questions related to T/C role conflict. Specifically, 24-items that included a combination of the questions administered by Ryan (2008) and Austell (2010) were administered for potential inclusion in the ICS-T/C. These items were selected because they had been utilized in recent research and are specific to T/C role conflict. All items were set to a seven-point, Likert-type scale ranging from strong disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Many of these items are derived from preexisting instruments that measure interrole conflict between other occupational roles (Hom & Kinicki, 2001; Kopelman et al., 1983; Rizzo et al., 1970) and appeared promising for the measure of T/C interrole conflict. The full list of items are included in Table 4.1.

**Teacher role stressors.** Participants also completed the nine-item Teacher Role Stressors Survey (TRSS; Conley & You, 2009), with subscales that evaluate role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload in the teacher role. All items were set to a seven-point, Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Example items include: “I feel certain about how much authority I have” (role ambiguity; recoded item), “I often work under incompatible policies and procedures” (role conflict), and “there isn’t enough time during my regular workday to do everything that’s expected of me” (role overload). The TRSS subscales measure constructs similar to what the researcher’s anticipated that the ICS-T/C would measure and were included to evaluate construct
validity. In the current investigation, internal consistency for the TRSS ranged from adequate to good (Cronbach’s $\alpha$ ranged from 0.73 to 0.86).

**Data Analysis**

Initial statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS 21.0. Following standard procedures for data screening for inferential statistics (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), EFA was used to identify the underlying factor structure of the ICS-T/C. Given the nature of the questions and the results reported by Ryan (2008) and Austell (2010), a four factor structure was identified as a potential fit for the data. The four hypothesized factors intended to measure teaching preference, coaching preference, T/C interrole conflict, and T/C job satisfaction. The EFA was conducted using Maximum Likelihood Extraction with a Direct Oblimin (non-orthogonal) rotation in order to account for correlations among the factors. Next, the researchers conducted factor reduction by removing items that did not load on any of the factors, did not load as predicted, or exhibited strong cross loading on two or more factors. Items were removed one at a time with the goal of identifying a more parsimonious factor structure which was evaluated through increases in the percentage of variance explained and decreases in the $\chi^2$ goodness of fit statistic. Internal consistency reliability for the ICS-T/C and the subscales of the TRSS was assessed using Cronbach’s (1951) coefficient alpha.

Following EFA, CFA using LISREL 9.1 was conducted in order to test and confirm the best factor structure of the ICS-T/C. CFA is a theory driven, confirmatory technique that tests relationships among latent and manifest variables that are supported by logic or theory (Schreiber, Stage, King, Nora, & Barlow, 2006). Multiple fit indices including the comparative fit index (CFI), Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI), the
Standardized Room Mean Residual (SRMR), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) were performed to evaluate the appropriateness of model fit (T. Brown, 2006). For both CFI and NNFI values greater than .95 indicate a close fit between the model and the data. SRMR values should be close to or below .08. RMSEA, values of .05 or less indicate good fit whereas values below .10 indicate an adequate fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Significance tests for factor loading were also examined. A significant factor loading with a standardized coefficient above .30 indicates that the item is a good measure of the underlying factor (Hatcher, 1994). Finally, bivariate correlations between the ICS-T/C and the subscales of the TRSS were conducted to evaluate the construct validity of the ICS-T/C.

Results

Items Included in the ICS-T/C

Initial EFA sought to determine if a four factor structure – T/C job satisfaction, teaching preference, coaching preference, and T/C interrole conflict – fit the data. This four factor structure was hypothesized following previous research (Austell, 2010; T. D. Ryan, 2008). Factor loadings for the 24-items measured for potential inclusion in the ICS-T/C are included in Table 4.1. While the four factor model explained 59.15% of the variance, several items cross-loaded, many did not load on the intended factor, and one item did not load on any factor. The four factor structure did not appear to be a good fit for the data. Importantly, none of the teaching preference items loaded correctly. As a result, the researchers conducted item and factor reduction in an effort to find a more parsimonious model to fit the data. This process confirmed that the four factor model may not have been an appropriate fit for the data.
The researchers experimented with a three factor model (teaching preference, coaching preference, and T/C interrole conflict) as well as a two factor model intended to measure the extent to which teaching interfered with coaching and coaching interfered with teaching. Both of these factor structures were loosely based on the work of Ryan (2008). However, neither of these options presented suitable models in which items loaded on the hypothesized factors and did not cross-load. Given that the intended purpose of the ICS-T/C was to measure T/C interrole conflict, the researchers decided to explore a unidimensional factor structure that used only the interrole conflict items. As is depicted in Table 4.2, the 10 items exhibited strong loadings on a single factor. The unidimensional factor structure explained 48.35% of the variance in the subscale score and internal consistency of the subscale was high (Cronbach’s α=.90). Taken together, this information provides support for the 10-item, unidimensional structure of the ICS-T/C.

**Confirmation of the ICS-T/C Unidimensional Factor Structure**

The 10-item, unidimensional structure of the ICS-T/C that was identified through EFA was tested using CFA to evaluate the degree to which the hypothesized model fit the data. The CFA indicated that the unidimensional model provided an adequate fit for the data, \( \chi^2(35)=136.90, p<.001; \) CFI=.95; NNFI=.94; SRMR=.06; RMSEA=.12. However, post-hoc model modification indexes recommended the estimation of an error covariance between RC 20 and RC 15. This error covariance is not surprising giving that all of the items loaded on a single factor and it is not uncommon for error covariances among items in the same factor. Following the revision, the model fit become very good, \( \chi^2(34)=105.50, p<.001; \) CFI=.97; NNFI=.95; SRMR=.06; RMSEA=.10. Table 4.3
provides the variance/covariance matrix for all items. The obtained $t$ values for the items ranged from 8.05 to 14.29. Since all $t$ values exceeded 3.29, all were significant at $p<.001$ (Hatcher, 1994). As displayed in Figure 4.1, the completely standardized factor loadings ranged from .76 to .59 and only one loading was below .60. Taken together, the CFA results provide strong support for the goodness of fit between the proposed model and the observed data.

**Construct Validity of the IC-T/C**

Table 4.4 displays bivariate correlations and descriptive statistics for the ICS-T/C as well as the three subscales of the TRSS. Bivariate correlations were conducted between the ICS-T/C and the three subscales of the TRSS in order to evaluate the construct validity of the new scale. The correlations between the ICS-T/C and all subscales of the TRSS are significant at the $\alpha=.001$ level, which provides empirical validation of the ICS-T/C. While the correlations were significant, they were not so high as to suggest that T/C role conflict is the same as intrarole conflict, role ambiguity, or role overload in the teacher role. The correlation between the ICS-T/C and role overload is strongest suggesting that having too many responsibilities to perform is an important reason for why T/Cs experience role conflict. The role conflict and role ambiguity subscales also correlate strongly with the ICS-T/C. This supports the notion that T/C role conflict is related to, yet distinct from, all dimensions captured by the TRSS.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this investigation was to create and validate an instrument intended to measure T/C interrole conflict. Initially, the initial 24 items derived from Ryan (2008) and Austell (2010) were subjected to EFA. While previous research
applications suggested a three or four factor structure, neither of these solutions appeared to be a good fit for the data. Through item and factor reduction, it was found that a 10-item, unidimensional factor structure best fit the data. This unidimensional factor structure was confirmed using CFA. Bivariate correlations between the ICS-T/C and the three subscales of the TRSS confirm that the ICS-T/C is similar to, yet distinct from the teacher intrarole stressors of role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload. The results of the current study suggest that the ICS-T/C is a valid and reliable instrument for measuring interrole conflict among T/Cs.

The availability of a valid and reliable quantitative measure of T/C role conflict is a critical contribution for the PE literature as well as the educational literature more broadly. Relative to physical education, the IC-T/C will allow for the verification of Ryan’s (2008) finding that T/C who have a preference for one role over the other experience greater levels of role conflict than those who prefer both roles equally. This would begin to test the concept of role balance among T/Cs (Marks & MacDermid, 1996). Further, it will allow researchers to empirically evaluate Richards and Templin’s (2012) multidimensional model of T/C role conflict by examining personal-level factors (e.g., gender, years of teaching experience) and socialization-level factors (e.g., administrative support for teaching and coaching, school context, teaching level) that are positively or negatively related to T/C role conflict. The ICS-T/C will also allow for studies that examine the impact of variables such as gender, teaching and coaching level, and subject affiliation on T/C role conflict. Based on previous research, it can be postulated that female T/Cs may experience greater role conflict than males (Felder & Wishnietsky, 1990). It is also logical to postulate that T/Cs who coach popular high
school sports (e.g., basketball, football) may experience greater role conflict than those in elementary and middle school and coaches of less popular sports (e.g., cross country, baseball; Herbert, 2007).

Beyond physical education, the ICS-T/C will likely prove valuable to educational researchers more broadly. While the T/C role conflict literature has focused primarily on PE teachers, educators across all disciplines engage in coaching roles. For example, the sample in the current investigation only included 23 PE teachers. The remaining 171 T/Cs taught in disciplines outside of PE. Richards and Templin (2012) included teaching assignment as part of their multidimensional model of T/C role conflict and postulated that teachers of core subjects (e.g., mathematics, science, elementary education) would experience role conflict differently than those of non-core subjects such as physical education. For example, while PE teachers cope with marginalization and isolation, teachers of core subjects may struggle with greater pressures associated standardized testing and student assessment (Valli, Croninger, & Walters, 2007). Initial research by Locke and Massengale (1978) supports the notion that role conflict may vary by subject affiliation and this hypothesis can be confirmed using the ICS-T/C.

The ICS-T/C also has practical implications and uses. The instrument provides researchers and practitioners with a way to quantify the effects of role conflict and identify instances in which role conflict appears to pose problems to organizational and personal wellbeing. When T/C role conflict has been identified, steps can be taken to promote a greater sense of role balance in order to mitigate the conflict and stress experienced by T/Cs. Richards and Templin’s (2012) multidimensional model for T/C role conflict suggests numerous variables that could be adjusted in order to help the
individual T/C achieve role balance. Further, the ICS-T/C will also allow future researchers to correlate T/C role conflict with other variables such as burnout and attrition that are believed to be related to role conflict (Drake & Hebert, 2002; Hom & Kinicki, 2001). Though the studies recommended above as well as others that will likely emerge, researchers can develop a better understanding of T/C role conflict, which includes its causes and correlates and interventions to reduce it.

**What Does This Paper Add?**

While much has been learned through the study of T/C role conflict, the majority of this research has been qualitative and only a handful of studies have attempted to quantitative measure role conflict in T/Cs. Therefore, the validation of a psychometric instrument to measure T/C role conflict is an important step forward in understanding the implications of concurrently occupying the roles of teacher and athletic coach. Future researchers will be able to use this instrument to measure T/C role conflict and understand how it varies by subgroups such as gender, teaching level, and subject affiliation. Further, researchers will be able to develop statistical models to predict role conflict and to study consequences associated with high role conflict. As research using the ICS-T/C accumulates cut offs for high, moderate, and low levels of T/C role conflict can be established which will allow applied researchers to use the instrument in order to better understand the experiences of inservice T/Cs and to identify individuals who may be at risk for some of the documented negative consequences of high role conflict, such as role retreatism. Research conducted with the ICS-T/C can also be used to educate preservice and inservice teachers on some of the consequences of role conflict and to help them understand the value of achieving role balance.
Table 4.1.

Factor loading from initial exploratory factor analysis of the full 24-items examined for inclusion in the ICS-T/C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. &quot;Because coaching is demanding, at times I am irritable while teaching.&quot;*</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. &quot;Because of the amount of energy I spend in coaching, I often come to class too tired to do some of the things that I would like to do.&quot;*</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. &quot;After teaching, I go to my practices or games more fatigued than I would prefer.&quot;*</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In general, I like working at my job. (includes both teaching and coaching combined).</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In general, I don't like my job. (includes teaching and coaching combined).</td>
<td>-.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. All in all, I am satisfied with my job. (includes teaching and coaching combined).</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. &quot;In general, I like teaching at this school.&quot;*</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. &quot;All in all, I am satisfied with teaching.&quot;*</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. &quot;I intend to stay in the teaching profession for the foreseeable future.&quot;*</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. &quot;It is likely that I will explore career opportunities other than coaching or teaching&quot;</td>
<td>-.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. &quot;I frequently think about leaving this school or school district&quot;</td>
<td>-.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. &quot;I will likely give up some or all of my teaching role(s) within the next two years.&quot;*</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. &quot;I will likely search and apply for a job with another district within the next year.&quot;</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. &quot;In general, I like coaching for this school.&quot;*</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. &quot;In teaching, I have so much work to do that it takes away from my coaching&quot;</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. &quot;My teaching schedule makes it difficult to perform my coaching duties&quot;</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. &quot;Coaching takes up time that I would spend involved in my teaching role.&quot;</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. &quot;My coaching makes it difficult to be the kind of teacher I'd like to be.&quot;</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. &quot;I am often preoccupied with an aspect of my coaching while I am in the classroom.&quot;</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. &quot;Because teaching is demanding, at times I am irritable while coaching&quot;</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I will likely give up some or all of my coaching role(s) within the next two years.</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. &quot;I intend to stay in the coaching profession for the foreseeable future.&quot;</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. &quot;I am often preoccupied with an aspect from the classroom while I am coaching.&quot;*</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. &quot;All in all, I am satisfied with coaching.&quot;</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: TP=teaching preference, JS=job satisfaction, IC=T/C interrole conflict, and CP=coaching preference. Only factor loadings of .30 or greater are presented. Items that do not include a factor loading did not load above .30 on any item.*Items did not load correctly in the hypothesized three factor structure.
Table 4.2.

Factor structure for the 10 item, unidimensional ICS-T/C after conducting factor reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICS-T/C Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. &quot;Coaching takes up time that I would spend involved in my teaching role.&quot;</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. &quot;My coaching makes it difficult to be the kind of teacher I'd like to be.&quot;</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. &quot;Because of the amount of energy I spend in coaching, I often come to class too tired to do some of the things that I would like to do.&quot;</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. &quot;Because coaching is demanding, at times I am irritable while teaching.&quot;</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. &quot;I am often preoccupied with an aspect from the classroom while I am coaching.&quot;</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. &quot;Because teaching is demanding, at times I am irritable while coaching.&quot;</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. &quot;My teaching schedule makes it difficult to perform my coaching duties.&quot;</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. &quot;After teaching, I go to my practices or games more fatigued than I would prefer.&quot;</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. &quot;I am often preoccupied with an aspect of my coaching while I am in the classroom.&quot;</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. &quot;In teaching, I have so much work to do that it takes away from my coaching.&quot;</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Item labels correspond to the labels for the original 24 items subjected to EFA.
Table 4.3.

Variance/covariance for all items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. RC 20</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. RC 4</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. RC 5</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. RC 15</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. RC 9</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. RC 16</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. RC 6</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RC 21</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. RC 24</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. RC 10</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Item labels correspond to the labels for the original 24 items subjected to EFA.
Table 4.4.

Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations for the ICS-T/C and subscales of the TRSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>ICS-T/C</th>
<th>Role Ambiguity</th>
<th>Role Conflict</th>
<th>Role Overload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICS-T/C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient Alpha</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *Correlation is significant at the α=.001 level (two-tailed).
Figure 4.1. Latent factor solution for the ICS-T/C with factor loadings. Item labels correspond to the labels for the original 24 items subjected to EFA. $\chi^2(34) = 105.50$, $p < .001$; CFI = .97; NNFI = .95; SRMR = .06; RMSEA = .10
CHAPTER FIVE – MANUSCRIPT TWO

Understanding Differences in Role Stressors, Resilience, and Burnout in Teacher/Coaches and Non-Coaching Teachers

Concurrent occupation in the roles of teacher and coach has long been viewed with skepticism in the physical education literature. Dating back to Locke and Massengale’s (1978) seminal article on teacher/coach (T/C) role conflict, questions have been raised relative to the compatibility of the teacher and coach roles as well as the ability of individuals to meet performance expectations in both roles (Konukman et al., 2010; T. D. Ryan, 2008; Templin & Anthrop, 1981). According to Figone (1994), the historical origins of this skepticism is rooted in the internal tensions caused by the forced partnership between physical education and athletics. Nevertheless, there is a history of combining teaching and coaching roles and even viewing coaching as one of the responsibilities of physical education teachers (Konukman et al., 2010; Sage, 1987).

Without question, the role of school teacher is complex and multifaceted (Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013). Adding other responsibilities to one’s daily regiment has the potential to cause more stress and hardship. Research related to T/C role conflict was popular from the late 1970s through the 1990s. During this time, much was learned about the manifestation of role conflict and the influence it has on dual role T/Cs’ lives and careers. The majority of scholarship in this area is qualitative (O’Connor &
Macdonald, 2002; Templin et al., 1994) and provides an in depth understanding of how individual T/Cs navigate their role-related responsibilities. However, few studies have examined T/C role conflict through the use of quantitative methods. Notable exceptions include studies conducted by Locke and Massengale (1978), Ryan (2008), and Austell (2010). These studies highlight the influence of role conflict in creating tension within T/Cs’ work that has implications for performance in the classroom.

Virtually no evidence exists to support the hypothesis that T/Cs experience more role stressors and burnout than non-coaching teachers (NCTs). Also, since the majority of the research on T/C role conflict has focused on physical education T/Cs rather than those teaching in other academic subject areas, little is known about how role conflict may vary by academic subject affiliation. In an attempt to advance knowledge related to T/C role stressors and burnout, the purpose of this study was to understand the ways T/Cs and NCTs perceive role stressors, burnout, and resilience. Specifically, the study was guided by the following research questions: 1) how do T/Cs and NCTs compare on levels of role stressors, resilience, and burnout?, 2) how do teachers of core subjects (e.g., mathematics, science) compare to those in non-core subjects (e.g., physical education, art) on levels of role stressors, burnout, and resilience?, 2) and how does coaching status (T/C or NCT) and subject assignment (core or non-core subject) interact in the experience of role conflict, burnout, and resilience?

**Role Theory and Role Stressors**

Role theory (Merton, 1957; Parsons, 1951) is the theoretical perspective that underlies most of the research focused on T/C role conflict. Role theory uses a theatre metaphor to explain the ways in which individuals act in response to social and cultural
expectations for behavior (Stryker, 2001). Social actors are cast in statuses, which represent their positions within societal hierarchies. Every status has an associated role. Roles represent the dynamic aspects of statuses or the ways in which statuses are performed (Merton, 1957). Actors are guided by a set of internalized or externally enforced expectations and are judged by how well they perform these expectations (Conrad, 2004; Turner, 2001). Important in determining expectations for a given status position are role-sets. Role-sets are categories of social actors with whom an individual interacts regularly due to the nature of the status they occupy. For example, role-sets for a teacher include students, colleagues, administrators, parents, and community members.

Through socialization, individuals learn societal expectations for the enactment of the roles associated with the status positions they occupy (Conrad, 2004). Functionalist versions of role theory posited that individuals within a specific society or culture share consensus for role-related performance (B. J. Biddle, 1986). Theoretically, when members of the same status and associated role-sets agree upon standards of performance the social system runs smoothly and conflict is avoided. However, when the assumption of role consensus is not met, conflict may ensue as status-incumbents and role-sets disagree on the correct performance of a role. True role consensus is somewhat of a rare occurrence, but role-sets are more likely to be in agreement when they share similar socialization experiences (Hindin, 2007). Individuals are also taught that different social statuses are associated with differing levels of prestige in the context of a particular culture. They are socialized to value the positions which hold the greatest amount of prestige, which can lead to conflict when certain roles are given greater preference than others (Harrison & Lynch, 2005).
Role Stressors

When the social system fails to function smoothly, status-incumbents may experience various types of role stress related to the performance of their social roles. Research indicates that three potential role stressors include role conflict, role overload, and role ambiguity (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964). Role conflict refers to a situation in which different role-sets have varying expectations for behavior that are incompatible in the performance of the specified role (B. J. Biddle, 1986). For example, students may expect teachers to act in a certain way while administrators and colleagues hold differing expectations. When role conflict is present it provokes a confrontation between role incumbents and societal or cultural expectations (Hindin, 2007). Intrarole conflict occurs within one specific role whereas interrole conflict occurs when individuals occupy multiple roles and expectations for performance of those roles are so different that the roles become incompatible and lead to conflict (Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013).

Role overload occurs when individuals play more roles than they have the time or resources to do properly, or when the responsibilities associated with the performance of a particular role are too multifaceted to be realistically fulfilled by one individual (Hindin, 2007). When role overload becomes a pervasive issue it can lead to role retreatism in which the role-incumbent prioritizes one role or certain facets of a role over other roles or role facets (Millslagle & Morley, 2004). Role retreatism can lead the role incumbent to neglect non-prioritized roles or responsibilities while focusing on those that have received priority. The third role stressor, role ambiguity, occurs when expectations for role performance are too vague or incomplete to guide behavior (Hindin, 2007). In
these situations, individuals may not understand the expectations of role sets, which limits the degree to which expectations can guide behavior.

Evidence indicates that role stressors can have negative individual-level consequences such as reduced self-esteem, increased anxiety and tension, and burnout (Conley & You, 2009). High levels of role stressors have also been linked to turnover and attrition, which results in additional costs to employers (Conley & Woosley, 2000).

While studies of role stressors in education are limited, the available research has demonstrated the negative influence of role stressors on teachers’ work. Reyes and Imber (1992) and Lachman and Diamant (1987) found that teachers who perceive high role overload note lower levels of commitment, morale, and satisfaction than teachers who perceive lower role overload. Conley and You (2009) found that job satisfaction and commitment mediate the relationship between role stressors and intentions to leave teaching. Koustelios and Kousteliou (1998) note that the changing policy landscape in education may lead to additional role stress. The standardized test movement may cause role conflict and overload as teachers feel less sure about their priorities and more pressured to meet student and school performance expectations (Valli et al., 2007).

**Teacher/Coach Role Stressors**

T/C role conflict occurs when the job-related responsibilities of teaching and coaching call for differing patterns of behavior to the extent that they are incompatible for performance by the same person (Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013). Evidence from the physical education literature indicates that when socializing structures in one’s background and workplace environment predispose the T/C to favor one role over the other, role conflict is more likely to occur (Konukman et al., 2010). In these instances, the
T/C may retreat into one role which results in neglect of the alter role (Millslagle & Morley, 2004). Physical education T/Cs are more likely to perceive that they are held accountable and rewarded for the coaching role (Herbert, 2007). At the school level, T/C role conflict can be perpetuated by colleagues and administrators who pressure the T/C to achieve in coaching, but not in teaching (Konukman et al., 2010; Templin et al., 1994). This can lead the T/C to prioritize coaching over teaching, which has negative consequences for the teaching role (Richards & Templin, 2012).

T/C role conflict appears less likely in the dual role structure when individuals value performance in both teaching and coaching roles equally and when social structures within the school support the performance of both roles (O'Connor & Macdonald, 2002; T. D. Ryan, 2008). In these instances, T/Cs may be able to achieve a sense of interrole balance (Marks & MacDermid, 1996) which allows them to survive and thrive in both roles. Stated differently, some T/Cs may be more resilient than individuals who are afflicted with symptoms of role stressors and burnout. Richards and Templin (2012) proposed a multidimensional conceptualization of T/C role conflict which aims to understand T/C role conflict as relating to a multitude of individual- and socialization-level factors. Individuals who are more resilient, see both teaching and coaching as important to their professional identity, and are supported and held accountable for both roles may be less apt to experience role conflict and burnout than their counterparts.

While role balance appears to be possible in some instances, the perception that T/C role conflict is problematic appears to be ingrained within the physical education literature. From initial articles on the topic (e.g., Locke & Massengale, 1978; Templin & Anthrop, 1981) through more recent publications (e.g., Konukman et al., 2010; Richards
& Templin, 2012) the notion that filling the dual role of T/C is at least potentially problematic appears pervasive. However, gaps remain in the literature. For example, little evidence is available to suggest that the role conflict perceived by T/Cs is more severe than that perceived by NCTs. Also, while Locke and Massengale (1978) found that T/Cs in physical education experienced significantly more role conflict than those from other subjects, little follow-up research has examined the role of subject affiliation in the experience of T/C role conflict. Further, only scant attention has been paid to T/Cs perceptions of role overload and role ambiguity. All three role stressors should be measured in order to understand the ways in which T/Cs and NCTs experience role stressors.

**Teacher Burnout**

Linked to the notion of role stressors is the construct of burnout. Burnout is a multidimensional syndrome marked by exhaustion and withdrawal from one’s work as the result of prolonged stress (Maslach & Jackson, 1986). Maslach, Jackson, and Leiter (1996) developed the Maslach Burnout Inventory which has become one of the most often used measures of burnout. The Maslach Burnout Inventory consists of three interrelated domains: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion refers to a state in which individuals feel as if they have expended all of their emotional resources or are emotionally overextended (Maslach & Jackson, 1986). Depersonalization relates to the development of negative attitudes towards others in the work environment that manifest through impersonal or callous interactions (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996). Finally, low levels of personal accomplishment relate to diminished feelings of competence and successful achievement.
(Maslach, 1993). This typically manifests through the tendency to criticize and negatively view one’s own work with clients. Taken together, these dimensions represent an emotional, interpersonal, and undesirable response to working with and in service to others (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996). Burnout has been associated with decreased job performance, health consequences, and an increased propensity to leave the profession among service workers in a variety of fields, including teaching (Maslach et al., 2001).

Maslach, Jackson, and Schwab (1996) created the Maslach Burnout Inventory-Educators Survey (MBI-ES) that has been used to study burnout among teachers. Using this instrument, a plethora of research has been conducted to examine teacher burnout. Given the substantial physical and emotional investment required to teach (Day et al., 2007; Lortie, 1975) as well as the repetitive nature of daily events, restricted interaction with other adults, and limited opportunities for reflection (Fullan, 2007), it should not be surprising that teaching has attracted such attention. Research has found that teaching is characterized by high levels of burnout and emotional exhaustion (Hakanen et al., 2006).

High burnout levels among teachers have been tied to teacher shortages through attrition and high rates of teacher turnover (T. M. Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Equally as important, teachers who are experiencing high levels of burnout, but remain in the teaching profession may have less motivation to teach, which can lead to degraded classroom practices (Olivier & Venter, 2003). Carson, Weiss, and Templin (2010) found that burnout may be an emotional state for teachers and that feelings of emotional exhaustion may vary throughout the day. This indicates that teachers may be more effective when feeling energized and satisfied with their jobs and less effective when
experiencing turbulence or negative work events. Numerous studies point to the importance of role stressors as predictors of burnout among teachers. Role ambiguity has been found to correlate positively with total teacher burnout as well as the dimensions of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization (Capel, 1991; Lee & Ashforth, 1996).

Strong evidence exists for the positive relationship between role conflict and burnout among teachers. Teachers who feel high levels of role conflict also tend to experience high levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization (Byrne, 1994; Lee & Ashforth, 1996). Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter (2001) note that job related stressors, including role conflict, correlate more highly with burnout than client-related stressors, such as problems interacting with clients. As a result, several theoretical models for explaining burnout include role conflict as a moderating variable (Byrne, 1994). Role overload also tends to correlate positively with burnout in general as well as the dimensions of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization (Chan, 2003; Dorman, 2003). Teacher burnout has also been found to be a mediating variable in the relationship between role overload and intention to leave (Lachman & Diamant, 1987). While it is unclear whether or not T/Cs experience higher rates of burnout than NCTs, moderate to high levels of burnout have been cited among T/Cs (Kosa, 1990).

**Teacher Resilience**

Teaching is a demanding job. As schools continue to diversify and the role of school teacher is made increasingly complex, it is important for teachers to become resilient if they are to survive in the context of schools (Gu & Day, 2007). Resilience is defined as an adaptive process related to negative or unpleasant experiences (Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000) and is seen as “the capacity to ‘bounce back,’ to recover strengths or
spirit quickly, and efficiently in the face of adversity” (Day & Gu, 2010, p. 156). While the stressors that teachers encounter in their daily lives are well documented, only recently have researchers began to investigate the processes that help teachers thrive in the schools (Beltman et al., 2011).

While the study of resilience in teaching is still developing, those investigations that have been conducted highlight the potential role of resilience in the management of teacher stress (Day & Gu, 2009, 2010; Le Cornu, 2009; Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000; Nieto, 2003a). Resilience is linked to the interactive impact of personal, professional, and situational factors on teachers’ work and commitment (Connor & Davidson, 2003). Nieto (2003a) notes that higher levels of resilience fuels teachers with the positive energy needed to overcome stressful working conditions and hardship. Connor and Davidson (2003) developed the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC) as a measure of resilience. The instrument has demonstrated sound psychometric properties in numerous investigations and has been used in studies involving schoolteachers (e.g., L. Wang et al., 2010).

The degree to which individuals are capable of exercising their resilient capacity is based, in part, upon the nature of the contexts in which they work, the people with whom they interact, and their intrinsic motivation to overcome adversity (Gu & Day, 2007). Bobek (2002) described resilience as a “process of development that occurs overtime” involving “the ability to adjust to varied situations and increase one’s competence in the face of adverse conditions” (p. 202). Thus, while resilience may have some internally driven characteristics, it is also relative and dependent upon the setting in which one works and the challenges with which one is confronted (Luthar & Cicchetti,
2000). Further, certain elements of the work environment may predispose individuals to resilience while others threaten their ability to be resilient. Mansfield, Beltman, Price, and McConney (2012) proposed a four dimensional framework of resilience that includes profession-related, social, emotional, and motivational factors that may encourage or prevent the development of resilience. Since managing emotions, coping with stress, and managing time are among the factors that influence resilience and are related to burnout and role stressors, these constructs may have important implications for teachers’ ability to build resilience.

Method

Participants and Setting

Participants in this investigation were 413 teachers from three adjacent school districts in the American Midwest. The sample was comprised of 207 T/Cs (88 male, 119 female) and 206 NCTs (32 male, 174 female). The average participant had been teaching for 16.87 years (SD=11.41) and the majority of the participants (55.70%) had completed a master’s degree. Participants were split among elementary (37.50%), middle (21.80%), and high schools (34.40%) with some (6.30%) teaching in multiple settings. With regards to subject affiliation, 63.90% of the participants taught core academic subjects (e.g., mathematics, science, language arts, elementary education) and the remaining 36.10% taught non-core subjects (e.g., physical education, art, music). In addition to their teaching responsibilities, participants reported engaging in an average of 2.51 non-teaching roles (e.g., athletic coaching, club supervisor, school committee member; SD=1.44). Participants reported having 52.20 minutes of prep time during the school day (SD=30.40) and spent a total of 3.00 hours per day preparing for school-related tasks.
On a five-point Likert-type scale, participants perceived moderate-to-high support from administrators ($M=4.21$, $SD=.92$) and parents ($M=3.25$, $SD=1.06$).

**Research Procedures and Instrumentation**

After receiving Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval for the conduct of the investigation, the researchers contacted superintendents at three school districts and asked permission to survey the teachers in their districts. District approval was granted in all three cases and the researchers proceeded to contact all of the teachers in the three districts via email and asked them to participate in the investigation and a link to an online survey. In total, 433 teachers, or approximately 33% of the teachers sampled, responded to the survey. Data screening resulted in 20 cases being dropped because the participants failed to complete several pertinent questions. Therefore, the final dataset included responses from 413 teachers.

All participants completed a questionnaire to gather demographic information including teaching assignment, coaching status, educational background, perceived support from administrators and parents, and the number of hours dedicated to preparing for their teaching. Participants also completed three psychometric inventories to measure burnout, role stress, and resilience. T/Cs were asked to respond to their inventories in reference to both teaching and coaching roles while NCTs were asked to only consider their teaching responsibilities.

**Teacher role stressors.** Role stressors were evaluated using the Teacher Role Stressors Survey (TRSS; Conley & You, 2009). The TRSS measures the role stressors of role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload in teachers. Participants were asked to respond to the nine-item TRSS by rating the degree to which each statement was accurate
relative to their personal experiences. Responses were recorded on a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (very inaccurate) to 7 (very accurate). Example questions included: “I feel certain about how much authority I have” (role ambiguity), “I often work under incompatible policies and procedures” (role conflict), and “I am rushed in doing my job” (role overload). Internal consistency has been demonstrated in previous research applications (Conley & You, 2009) and was adequate to good in the current investigation (Cronbach’s α ranged from .77 to .82).

**Teacher burnout.** Burnout was measured using the MBI-ES (Maslach, Jackson, & Schwab, 1996). The MBI-ES measures burnout in educators along the dimensions of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. Participants were asked to respond to 22 burnout-related questions that ask them to consider how often they feel the way suggested in the prompt on a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (every day). Example questions include: “I can easily understand how my students feel about things” (personal accomplishment), “I feel I treat some students as if they were impersonal objects” (depersonalization), and “I feel emotionally drained from my work” (emotional exhaustion). Internal consistency for the MBI-ES has been demonstrated (Maslach, Jackson, & Schwab, 1996), and ranged from adequate to very good in the current study (Cronbach’s α=.74 to .90).

**Resilience.** Resilience was measured using the 10-item version of the CD-RISC (CD-RISC 10; Campbell-Sills & Stein, 2007). The CS-RISC 10 reflects one latent factor of resilience and has been used with individuals from a variety of occupations, including teachers (L. Wang et al., 2010). Participants were asked to respond to the 10 items by indicating how much they agreed with the items as they applied to them over the last
Responses were set to a five-point, Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (not true at all) to 4 (true nearly all the time). Example questions include: “I am able to adapt when changes occur,” “I tend to bounce back after illness, injury, or other hardships,” and “during times of stress/crisis, I know where to turn for help.” Internal consistency for the CD-RISC 10 has been demonstrated previously (Campbell-Sills & Stein, 2007; L. Wang et al., 2010) and was good in the current investigation (Cronbach’s $\alpha=.81$).

**Data Analysis Procedures**

Primary analyses involved 2x2 (Coaching Status x Subject Affiliation) factorial ANOVAs. Prior to conducting the primary analyses, data analysis began with standard procedures for data screening for inferential statistics (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). After determining that the data were appropriate for inferential statistical analyses and that the assumptions of factorial ANOVA had been met, indexes were then created by averaging the items associated with each of the scales together in order to form the burnout subscales of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment; the role stressor subscales of role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload; and resilience.

Descriptive statistics were computed for all study indices and Pearson correlations were used to examine bivariate relationships among variables. Following initial assessments, 2x2 (Coaching Status x Subject Affiliation) factorial ANOVAs were used to examine the influence of coaching status and subject affiliation on burnout, role stressors, and resilience. Interactions between coaching status and subject affiliation were also considered. Partial-$\eta^2$ is presented as a measure of effect size for F-Tests. A partial-$\eta^2$ value between .01 and .06 is associated with a small effect, between .06 and .14 with a medium effect, and .14 or greater with a large effect (Warner, 2012). When applicable,
follow-up tests to examine simple effects were conducted using independent sample t-tests. Cohen’s $d$ is presented as a measure of effect size for independent samples t-tests. A Cohen’s $d$ between .15 and .40 is associated with a small effect, between .40 and .75 with a medium effect, and above .75 with a large effect (Cohen, 1992).

**Results**

Table 5.1 displays means, standard deviations, skewness, and minimum and maximum values for each of the study variables. Participants in this study reported low levels of role ambiguity and depersonalization; moderate levels of role conflict, emotional exhaustion, and resilience; and high levels of role overload and personal accomplishment. As depicted in Table 5.2, all variables were significantly correlated at the $\alpha=.01$ level and correlations were all in the hypothesized direction: role stressors correlated positively with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization and negatively with personal accomplishment. Resilience correlated negatively with all study variables except for its positive correlation with personal accomplishment.

Following preliminary analyses, 2x2 (Coaching Status x Subject Affiliation) Factorial ANOVAs were conducted for each of the study variables. Means and standard deviations for each test are displayed in Table 5.3. For emotional exhaustion, the main effect for coaching status was insignificant, as was the main effect for subject affiliation. However, there was a small and significant interaction effect between coaching status and subject affiliation, $F(1,409)=5.31, p=.02$, partial-$\eta^2=.013$. The means plot in Figure 5.1a illustrates this interaction. Independent samples t-tests confirmed the difference in emotional exhaustion between core and non-core NCTs was insignificant, but T/Cs of
non-core subjects had lower emotional exhaustion than T/Cs in core subjects,

\( t(205)=2.54, p=.012, d=.37. \)

When examining role ambiguity, the main effect for coaching status was small and significant, \( F(1,409)=6.97, p=.009, \text{partial-}\eta^2=.017. \) This result suggests that NCTs had higher levels of role ambiguity than T/Cs. The main effect for teaching status was insignificant The interaction effect was also insignificant, \( F(1,409)=1.68, p=.195, \text{partial-}\eta^2=.004, \) but the means plot suggested that differences may exist with regards to coaching status (See Figure 5.1b). Follow-up \( t \)-tests were conducted to examine simple effects. The results of the \( t \)-tests indicated that differences in role ambiguity between core and non-core subject affiliation was not significant for NCTs, but differences were significant for T/Cs and are associated with a small effect size, \( t(205)=1.96, p=.05, d=.28. \) These follow-up tests indicate that T/Cs and NCTs in non-core subjects likely have similar levels of role ambiguity, but that T/Cs in core subjects have higher levels of role ambiguity than their non-core subject counterparts.

In regards to role conflict, the main effect for coaching status was insignificant, as was the main effect for subject affiliation. The interaction effect was also insignificant. When examining role overload, the main effect for coaching status was small and significant, \( F(1, 409)=12.46, p<.001, \text{partial-}\eta^2=.030. \) The main effect for subject affiliation was also small and significant, \( F(1,409)=9.29, p=.002, \text{partial-}\eta^2=.022. \) The interaction between coaching status and subject affiliation was not significant. The means plot in Figure 5.1c indicates that NCTs perceived higher levels of role overload than T/Cs and that teachers of core subjects perceived higher levels of role overload than those who taught non-core subjects.
For resilience, there was a small and significant main effect for coaching status, $F(1.409)=4.04, p=.045$, partial-$\eta^2=.010$. This indicates that T/Cs had higher levels of resilience than NCTs. The main effect for subject affiliation was insignificant. While the interaction term was also not significant, $F(1,409)=2.34, p=.127$, partial-$\eta^2=.006$, examination of the means plot (Figure 5.1d) suggested that there may be differences between the resilience of T/Cs of core and non-core subjects. Thus, follow-up $t$-tests were used to examine simple effects. The $t$-tests confirmed that there was not a significant difference between core and non-core subject NCTs, but that there was a small and significant difference between core and non-core subject T/Cs, $t(205)=-2.23, p=.027, d=.34$. This confirms the trend noted in Figure 5.1d in that T/Cs of non-core subjects appear to have higher levels of resilience than T/Cs of core subjects. For depersonalization and personal accomplishment, the main effects for coaching status and subject affiliation were insignificant, as was the interaction effect.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this investigation was to understand of how T/Cs and NCTs experience role stressors, burnout, and resilience as well as how their experiences vary by subject affiliation. Results indicate that T/Cs from core subjects experienced more emotional exhaustion and role ambiguity than T/Cs from non-core subjects. Teachers of core subjects experienced higher levels of role overload than teachers of non-core subjects. T/Cs of non-core subjects reported higher levels of resilience than T/Cs of core subjects. Differences between T/Cs and NCTs were not significant for personal accomplishment, depersonalization and role conflict.
Prior literature on the T/C role conflict (Konukman et al., 2010; Locke & Massengale, 1978; Millslagle & Morley, 2004) proceeds with the assumption that being a T/C results in negative consequences related to role conflict and burnout than that which is experienced by NCTs. However, the results of this investigation indicate that, in several cases, T/Cs and NCTs from core and non-core subjects did not perceive significantly different levels of role stressors and burnout. Where differences are noted, they are small in effect size and NCTs experienced greater negative consequences than T/Cs. While future investigations are needed to confirm and expand upon these findings, individuals who choose to pursue both teaching and coaching assignments may be able to avoid additional role stressors and burnout due to the satisfaction derived from the multiple roles (Napper-Owen & Phillips, 1995; O'Connor & Macdonald, 2002). The finding that NCTs reported greater levels resilience would seem to support this hypothesis. Resilience may moderate the negative experiences of role stressors and burnout among T/Cs.

Results of this investigation also shed light upon the influence of subject affiliation in the experience of role conflict, burnout, and resilience. Where differences exist, teachers of non-core subjects experienced less of the negative effects associated with burnout and role stressors than their core subject counterparts. While additional investigation will be required to further examine this phenomenon, these differences could be related to the increased pressures put on teachers of core subjects to meet student and school performance standards in an age characterized by high stakes testing and teacher accountability (Valli et al., 2007). Nevertheless, this finding supports
Richards and Templin’s (2012) observation that personal-level factors, such as subject affiliation, have implications for the ways in which T/Cs experience role conflict.

Rather than assuming that all T/Cs experience role stressors and burnout, it must be recognized that certain factors, such as resilience, may buffer against negative consequences. Richards and Templin (2012) made this point in reference to role conflict by positing that “there are a variety of factors that determine whether or not a T/C will experience conflict and, when it is experienced, the degree to which it interferes with one or both of the incumbent’s roles” (p. 173). Aspects of the T/C dual role, such as varied work responsibilities and the satisfaction of achievement in the classroom and on the playing field, may facilitate increased resiliency that allows the T/C to cope with the increased stresses of long work days and the multitude of job-related responsibilities (Mansfield et al., 2012). Nevertheless, finding that T/Cs in this sample did not experience greater levels of role stressors and burnout than their NCT counterparts does not necessarily mean that role conflict is not an issue for dual role T/Cs. It is possible that T/Cs who engage in role retreatism (Millslagle & Morley, 2004) avoid role stressors and burnout by focusing all of their energy on one role and neglecting alternative roles. When the teaching role is neglected in favor of the coaching role, T/Cs could avoid consequences associated with role stressors and burnout by sacrificing teaching performance (Richards & Templin, 2012).

In interpreting the results of this investigation, several limitations should be borne in mind. First, the sample was skewed toward experienced practitioners (mean years of experience was 16.87 years). Younger T/Cs and NCTs may experience role stressors and burnout differently than their more experienced counterparts. Second, the sample was
composed of more women than men. As a result, the findings may be more applicable to female teachers than to males. The cross-sectional nature of the study also merits mention. Role stressors and burnout may vary depending upon the time of year, the level of stress the teacher was under, and whether or not T/Cs were in season when completing the survey. Longitudinal designs would provide more insight into roles stressors, burnout, and resilience than is possible through a single survey administration. Finally, teachers serve in numerous other ancillary roles beyond that of athletic coach that were not captured in this investigation. Future researchers should examine how roles such as supervising extracurricular clubs, serving in administrative capacities, and serving on school committees impacts teachers’ perceived role stressors and burnout.

In conclusion, the primary finding of this investigation is that it does not appear safe to assume that role stressors and burnout experienced by T/Cs are any more severe than that which is experienced by NCTs. However, as previously noted, it is possible that T/Cs avoid the consequences of work related stress by retreating into the preferred role (Millslagle & Morley, 2004). Therefore, T/Cs should be encouraged to develop a sense of role balance in order to maintain levels of performance in both roles while avoiding role stress and burnout (Marks & MacDermid, 1996). Richards and colleagues (2013) recommend preparing preservice teachers for the realities of school life as a part of teacher education programming. In many cases, this includes preparation for the dual role of T/C. Similarly, Richards and Templin (2012) describe a multitude of school-level factors that should be considered when promoting role balance.
Table 5.1.

Aggregate descriptive statistics for all study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment are set to a seven-point scale ranging from 0-6; role ambiguity, role conflict, and role overload were set to a seven-point scale ranging from 1-7; and resilience was set to a five-point scale ranging from 0-4.
Table 5.2.

Bivariate correlations among study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>DP</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>RES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>.648**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>-.343**</td>
<td>-.420**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>.412**</td>
<td>.387**</td>
<td>-.372**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>.480**</td>
<td>.426**</td>
<td>-.214**</td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>.565**</td>
<td>.294**</td>
<td>-.176**</td>
<td>.314**</td>
<td>.487**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>-.287**</td>
<td>-.294**</td>
<td>.492**</td>
<td>-.278**</td>
<td>-.151**</td>
<td>-.192**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: EE=Emotional Exhaustion, DP=Depersonalization, PA=Personal Accomplishment, RES=Resilience, RA=Role Ambiguity, RC=Role Conflict, RO=Role Overload. **Significant correlation at the α=.01 level (two-tailed)
Table 5.3.

Means and standard deviations for each study variable by coaching status and subject affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coaching Status</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Core-Subject Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Core Subject Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/Cs</td>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTs</td>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.1. Means plots displaying the relationship between coaching status and subject affiliation for (a) emotional exhaustion, (b) role ambiguity, (c) role overload, and (d) resilience.
CHAPTER SIX – MANUSCRIPT THREE

Understanding the Impact of Role Stressors and Burnout on Teacher Resilience

An abundance of evidence from multiple sources supports the notion that teaching is a stressful and emotionally draining profession (Day et al., 2007; Lortie, 1975). Long days, intense workloads, and limited interactions with other adults are among the reasons Ryan (1970) once described teachers as the “ranks of the chalk-soiled, ink stained, over-challenged, under-supported, memo-ridden, privacy-riddled, patience-worn, school-fatigued, lovers of children and ideas” (p. vi). The relatively recent influence of government mandates and policy have only added to this complexity and caused the teaching profession to look very different than it did in previous generations (Rovegno, 1992; Valli et al., 2007). In the United States, this is best exemplified by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB; US Department of Education, 2002) and the recent Race to the Top Fund (US Department of Education, 2009) which have ushered high stakes testing and teacher- and school-level accountability into the national education discourse.

Developments in educational policy over the past 40 years have had several significant and varied impacts on the roles played by teachers. Michael Apple (1986, 2000) has noted that the increasingly bureaucratization and hierarchical structuring of education has led to the deskilling and proletarianization of teachers’ work. As state and federal governments continue to take an increased role in structure and function of
classroom interactions, teachers take on additional non-teaching tasks and become responsible for a wider variety of initiatives. The effects of policies such as NCLB operate within a tightly packed, complex, and contradictory spaces that lead to increased stress and teacher workloads (Apple, 2001; Furney, Hasazi, Clark-Keefe, & Hartnett, 2003; Houlihan, 2002).

As teachers’ workloads increase in both intensity and complexity researchers and practitioners must be concerned with how teachers respond to the challenges they face. More specifically, the implications that these various stressors have for teachers’ ability to develop and exercise resilience must be investigated (Gu & Day, 2007). While resilience was once conceptualized as an innate quality that individuals either possessed or did not possess, it is now generally understood that resilience develops over time and is the result of individuals’ interactions with the environments in which they work (Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000; Mansfield et al., 2012). Role stressors such as role conflict, role overload, and role ambiguity, and burnout are related to the way in which teachers respond to and are influenced by the organizational contexts and it is important to consider the way in which these constructs impact teachers’ ability to develop resiliency (Conley & You, 2009; Hakanen et al., 2006).

**Review of Literature and Theory**

Dating back to the seminal works of Waller (1932), Lortie (1975), and Lacey (1977), among others, much has been written about the lives and careers of teachers. Research has also documented the role that the micropolitical climate of schools play in socializing teachers through interactions with colleagues, administrators, and students (Kelchtermans & Ballet, 2002; Schempp et al., 1993). This work highlights the important
role that organizational and contextual factors play in shaping the lives and careers of teachers (Day & Gu, 2010). Similarly, it highlights the influence of role stressors and burnout in the lives of teachers, as well as the importance of resilience in surviving and thriving in schools (Conley & You, 2009; Rovegno, 1993a).

**Role Theory and Teacher Role Stressors**

Important to understanding one’s experiences within a particular teaching context is the way in which the role of teacher is constructed within that context. Role theory (Linton, 1936; Parsons, 1951) is a sociological perspective that has been adopted by educational researchers to describe the way in which the occupational role of teacher is conceptualized as well as stressors that arise in the school setting (Conley & Woosley, 2000; Conley & You, 2009). Role theory typically uses a theatre metaphor to explain the social construction of work roles and (in)congruencies in expectations for role-related behavior: “the vision is of actors playing parts in scripts written by culture and shaped by evolutionary adaptation” (Stryker, 2001). Through socialization, individual are taught what it means to fill a specific social role as well as expectations for performance of that role (Conrad, 2004; Hindin, 2007). Individuals are held accountable for their performance through internally and externally enforced norms and sanctions that are intended to guide behavior (B. J. Biddle, 1986; Turner, 2001).

Important in understanding expectations for role performance is the influence of role-sets (Richards, Templin, & Guadreault, 2013). Role-sets can be viewed as the relationships and interactions in which a person is involved by virtue of playing a particular social role (Merton, 1957). For example, a teacher has a role-set for stakeholders in the educational process such as the principal, school board, parents,
children, etc. Interactions with role-sets help social actors understand and identify expectations for behavior and judge the degree to which they are fulfilling the requirements of their work (Turner, 2001). When the social actor and role-sets share agreed upon expectations for performance, role consensus occurs and the role can be performed with little tension. Consensus allows the actor to conform to the socially defined version of the role and hold themselves and others accountable for performance through social sanctions (B. J. Biddle, 1986). While consensus may be more likely when individuals within a social context share similar socialization experiences, evidence indicates that it cannot be assumed that consensus will arise naturally (Hindin, 2007).

The context in which one works is important to understanding the degree to which consensus can be achieved. School environments in which teachers, students, parents, and administrators share relative agreement on the definition and enactment of the teacher role are more likely to reflect consensus. However, research has demonstrated that teachers and the individuals with which they interact often do not share mutually agreed upon expectations for one another’s norms and role consensus is now viewed as an ideal rather than the norm (B. J. Biddle et al., 1966; Hindin, 2007). In many school environments, a lack of consensus leads to problems in the ways in which teachers navigate their work roles, interact with colleagues, experience stress, and generally leads to increased tension in the teacher’s work-life. The exploration of role stressors is critical to understanding the lived experiences of teachers as high levels of stressors have been linked to psychological distress, burnout, job dissatisfaction, and an increased propensity to leave teaching (Beehr, 1995; Conley & You, 2009). These outcomes likely decrease
the amount of enjoyment teachers derive from their work and impact their ability to develop and exercise resilience.

The three prominent role stressors described in research with teachers include role conflict, role overload, and role ambiguity (Conley & Woosley, 2000; Conley & You, 2009). Role conflict refers to a situation in which different role-sets have varying expectations for behavior that are incompatible in the performance of the specified role (B. J. Biddle, 1986). Personal and sociocultural or institutional expectations for behavior do not align and the teacher may not be able to meet all of the expectations held by role-sets (Richards, Templin, & Guadreault, 2013). Students, for example, may hold certain expectations for teachers’ performance while parents and administrators hold differing expectations. Further, the numerous and varied responsibilities afforded to teachers may cause them to feel torn between the performance of various aspects of their role. In addition to primary teaching responsibilities, many teachers are expected to complete paperwork, serve on committees, manage students, participate on school committees, and advise various extracurricular activities, such as school sports (Richards & Templin, 2012; Rovegno, 1993b). Teachers must often choose the specific role-related responsibilities or variation of role performance to focus upon, which can lead to tension and stress (Hindin, 2007). Evidence indicates that teachers may be more likely to adhere to the conceptualization of the role that most aligns with their identity and that for which they receive the greatest rewards (Merton, 1957; Richards, Templin, & Guadreault, 2013).

The second role stressor, role overload, occurs when individuals play more roles than they have the time or resources to do properly, or when the responsibilities
associated with the performance of a particular role are too multifaceted to be fulfilled by one individual (Chan, 2003). Teachers who are experiencing significant levels of role overload may feel as if they are unable to fulfill all of their role-related responsibilities, which can lead them to prioritize certain facets of the teaching role over others. Referred to as role retreatism, this prioritization can lead to the neglect of facts of the teaching responsibilities that receive lower priority (Millslagle & Morley, 2004). The third role stressor, role ambiguity, occurs when expectations for role performance are too vague or incomplete to appropriately guide behavior (Conley & You, 2009). Teachers may not explicitly understand the expectations of role sets, which impacts the degree to which they are able to perform the role as intended (Hindin, 2007). High levels of role ambiguity can lead teachers to become frustrated and stressed because they are not sure how to perform their role properly or how their performance will be evaluated.

**Teacher Burnout**

Important in understanding the impact of role stressors is the multidimensional syndrome known as burnout (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996). While related to stress, researchers have noted that burnout is not synonymous with stress. Rather, burnout may be conceptualized as an outcome of job-related stress (Faber, 1984; Rudow, 1999). Although several models of burnout exist (e.g., Pines & Aronson, 1988; Shirom, 1989), the one that has received the most empirical attention and support is that which was developed by Maslach and her colleagues (Maslach, 1982; Maslach & Jackson, 1986; Maslach et al., 2001). According to Maslach’s conceptualization, burnout is marked by emotional withdrawal from one’s work as a result of prolonged stressed and is characterized by three interrelated constructs: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization,
and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach & Jackson, 1986). Emotional exhaustion relates to feeling psychologically drained of one’s resources (Maslach, 1982). Individuals who are emotionally exhausted feel as if they have spent all of their emotional resources and are emotionally overexerted (Maslach & Jackson, 1986).

The second dimension of burnout, depersonalization, is marked by a negative, unsympathetic attitude toward others in the work environment (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996). These negative attitudes typically manifest through impersonal or callous interactions with colleagues and clients. A reduced sense of personal accomplishment is conceptualized as the self-evaluation component of burnout and denotes the tendency to hold diminished feelings of success and achievement (Maslach, 1993). This facet of burnout typically manifests through disapproving or critical attitudes with regards to work with clients and colleagues (Maslach, 1998). As a result, the facets of burnout represent an interconnected, emotional, and interpersonal response to working environments (Maslach, 1993).

Burnout tends to be especially important for understanding the experiences of human service providers who work closely with people, such as teachers, nurses, and social service employees. These professions tend to have strenuous and emotionally demanding workloads and employees become prone to burnout (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002). The physical and emotional labor required for teaching, as well as the repetitive nature of daily events, and restricted interaction with other adults (Day et al., 2007; Fullan, 2007; Lortie, 1975) has drawn the interest of scholars studying burnout. The study of teacher burnout is especially important given that high levels of burnout have been connected to teacher attrition and early career
termination (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996; T. M. Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Importantly, teachers who experience burnout, but do not leave the profession, may not teach at the same level of quality as those who are not experiencing burnout (Olivier & Venter, 2003). In this way, the effects of burnout are important both relative to teaching turnover and teacher effectiveness.

Research on teacher burnout has produced a plethora of results that inform what we know about teachers’ lived experiences and that help to explain why teachers leave the field at such high rates (Rovegno, 1993a). Research investigating differences based on teacher gender has produced mixed results with some evidence indicating that males experience greater burnout (Borg & Riding, 1991), with others finding no differences between genders (Ito & Toda, 2002). Generally, younger teachers are more likely to experience burnout than their older colleagues, except in the area of decreased personal accomplishment which is less clear (Russel et al., 1987). The linear pattern found with age does not hold for years of experience. Rather, the relationship seems to take on the shape of a parabola as beginning and veteran teachers have both been found to have higher levels of burnout than teachers in the middle of their careers (Benham Tye & O'Brien, 2002; Zabel & Zabel, 2001). Marital status (R. Burke et al., 1996) and marital satisfaction (Greenglass et al., 1994) appear to play significant roles in understanding burnout, with unmarried individuals and those unsatisfied with their marriages expressing higher levels of overall burnout. Similarly, teachers with children tend to express lower levels of burnout (Pierce & Mallory, 1990).

Several workplace factors have been found to correlate with burnout. Related to school subject, it appears as if teachers of different subjects experience burnout in
different ways. Specifically, physical education teachers appear to experience lower than average levels of burnout (Koustelios, 2003; D. Smith & Leng, 2003) whereas special education teachers (Fore et al., 2002) and music education teachers (Hamann & Gordon, 2000) have been found to have higher levels. Research examining school level has overwhelmingly found that teachers in elementary schools are less likely to experience burnout than their high school counterparts (Gold et al., 1991). Teachers who have more favorable physical features in their workplace (e.g., new computers; enough classroom space, books, and desks for their students) experience less burnout than those who believe they work in old buildings or do not have adequate equipment or supplies (Carson et al., 2010).

Researchers investigating burnout have noted the importance of role overload, role conflict, and role ambiguity as antecedents of the three dimensions of burnout. Specifically, teachers who perceive role overload in their jobs are more likely to report stress and burnout than their colleagues who are satisfied with the amount of work they are asked to perform (Chan, 2003). Teachers who report high levels of role conflict also tend to report higher levels of burnout (Lee & Ashforth, 1996). Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter (2001) note that job related stressors, including role conflict, correlate more highly with burnout than client-related stressors, such as problems interacting with students. Beyond global measures of burnout, teachers who experience role conflict are also more likely to report higher levels of emotional exhaustion (Pierce & Mallory, 1990). Finally, role ambiguity has been found to correlate strongly with overall burnout as well as the dimensions of depersonalization and emotional exhaustion (Capel, 1991; Lee & Ashforth, 1996).
Teacher Resilience

While much has been learned about teacher burnout and role stressors, only recently have scholars began to ask questions related to what helps teachers survive and thrive in the profession (Beltman et al., 2011). Specifically, there has been a shift away from focusing on the aspects of teachers’ work that are considered stressful, toward a focus on the individual and contextual factors that help teachers survive and thrive in schools (Gu & Day, 2007). Rather than studying stress as a mechanism that causes teacher attrition, scholars are beginning to focus on resilience as a way to reduce or prevent early career exit (Yonezawa et al., 2011). Whereas burnout examines the negative consequences associated with stress and emotional exhaustion, resilience is an individual’s ability to adapt to negative experiences (Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000). Specifically, Day and Gu (2010) define resilience as “the capacity to ‘bounce back,’ to recover strengths or spirit quickly, and efficiently in the face of adversity” (p. 156).

While the literature related to teacher resilience is still developing, the research that has been conducted to date has identified resilience as an important variable in the management of teacher stress (Day & Gu, 2009, 2010; Le Cornu, 2009; Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000; Nieto, 2003a). Resilience has proven to be important in understanding the ways in which some teachers are able to cope with hardship while others succumb to the challenges of their work lives. Evidence indicates that higher levels of resilience fuel teachers with the positive energy required to overcome stressful working conditions (Connor & Davidson, 2003). For example, resilience has been cited as an important variable in helping teachers overcome the challenges associated with working in difficult contexts, such as urban environments (Yonezawa et al., 2011). Characteristics such as
love, hope, and engagement in an intellectual community contribute to teachers’ ability to persevere despite the odds (Nieto, 2003b). Insight, independence, relationships, initiative, creativity, humor, morality, persistence, determination, optimism, and self-reflection have also been cited as characteristics of resilient teachers (Gupton & Slick, 1996; Whatley, 1998; Wolin & Wolin, 1993).

There has been a significant amount of debate in the resilience literature as to whether resilience should be conceptualized as an innate quality, or one that is developed over time and influenced by the context in which one works (Yonezawa et al., 2011). Many of the seminal resilience studies assumed that resilience was an innate quality and focused on the characteristics of resilient people (Masten & Gramezy, 1985). However, more recently scholars have begun to view resilience as an construct that can be grown and nurtured and have sought to understand the adaptive process that helps people develop resiliency (Sammons et al., 2007). Bobek (2002), for example, described resilience as “process of development that occurs overtime” involving “the ability to adjust to varied situations and increase one’s competence in the face of adverse conditions” (p. 202). Yonezawa and colleagues (2011) conceptualized resilience “as a dynamic construct that emerges within the interplay between individuals’ strengths and self-efficacy and social environments in which they live and work” (p. 916).

When conceptualizing resilience as a dynamic process rather than a static construct, researchers can begin to explore the social, cultural, and contextual factors that influence teachers’ ability to develop resiliency (Pearce & Morrison, 2011). Research generally supports the notion that certain elements of the work environment may predispose individuals to resiliency, while others threaten their ability to be resilient
Examples of resources that support resiliency include time, professional development opportunities, adequate equipment and materials, caring collegial relationships, high expectations, and opportunities for shared decision making (Benard, 2003). Pearce and Morrison (2011) found that a supportive environment helped a beginning teacher build resilience through interactions with his colleagues. Similarly, Mansfield, Beltman, Price, and McConney (2012) included profession-related, social, emotional, and motivational factors that may encourage or prevent the development of teacher resilience in their conceptual model for understanding the construct.

Given that role stressors and burnout are connected to and reflective of the sociocultural and contextual factors within the workplace, they may play an important role in understanding the development of teacher resilience. Research documenting the negative consequences of role stressors and the components of burnout is plentiful and it is logical to posit that these variables impact perceived resilience. As such, the purpose of this investigation is to examine the relationship among teacher role stressors, the components of burnout, and resilience. Specific research questions included: 1) how do role stressors, the components of burnout, and resilience vary by gender, teaching level, and teaching context?; 2) how do role stressors relate to the components of burnout and resilience?; 3) how do the components of burnout relate to resilience?; and 4) how do role stressors and the components of burnout collectively predict teachers’ ability to develop resilience?
Method

Participants and Setting

Across three adjacent school districts in the American Midwest, 1,325 teachers were invited to participate in the investigation. A total of 676 participants provided partial responses to the survey for a response rate of 51%. However, when the researcher conducted preliminary data screening it was determined that numerous respondents only completed a few questions and did not provide any usable data. Of the 676 responses, 445 (34%) answered enough questions to merit further screening. Following further screening, 30 additional responses were deleted because the participants failed to complete numerous items that were integral to the investigation. The final sample that was used in the study consisted of 415 teachers (121 male, 294 female), which is a response rate of 31%. One of the districts from which the participants were recruited served a rural area (N=213), while a second was located within a small city (N=154), and the third in a college town (N=48). The vast majority of the participants were Caucasian (N=400; 96.4%). Fewer participants were Hispanic (N=7; 1.7%), African American (N=4; 1.0%), Native American (N=1; 0.2%), Mixed Race (N=1; 0.2%), and Other (N=2; 0.5%).

The average participant had been teaching for 16.90 years (SD=11.43), had completed a master’s degree (N=231, 55.7%), and taught in an average of 3.13 different schools (SD=2.20). Related to subject affiliation, 279 taught primarily core subjects (e.g., mathematics, language arts, elementary education) and 136 taught primarily non-core subjects (e.g., physical education, art, music). Participants taught in elementary (38.1%), middle (21.7%), and high (34.0%) schools, with a smaller percentage (6.3%) teaching
across multiple levels. The teachers spent an average of 5.35 hours per day teaching class (SD=1.17) and had 23.99 students per class (SD=8.37). They had approximately 52.20 minutes each day during school to prepare for their teaching assignment (SD=20.40) and spent a total of 3.01 total hours per day preparing their lessons (SD=1.72). Assessed on a five-point Likert-type scale, perceived administrative support for teaching was high (M=4.21, SD=0.92) and perceived parental support was slightly lower (M=3.26, SD=1.06), but still above the midpoint on the scale. Motivation for teaching was moderate-to-high (M=3.61, SD=0.93), but 19.3% (N=80) of teachers reported that they would probably or definitely leave teaching in the near future.

**Research Procedures and Instrumentation**

Following Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, initial contact with the three school districts was made through the superintendents’ offices. All three school district agreed to the study and the researchers proceeded to contact the teachers via email. The email instructed teachers who were interested in participating to follow a URL link that redirected them to an online survey administered through Qualtrics Survey Software. The survey took between 15 and 25 minutes. All participants who took part in the research project were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire. The purpose of the questionnaire was to collect information relative to teachers’ background characteristics, school contextual factors, and an overview of teaching responsibilities. In addition to the demographic questionnaire, all teachers completed psychometric inventories that measured role stressors, the components of burnout, and resilience.

**Teacher role stressors.** The Teacher Role Stressors Survey (TRSS; Conley & You, 2009) was used as a measure of role stressors. The TRSS evaluates the role
stressors of role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload in teachers. Participants were asked to respond to the nine-item survey by considering the accuracy of each item relative to their personal experience. Responses were set to a seven-point Likert-type scale anchored by 1 (very inaccurate) and 7 (very accurate). Example questions included: “I feel certain about how much authority I have” (role ambiguity; reverse code), “I often work under incompatible policies and procedures” (role conflict), and “I am rushed in doing my job” (role overload). Internal consistency for the subscales of the TRSS has been demonstrated in previous research (Conley & You, 2009), and was adequate to good in the current investigation (Cronbach’s α ranged from 0.77 to 0.82).

**Teacher burnout.** The components of teacher burnout were measured using the Maslach Burnout Inventory-Educators Survey (MBI-ES; Maslach, Jackson, & Schwab, 1996). The MBI-ES is an adaptation of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach & Jackson, 1986; Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996) intended for use with educational professionals. As with the original Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996), the MBI-ES and measures burnout along the three dimensions of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. Participants responded to 22 burnout-related questions that asked them to consider how often they feel the way suggested in the prompt on a seven-point Likert-type scale anchored by 0 (never) and 6 (every day). Example questions include: “I can easily understand how my students feel about things” (personal accomplishment), “I feel I treat some students as if they were impersonal objects” (depersonalization), and “I feel emotionally drained from my work” (emotional exhaustion). Internal consistency for the subscales of the MBI-ES has been
documented in previous research (Maslach, Jackson, & Schwab, 1996), and ranged from adequate to very good in the current investigation (Cronbach’s α=0.74 to 0.90).

**Resilience.** Connor and Davidson (2003) developed the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC) as a measure of resilience. Using the 25 items included in the original CD-RISC, Campbell-Sills & Stein (2007) created and validated a 10 item version of the CD-RISC (CD-RISC 10). Whereas the factor structure of the RISC has been relatively unstable across studies (e.g., Lamond et al., 2009), the CD-RISC 10 has consistently demonstrated a stable, unidimensional factor structure that reflects one underlying, latent construct of resilience (Lopes & Martins, 2011). Further, the CD-RISC 10 has been used with individuals from a variety of occupations, including teachers (L. Wang et al., 2010). Participants in the current study were asked to respond to the 10-item survey by indicating their level of agreement relative to the way in which the items applied to them over the last month. Responses were set to a five-point, Likert-type scale anchored by 0 (not true at all) and 4 (true nearly all the time). Example items include: “I am able to adapt when changes occur,” “I tend to bounce back after illness, injury, or other hardships,” and “during times of stress/crisis, I know where to turn for help.” Internal consistency for the CD-RISC 10 has been demonstrated in previous studies (Campbell-Sills & Stein, 2007; L. Wang et al., 2010), and was good in the current investigation (Cronbach’s α=0.80).

**Analytic Procedure**

Preceding statistical analysis, the researchers conducted standard procedures for data screening (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). All quantitative variables were screened for accuracy, representation, and quality. Diagnostics were performed using stem and leaf
plots and box plots to identify any potential outliers. The data were checked for normality and linearity and the assumptions associated with Multiple Linear Regression, ANOVA, and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) were evaluated. Following data screening, internal consistency assessments for all scales and subscales were conducted using Cronbach’s (1951) coefficient alpha. It was determined that all factors exceeded the $\alpha=0.70$ cut off for internal consistency and indicators for each of the factors were averaged into composite scores. This led to the creation of the burnout subscales of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment; the role stressor subscales of role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload; and the single factor of resilience. Once the scales and subscales were created, descriptive statistics and zero-order correlations were calculated to examine hypothesized associations among variables.

Following initial assessments, one-way ANOVAs were used to answer RQ1 by examining group differences for gender, teaching level, and teaching context. When applicable, a Tukey’s HSD post hoc test was used to adjust for multiple comparisons when determining statistical significance. The $\eta^2$ statistic is presented as a measure of effect size for significant one-way ANOVAs. An $\eta^2$ value between.01 and .06 is associated with a small effect, between.06 and.14 with a medium effect, and.14 or greater with a large effect (Warner, 2012). Next, Multiple Linear Regression was conducted to answer RQ2 and RQ3 by examining how role stressors predict burnout, and how burnout and role stressors predict resilience. Multiple $R^2$ and adjusted-$R^2$ are presented as overall estimates of effect size in order to denote the percentage of variance in the dependent variable explained by the independent variables. Significant indicator variables in each multiple regression analysis are discussed.
In order to answer RQ4 and more broadly evaluate the relationship among role stressors, burnout, and resilience, the researchers employed Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) using LISREL 9.1 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2013). SEM has been described as a combination of confirmatory factor analysis and multiple regression (Schreiber et al., 2006) and is based on variance and covariance matrix estimation whereby all variables in the model are evaluated simultaneously (Byrne, 1998). SEM evaluates relationships among latent and manifest variables that are supported by logic or theory (Schreiber et al., 2006). In the current study, relationships identified through the Multiple Regression Analyses and supported by the underlying theoretical framework were tested. The results of an SEM analysis indicate the degree to which the hypothetical model fits the data (Hatcher, 1994). The current study utilized multiple goodness of fit indices including $\chi^2$, the non-normed fit index (NNFI), the comparative fit index (CFI), the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). For good model fit, the ratio of $\chi^2$ to $df$ should be $\leq 3$ (Schreiber et al., 2006). NNFI and CFI values above .95 indicate good fit, as do SRMR values of .08 or below (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Lower RMSEA values are indicative of better fitting models with values below .10 suggesting adequate fit and those below .05 indicating excellent fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). The researchers also considered significance tests for the regression coefficients included in the structural model. Insignificant coefficients were removed and the model was respecified (Byrne, 1998). Selected post-hoc model modifications were made to improve fit before arriving at the final model (Schreiber et al., 2006).
Results

Group Differences in Study Variables

Following the initial analyses, one-way ANOVAs were conducted to examine group differences in the study variables based on gender, teaching level, and subject affiliation (see Table 6.1). Relative to gender, there was a significant difference ($F(1, 413) = 26.73, p < .001$), with female participants ($M = 5.74, SD = 1.32$) reporting significantly higher levels of role overload than males ($M = 4.94, SD = 1.67$). This difference was associated with a moderate effect size ($\eta^2 = .061$). There was a significant gender difference for emotional exhaustion ($F(1, 413) = 12.73, p = .007$), with female participants ($M = 3.01, SD = 1.30$) reporting significantly higher emotional exhaustion than males ($M = 2.62, SD = 1.33$). The effect size for this difference was small ($\eta^2 = .018$). Relative to depersonalization, there was also a significant difference for gender ($F(1, 413) = 4.60, p = .026$). This difference indicated that male participants ($M = 1.59, SD = 1.36$) reported experiencing greater depersonalization than their female counterparts ($M = 1.31, SD = 1.09$). Gender differences for role ambiguity, role conflict, personal accomplishment, and resilience were not statistically significant.

The next set of ANOVAs examined differences in study variables across teaching levels (i.e., elementary school, middle school, high school, and multiple levels). The test for role ambiguity indicated that there was a significant effect of role ambiguity across the four levels ($F(3, 411) = 3.40, p = .018$), which was associated with a small effect size ($\eta^2 = .024$). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that middle school teachers ($M = 2.70, SD = .10$) experienced more role ambiguity than teachers who taught at multiple levels ($M = 2.10, SD = .19$). For role conflict, the omnibus $F$-test approached
conventional levels of statistical significance \((F(3, 411)=2.45, p=.063)\) with a small effect size \((\eta^2=.018)\). However, the Tukey HSD post hoc test indicated that high school \((M=3.47, SD=.13)\) and middle school \((M=3.63, SD=.16)\) teachers experienced higher role conflict than teachers of multiple levels \((M=2.78, SD=.29)\). For role overload, the overall \(F\)-test was statistically significant \((F(3, 411)=2.89, p=.035)\) and associated with a small effect size \((\eta^2=.021)\). The Tukey HSD post hoc test indicated that elementary teachers \((M=5.70, SD=1.47)\) experienced greater role overload than their counterparts who taught at multiple levels \((M=5.02, SD=1.58)\).

For emotional exhaustion, the effect of teaching level was significant \((F(3, 411)=3.81, p=.010)\) with a small effect size \((\eta^2=.027)\). The post hoc test using a Tukey HSD adjustment indicated that middle school teachers \((M=3.26, SD=1.38)\) experienced greater emotional exhaustion than teacher of multiple levels \((M=2.55, SD=1.38)\). For depersonalization, the omnibus \(F\)-test was significant \((F(3, 411)=4.06, p=.007)\) and indicated a small effect for the difference in teaching levels \((\eta^2=.029)\). The Tukey HSD post hoc test indicated that middle school teachers \((M=1.72, SD=1.28)\) experienced higher levels of depersonalization than those who taught across multiple levels \((M=1.05, SD=1.14)\). The omnibus \(F\)-test that examined personal accomplishment across teaching levels was also significant \((F(3, 411)=2.75, p=.042)\) and associated with a small effect size \((\eta^2=.020)\). The Tukey post hoc test for multiple comparisons indicated that teachers of multiple subjects \((M=5.08, SD=.69)\) had higher levels of personal accomplishment \((M=4.74, SD=.78)\) than middle school teachers. The final ANOVA indicated that there were no differences in resilience across teaching level.
Next, a set of ANOVAs were run to determine if there were differences in study variables related to school context (suburban, rural, or urban) based on the school district in which the teachers worked. Results for the test of role conflict were significant ($F(1, 413)=3.70, p=.025$), which was associated with a small effect size ($\eta^2=.018$). The Tukey post-hoc test for multiple comparisons indicated that teachers who taught in the suburban district ($M=3.02, SD=1.43$) had lower levels of role conflict than those who taught in the urban district ($M=3.64, SD=1.50$). The test for emotional exhaustion was also significant ($F(1, 413)=5.52, p=.004$) and associated with a small effect size ($\eta^2=.026$). The follow up test using a Tukey adjustment for multiple comparisons indicated that teachers from the suburban district ($M=3.02, SD=1.42$) expressed lower levels of emotional exhaustion than their counterparts from the urban district ($M=3.63, SD=1.50$). The omnibus F-test for depersonalization was as significant ($F(1, 413)=7.25, p=.001$) and associated with a small effect size ($\eta^2=.034$). The post-hoc test using a Tukey adjustment for multiple comparisons indicated that that teachers from the suburban district ($M=.98, SD=.92$) reported lower levels of depersonalization than teachers from the urban district ($M=1.64, SD=1.27$). Tests examining the differences between school contexts failed to reach statistical significance for role ambiguity, role overload, personal accomplishment, and resilience.

**Pre-Structure Equation Modeling Analysis: Predicting Burnout and Resilience**

Table 6.2 displays the means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values, and skewness for each of the study variables. In aggregate, participants expressed low levels of role ambiguity, depersonalization, and emotional exhaustion; moderate levels of role conflict; and high levels of role overload, personal accomplishment, and
resilience. Table 6.3 displays zero-order correlations among the study variables. All variables are significantly correlated at the $\alpha=.01$ level and are in the hypothesized direction. Role stressors correlate positively with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, and negatively with resilience and personal accomplishment. Resilience correlates positively with personal accomplishment, and negatively with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization.

Prior to specifying an SEM model to understand the relationship among the subscale of burnout, role stressors, and resilience, multiple regression analysis was employed to identify relationships among the study variables (see Table 6.4). Due to prior research and theory documenting the ability of role stressors to predict facets of burnout (Chan, 2003; Lee & Ashforth, 1996; Maslach et al., 2001), three Multiple Regressions were run to determine which role stressors predicted which facets of burnout. Further, given that resilience is at least in part a reflection of contextual factors related to the workplace (Benard, 2004; Pearce & Morrison, 2011), it has been hypothesized that both role stressors and the facets of burnout will be able to predict teacher resilience. To test this hypothesis, two addition Multiple Regressions were run. The first included role stressors as predictors of resilience and the second examines the facets of burnout as predictors of resilience. In total, five Multiple Regression Analyses were conducted.

First, three models were used to examine the role stressors of role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload as predictors of facets of burnout. The three predictors explained 40.3% of the variance in emotional exhaustion, $R^2=0.403$, $F(3,411)=92.50$, $p<0.001$. Role ambiguity significantly predicted emotional exhaustion, $\beta=0.20$, $p<0.001$, 
as did role overload, $\beta=0.40, p<0.001$, and role conflict, $\beta=0.21, p<0.001$. In the second model, which evaluated role stressors as predictors of depersonalization, the three predictors explained 24.1% of the variance, $R^2=0.201, F(3,411)=43.40, p<0.001$. Role ambiguity significantly predicted depersonalization, $\beta=0.25, p<0.001$, as did role conflict, $\beta=0.30, p<0.001$. The third model explained 14.3% of the variance in personal accomplishment using the three role stressors, $R^2=0.143, F(3,411)=22.95, p<0.001$. Role ambiguity was the only significant predictor, $\beta=-0.33, p<0.001$.

Next, the three role stressors were examined as predictors of resilience. The results of the regression indicate that the model explained 8.6% of the variance, $R^2=0.86, F(3,411)=12.94, p<0.001$. Role ambiguity, $\beta=-0.24, p<0.001$, and role overload, $\beta=-0.11, p=0.038$, were significant predictors of resilience. Finally, the three facets of burnout were modeled as predictors of resilience. The three predictors explained 26.1% of the variance in resilience, $R^2=0.261, F(3,411)=48.47, p<0.001$. Emotional exhaustion was a significant predictor of resilience, $\beta=-0.13, p=0.024$, as was personal accomplishment, $\beta=0.44, p<0.001$.

**Evaluation of the Structural Equation Model**

The results of the preceding Multiple Regression Analyses document that the hypothesized relationships among role stressors, the components of burnout, and resilience were generally supported. Further, the results suggest regression pathways to be tested through SEM. Figure 6.1 diagrams the hypothesized model constructed to reflect the results of the Multiple Regression Analyses. It was hypothesized that role ambiguity would be associated with resilience and all facets of burnout; role conflict would be associated with depersonalization and emotional exhaustion; and role overload
would be associated with emotional exhaustion and resilience. It was also predicted that emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment would be associated with resilience.

The test of the hypothesized model showed that the fit for the model was good, $\chi^2(285)=787.32$, p<.001; CFI=.96; NNFI=.95; SRMR=.08; RMSEA=.07 as indicated by the CFI and NNFI over .95, SRMR below .08, and the RMSEA under .10. However, the pathways from role overload and role ambiguity to resilience were insignificant ($t>1.96$) and were removed and the model. Post-hoc model modifications were also made to improve the model. Residual covariances between two depersonalization items (DP3 and DP5) and two role ambiguity items (RA1 and RA2) were estimated. Estimation of these covariances was not viewed as problematic because the errors that covaried were associated with indicators that loaded on the same factor, which is common in SEM analyses. The covariances between the residuals of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment in the structural model were also estimated. Since these three constructs are all related to burnout, it is logical that their errors covary and need to be estimated.

After making the post hoc model modifications, the fit became very good, $\chi^2(280)=588.80$, p<.001; CFI=.97; NNFI=.97; SRMR=.05; RMSEA=.05. Figure 6.2 displays the final model with standardized path coefficients. All paths specified in the measurement model were associated with $t$-values that were above 3.29, indicating that all were significant at the $\alpha=.001$ level. Related to the structural model, all of the specified regression pathways were associated with $\beta$ values that were significant at the $\alpha=.05$ level (Hatcher, 1994). The standardized regression coefficients are included in Figure 6.2. The model indicates that role conflict and role ambiguity significantly predict
depersonalization, all three role stressors significantly predict emotional exhaustion, and role ambiguity predicts personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment are significant predictors of resilience. While it was hypothesized that role ambiguity and role overload would have a direct, significant and negative relationship with resilience, the final SEM model indicates that this influence is mediated through emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment as the direct link between the two role stressors and resilience was not significant.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this investigation was to develop a more complete understanding of teachers’ perceptions of role stressors, the components of burnout, and resilience. The results of the ANOVA analyses support previous research indicating that certain demographic variables are important for understanding teachers’ experiences with burnout (Benham Tye & O’Brien, 2002; Borg & Riding, 1991; Gold et al., 1991) and elaborates on how demographic variables can be important for understanding role stressors. The finding that women express higher levels of role overload and emotional exhaustion than their male counterparts aligns with previous research (Borg & Riding, 1991). The higher scores for male participants on depersonalization also aligns with previous studies (Moore & Notz, 2009; Pierce & Mallory, 1990). Differences in role overload, emotional exhaustion, and depersonalization can be at least partially explained by occupational role stereotypes that cast males as more impersonal and distant, while expecting that females will be more emotionally involved in their work (Carson, 2006; Rumsey, 2002). Given the increased stressors associated with teaching in urban school environments in comparison to suburban settings (Yonezawa et al., 2011), it is not
surprising that teachers in the urban schools expressed higher levels of certain role stressors and facets of burnout. Teachers from suburban areas are also more likely to have stronger support systems, which may decrease burnout and role stressors (Zabel & Zabel, 2001).

While previous research has documented an increasing incident of burnout and role-related stress in higher grades (Faber, 1984), findings were not so linear in this investigation. Middle school teacher experienced high levels of role conflict, emotional exhaustion, and depersonalization, along with lower levels of personal accomplishment, but elementary school teachers experienced higher levels of role overload. Further, differences were only significant when compared to teachers who teach at multiple levels indicating that there were not significant differences between teachers who taught exclusively at one school site. Since the shifting policy landscape surrounding education has recently introduced reforms that call for high stakes testing and teacher accountability across all grade levels, it is possible that all teachers now experience role stressors and burnout in a similar fashion (Furney et al., 2003; Houlihan, 2002; Valli et al., 2007).

Interestingly, no differences in teachers’ reported resilience levels were found among any of the study variable. This finding merits further investigation as scholars continue to develop an understanding of the types of factors that increase or reduce teachers’ ability to promote or inhibit resiliency.

Multiple regression analyses supported the hypothesis that relationships would exist among role stressors, the components of burnout, and resilience. The significant relationship identified through these analyses were combined into a single statistical model using SEM. The SEM model reflected excellent model fit and all of the
hypothesized relationships were significant with the exception of the direct linkages from role overload and role ambiguity to resilience. Since these relationships were present in the multiple regression analyses, but not in the SEM, the impact of the two role stressors on resilience is mediated through emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment. This finding aligns with previous research indicating that role stressors are causally prior to the facets of burnout (Chan, 2003; Maslach et al., 2001; Pierce & Mallory, 1990).

Personal accomplishment appears to be the strongest variable in predicting resilience and is strongly impacted by role ambiguity. Therefore, teachers who are able to derive stronger feelings of accomplishment from their work will likely develop enhanced resiliency. The strong relationship between personal accomplishment and resilience is reflected in previous research that has found engagement, optimism, self-reflection, and satisfaction with one’s job are important in developing resilience (Nieto, 2003b; Sammons et al., 2007; Whatley, 1998). Based on the model tested, one way to increase personal accomplishment is through a reduction of role ambiguity, which requires that teachers develop a complete understanding of what is required of them in their work-related roles. (Conley & Woosley, 2000; Conley & You, 2009).

In addition to personal accomplishment, emotional exhaustion had a negative and significant impact on teacher resilience. While this relationship was not as strong as the one noted for personal accomplishment, it appears as if teachers who are emotionally drained by their work are less resilient than those who do not find their work as exhausting. This speaks to the importance of developing a positive school culture in which teachers are valued, have decision making responsibilities, and administrators foster positive relationships with and among teachers (Benard, 2003; Mansfield et al.,
Importantly, all three role stressors contribute positively to the development of emotional exhaustion. This relationship is supported by prior research connecting role stressors and emotional exhaustion (Chan, 2003; Lee & Ashforth, 1996). Efforts at increasing teacher resilience should focus on reducing teachers’ levels of exhaustion, which includes reducing role overload, conflict, and ambiguity. Interestingly, while role conflict and role ambiguity significantly contribute to depersonalization, depersonalization does not have a significant impact on teacher resilience. Therefore, this facet of burnout may not be important in understanding teacher’s resilience.

Education has been characterized as an emotionally draining profession (Day et al., 2007) and is becoming more complex with the introduction of government mandates and high stakes testing (Valli et al., 2007). As such, the development of teacher resilience becomes increasingly important so that teachers are fueled with the capacity to cope with and bounce back from stressful events (Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000). Generally, the results of this investigation speak to the importance of developing a positive school culture that supports teacher development and collaboration in helping teachers to effectively and efficiently navigate the sociopolitical cultures of schools (Kelchtermans & Ballet, 2002; Schempp et al., 1993).

Environments in which expectations for teacher behavior are clear and consistent (reduced role ambiguity and conflict), workloads are manageable and teachers are provided an adequate amount of time to complete their tasks (reduced role overload), teacher accomplishments are praised and rewarded (enhanced personal accomplishment), and teachers do not find their work or interactions with key stakeholders to be exhausting (reduced emotional exhaustion) are most likely to foster resilient capacities so that
teachers are able to cope with the stresses of their jobs in a productive and meaningful way. Interventions should also be developed in order to aid teachers who have high levels of role stressors and the components of burnout. Such interventions should provide afflicted teachers with strong support structures and assistance as they work through challenges and seek to reduce perceptions of role stressors and burnout while raising feelings of personal accomplishment and building positive relationships with children (Covell, McNeil, & Howe, 2009; Pietarinen, Pyhältö, Soini, & Salmela, 2013).

While the results of this study have implications for inservice teachers and the individuals who work with them, there is also an important message for the preparation of preservice teachers. Many teacher education programs prepare their students in the content and skills required to teach; however, few do an effective job of preparing preservice teachers to take on the non-teaching responsibilities that are becoming increasingly important for educators (Kelchtermans & Ballet, 2002; Richards, Templin, & Guadreault, 2013). Preparation for activities such as completing paperwork, participating on committees, supervising students in extracurricular activities, and navigating the sociopolitical realities of life in schools is critical teacher preparation and successful induction (Kelchtermans & Ballet, 2002; Schempp et al., 1993). The lack of preparation for these realities likely contributes to high teacher attrition rates directly and indirectly through the influence of role stressors (Conley & Woosley, 2000; Conley & You, 2009) and the dimensions burnout (Lee & Ashforth, 1996; Tatar & Yahav, 1999). By taking directed efforts to more effectively prepare preservice teachers for the realities of school life, and create supportive, nurturing school cultures, teacher resilience can be fostered among novice and veteran teachers alike.
Limitations and Future Directions

While the current investigation provides important insight into the relationship among role stressors, the facets of burnout, and resilience, there are several limitations that should be borne in mind. First, the population sampled was predominantly female, white, and skewed toward having more years of teaching experience. This may impact the relevance of these results for male teachers, teachers who are non-white, and those who are novices. Similarly, the sample was gathered from three school districts in the American Midwest, so the results may not reflect the experiences of teachers from other parts of the United States or those who are teaching internationally. The unequal sample sizes in the ANOVA analyses similarly merits mention. While it would have been ideal for equal cell sizes across the one-way ANOVAs, this was not the case and, in certain tests, the sample sizes were fairly uneven. This could impact the analyses and should be acknowledged when interpreting the results. The cross-sectional nature of the study is also a limitation. Since teachers’ perceptions of role stressors, the facets of burnout, and resilience are likely to change over time, it is possible that more robust findings could be produced through a longitudinal design that tracks teachers across the school year and accounts for regular fluctuations in the study variables. Such a longitudinal study presents a much needed topic for future researchers to explore.

In addition to more completely exploring the relationship between role stressors, the components of burnout, and resilience, future researchers should investigate the impact of teacher resilience on key outcome variables, such as teacher retention and student achievement. Investigations related to these outcomes would help researchers and practitioners more completely understand the outcomes of resilience and as well as the
consequences of having low resiliency. Future studies should also use a variety of qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis techniques in order to more completely understand the implications of teacher resilience and the way in which it develops in relation to school contexts and factors such as role stressors and burnout. Quantitative studies can help to document the relationships among variables, while qualitative studies can aid in interpreting those relationships and understanding how teachers’ lived experiences and work situations promote or inhibit resilience. These studies will be especially critical as research related to resilience continues to accumulate and the research community begins to understand how resilience relates to and is derived from teachers’ experiences in schools.

**Conclusion**

It is critical to remember that teaching, like many other human service professions, can be stressful (Day et al., 2007). This stress has increased in recent years with the introduction of government mandates including high stakes testing and teacher- and school-level accountability (Darling-Hammond, 2013; Day et al., 2007). While it may not be possible to fully alleviate this stress, steps can be taken to better support teachers and help them to feel like members of a community within and around the school. By working together key stakeholders in the educational process – teachers, students, parents, and community members – can help to foster more productive and less stressful working environments that lead to both increases in teacher resilience and student-level outcomes. As was demonstrated in this study, reducing role stressors and the facets of burnout represents one viable approach to increasing teacher resilience. As noted by Day and Colleagues (2007) in the introduction to their book-length study,
Teachers Matter: Connecting Lives, Work and Effectiveness, “teachers matter. They matter to the education and achievement of their students and, more and more, to their personal and social wellbeing” (p. 1). Because teachers matter so much, those of us who support teachers have a responsibility to ensure their wellbeing. Taking strides to create environments that promote resilience is an important part of this process.
Table 6.1.

Gender differences in role stressors, resilience, and burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO***</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE**</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP*</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching level differences in role stressors, resilience, and burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Multiple Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA*</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2.42, ab .08</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.69b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3.34a</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO*</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>5.70a</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE**</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2.90ab</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP**</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1.24ab</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA*</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>4.97ab</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3.19a</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching context differences in role stressors, resilience, and burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.27a</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC*</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.02a</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.27a</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE**</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.55a</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP***</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.98a</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.02a</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.24a</td>
<td>.50a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment are set to a seven-point scale ranging from 0-6; role ambiguity, role conflict, and role overload were set to a seven-point scale ranging from 1-7; and resilience was set to a five-point scale ranging from 0-4. EE=Emotional Exhaustion, DP=Depersonalization, PA=Personal Accomplishment, RES=Resilience, RA=Role Ambiguity, RC=Role Conflict, RO=Role Overload. *Significant at α=.05, **Significant at the α=.01 level, ***Significant at the α=.001 level. Means that share the same letter subscript are in the same group for the given test.
Table 6.2.

Descriptive statistics for all study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishment</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment are set to a seven-point scale ranging from 0-6; role ambiguity, role conflict, and role overload were set to a seven-point scale ranging from 1-7; and resilience was set to a five-point scale ranging from 0-4.
Table 6.3.

Bivariate correlations among study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. RA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. RC</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. RO</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. EE</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. DP</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PA</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. RES</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: EE=Emotional Exhaustion, DP=Depersonalization, PA=Personal Accomplishment, RES=Resilience, RA=Role Ambiguity, RC=Role Conflict, RO=Role Overload. **Significant correlation at the α=.01 level (two-tailed)
### Table 6.4.

Summary of Multiple Regression Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>DP</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>RES</th>
<th>RES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>-.33***</td>
<td>-.24***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.80)</td>
<td>(5.19)</td>
<td>(-6.66)</td>
<td>(-4.54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>-.06&lt;sup&gt;NS&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.01&lt;sup&gt;NS&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.54)</td>
<td>(5.74)</td>
<td>(-1.15)</td>
<td>(-0.11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.07&lt;sup&gt;NS&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.04&lt;sup&gt;NS&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.03)</td>
<td>(1.45)</td>
<td>(-0.73)</td>
<td>(-2.08)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>(-2.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03&lt;sup&gt;NS&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(-0.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>(9.30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$     | .403    | .241    | .143    | .077    | .261    |
Adjusted $R^2$ | .399    | .235    | .137    | .070    | .256    |
$N$       | 415     | 415     | 415     | 415     | 415     |

*Note:* EE=Emotional Exhaustion, DP=Depersonalization, PA=Personal Accomplishment, RES=Resilience, RA=Role Ambiguity, RC=Role Conflict, RO=Role Overload. Standardized regression coefficients are reported and $t$-values are in parentheses. *Significant at $\alpha=.05$, **Significant at the $\alpha=.01$ level, ***Significant at the $\alpha=.001$ level, <sup>NS</sup>Not significant.
Figure 6.1. Hypothesized Structural Equation Model with paths identified through Multiple Regression Analyses. Error terms are omitted for simplicity in representation. RO=Role Overload, RC=Role Conflict, RA=Role Ambiguity, EE=Emotional Exhaustion, DP=Depersonalization, PA=Personal Accomplishment, RES=Resilience
Figure 6.2. Final structural model with regression path coefficients. $\chi^2(280)=588.80$, $p<.001$; CFI=.97; NNFI=.97; SRMR=.05; RMSEA=.05. Error terms are omitted for simplicity. RO=Role Overload, RC=Role Conflict, RA=Role Ambiguity, EE=Emotional Exhaustion, DP=Depersonalization, PA=Personal Accomplishment, RES=Resilience, *$p<.05$, NSNot Significant.
CHAPTER SEVEN – DISCUSSION

The purpose of this investigation was to develop a more comprehensive understanding of role stressors, burnout, and resilience among teacher/coaches (T/Cs) and non-coaching teachers (NCTs) and the relationships among the constructs. The investigation was conducted in two phases – the first of which gathered quantitative survey data from 415 teachers from three adjacent school districts in the American Midwest. In the second phase of the study, 27 teachers who were identified using stratified sampling procedures were interviewed in order to get a more in-depth understanding of T/C and NCTs’ experience with role stressors, burnout, and resilience. Due to the fact that phase two was still ongoing at the completion of this dissertation, only the results of phase one have been presented through three studies in Chapters Four, Five, and Six. Initial results from phase two will be discussed later in this chapter, but the majority of the discussion will focus on the insights gleaned from the studies that made up phase one of the investigation. Each of the three studies from phase one will be discussed briefly in the following sections followed by a comprehensive discussion of all of phase one. Specific discussion sections related to each of the three studies were presented in Chapters Four, Five, and Six.
Discussion of Individual Studies

Chapter Four

The study presented in Chapter Four overviewed the creation and validation of a novel approach to measuring T/C role conflict, called the Interrole Conflict Scale – Teacher/Coach (ICS-T/C) using exploratory and confirmatory factor analytic procedures (Richards et al., in preparation). The analyses identified a 10-item, unidimensional factor structure that had high internal consistency (Cronbach’s α=.90) and was determined to be valid through confirmatory factor analysis. Construct validity for the scale was documented by comparing the ICS-T/C to the three subscales of the Teacher Role Stressors Survey (TRSS; Conley & You, 2009). The high correlations found between the ICS-T/C and the subscales of the TRSS speaks to the construct validity of the new instrument.

The validation of an instrument to measure T/C role conflict is an important step forward for research investigating issues that arise when individuals fulfill the concurrent roles of teacher and coach. While previous attempts at instrument creation have been made in the past (see Austell, 2010; Locke & Massengale, 1978; T. D. Ryan, 2008), no previous study has produced a valid and reliable instrument for measuring the construct. Issues associated with this lack of a valid and reliable measure became evident in the current investigation when the researcher attempted to use the instrument proposed by Ryan (2008) and modified by Austell (2010). As depicted in Figure 4.1, when the items were subjected to exploratory factor analysis, several items did not load on the proper factors, some items exhibited strong cross-loadings, and one item did not load significantly on any factor. The factor arrangement depicted in Figure 4.1 does not
represent a simple factor structure, indicating that there are problems associated with using the items in the way that they had been used in previous research applications (T. Brown, 2006).

While much has been learned about T/C role conflict in the literature to date, many of the available studies are qualitative and do not provide adequate insight into levels of T/C role conflict or the consequences of having high levels of role conflict (Richards & Templin, 2012). The validation of the ICS-T/C will allow future researchers to measure T/C role conflict quantitatively and document the extent to which interrole conflict is problematic for T/Cs. Researchers will also be able to correlate the construct with other variables such as job satisfaction, burnout, resilience, and the propensity to leave teaching. This will allow for the development of more sophisticated statistical models that can identify both antecedents to and the results of T/C role conflict.

With the introduction of the ICS-T/C, researchers and practitioner will be able to develop upper and lower bounds for high, moderate, and low levels of role conflict that can be used to monitor the health and wellbeing of T/Cs. Higher scores on the instrument would indicate that the roles of teacher and coach are interfering with one another in a way that negatively impacts the T/C’s work. In contrast, lower scores on the ICS-T/C would be indicative of role balance (Marks & MacDermid, 1996), or a state in which the T/Cs is able to perform both teaching and coaching roles without mutual interference. As noted in the work of Ryan (2008) and O’Connor and Macdonald (2002), role balance is associated with increased job satisfaction and performance in both the teaching and coaching role.
Richards and colleagues (Richards & Templin, 2012; Richards, Templin, & Guadreault, 2013) note that the presence or absence of certain socializing factors within the workplace can promote or inhibit the development of role conflict. For example, administrators and community members who support and hold T/Cs accountable for performance in both roles would help to promote a sense of role balance. In contrast, administrators who pressure T/Cs to perform in the coaching role without holding them accountable for performance in the teaching role would lead to conflict, or role retreatism (Herbert, 2007; Konukman et al., 2010). The ICS-T/C will allow researchers and practitioners to monitor T/Cs levels of role conflict in order to evaluate the extent to which role conflict is problematic for T/Cs, which can lead to theory-based recommendation for changes in the workplace culture that will better support T/C and promote role balance.

Chapter Five

The study presented in Chapter Five sought to understand differences in perceived role stressors, burnout, and resilience among T/Cs and non-coaching teachers (NCTs) from core and non-core subjects. The study used 2x2 (Coaching Status x Teaching Assignment) Factorial ANOVAs to examine group differences among the outcome variables (Richards, Templin, Levesque-Bristol, et al., in review). Results indicate that T/Cs from core subjects experienced more emotional exhaustion and role ambiguity than T/Cs from non-core subjects. Teachers of core subjects experienced higher levels of role overload than teachers of non-core subjects. T/Cs of non-core subjects reported higher levels of resilience than T/Cs of core subjects. However, differences between T/Cs and NCTs were not significant for personal accomplishment, depersonalization and role
conflict. When differences are present the effect sizes are small and the analyses indicate that T/Cs and NCTs are more similar than they are different across study variable. Moreover, when results are significant, they indicate that NCTs experience more of the negative consequences related to role stressors and burnout than do their counterparts who teach and coach.

The findings from this investigation are interesting in light of the fact that scholars writing about T/C role conflict have proceeded with the assumption that there is something inherently bad about combining the roles of teacher and coach that produces more negative outcomes than that which would be experienced while only teaching (Konukman et al., 2010; Locke & Massengale, 1978). While future investigations are needed to confirm and expand upon these findings, individuals who choose to pursue both teaching and coaching assignments may be able to avoid additional role stressors and burnout due to the satisfaction derived from the multiple roles (Napper-Owen & Phillips, 1995; O'Connor & Macdonald, 2002). The finding that T/Cs reported greater levels resilience would seem to support this hypothesis. Therefore, in certain situations when the context of the school environment supports teaching and coaching equally, one can hypothesize that the combination of teaching and coaching roles does not automatically lead to role conflict, stress, and burnout.

The finding that T/Cs do not automatically experience more stress and burnout aligns with Richards and Templin’s (2012) multidimensional model for understanding T/C role conflict. According to this model (see Figure 2.1), combining the occupational roles of teacher and athletic coach does not automatically lead to role conflict. Rather, the extent to which role conflict becomes problematic is dependent upon numerous
individual- and socialization-level factors that operate within the occupational milieu. Individual-level factors include elements of the T/C’s identity such as gender, personal career aspirations, teaching area, and years of teaching and coaching experience. Socialization-level factors are divided into the three phases of occupational socialization (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b). During acculturation, interactions with teachers and coaches, the development of a teaching or coaching orientation, and experiences in physical education and athletics are important in terms of predisposing T/Cs to role conflict. During professional socialization, interactions with teacher educators and teacher education students, as well as the quality of the teacher education program influence T/C role conflict. Finally, during organizational socialization, numerous factors operating within the context of the school impact T/C role conflict. For example, community- and school-level rewards for teaching and coaching, the sports being coached, and expectations for teaching and coaching performance may all influence the extent to which an individual experiences T/C role conflict.

While the results of this study do not directly test the hypotheses forwarded by Richards and Templin (2012), they do support the authors’ position that a unidimensional approach to T/C role conflict is too narrow and that a variety of factors related to the T/Cs background as well as those operating within the context of the school impact the experience of stress and role conflict. As such, the findings forwarded in this study should not be interpreted as a dismissal of T/C role conflict. Rather, the findings support the notion that individuals can survive and thrive in dual roles as long as their background and current working conditions support such an arrangement. However, Locke’s (as cited in Templin & Anthrop, 1981) observation that “the two roles [of
teacher and coach] may not be equally attractive or compatible and when linked together, it is not unexpected that one would become the preferred role, leading perhaps, to dysfunction in the non-preferred role” is still relevant (p. 183). Not all teachers are interested in coaching and, when individuals’ prefer one role to the other, role conflict and dysfunction occur (T. D. Ryan, 2008). Similarly, when the context of the school does not support the T/C in both roles, role conflict is more like to ensure (Richards & Templin, 2012; Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013).

An alternative explanation for the results found in this study is that the T/C are engaging in role retreatism (Millslagle & Morley, 2004). Role retreatism occurs when the T/C holds a preference for one role over the other and identifies primarily with the preferred role. In this situations, the T/C will strive to perform the preferred role well and may neglect the non-preferred role. While these individuals are occupying two roles, they are really only performing one, which may allow them to avoid the consequences associated with role conflict (Richards & Templin, 2012). In essence, these individuals are so burned out with their teaching and coaching responsibilities that they put all of their energy into one role and cease functioning in the alternative role. Due to reward and accountability structures, when this occurs in physical education, the coaching role is often preferred, which leads to dysfunction and ineffective practice in the teaching role (Konukman et al., 2010; Millslagle & Morley, 2004).

Chapter Six

The study reported in Chapter Six investigated the impact of role stressors and burnout on teachers’ resilience levels (Richards, Levesque-Bristol, et al., in review). Initial analyses sought to understand difference in role stressors, the dimensions of
burnout, and resilience based on gender, teaching level, and teaching context. The results of the ANOVA analyses support previous research indicating that certain demographic variables are important for understanding teachers’ experiences with burnout (Benham Tye & O’Brien, 2002; Borg & Riding, 1991; Gold et al., 1991) and elaborates on how demographic variables can be important for understanding role stressors. The finding that women express higher levels of role overload and emotional exhaustion than their male counterparts aligns with previous research (Borg & Riding, 1991). The higher scores for male participants on depersonalization also aligns with previous studies (Moore & Notz, 2009; Pierce & Mallory, 1990). Given the increased stressors associated with teaching in urban school environments in comparison to suburban settings (Yonezawa et al., 2011), it is not surprising that teachers in the urban schools expressed higher levels of certain role stressors and facets of burnout. Teachers from suburban areas are also more likely to have stronger support systems, which may decrease burnout and role stressors (Zabel & Zabel, 2001).

While previous research has documented an increasing incidence of burnout and role-related stress in higher grades (Faber, 1984), findings were not so linear in this investigation. Middle school teachers experienced high levels of role conflict, emotional exhaustion, and depersonalization, along with lower levels of personal accomplishment, but elementary school teachers experienced higher levels of role overload. Further, differences were only significant when compared to teachers who teach at multiple levels, which indicates that there were not significant differences between teachers who taught exclusively at one school site. Since the shifting policy landscape surrounding education has recently introduced reforms that call for high stakes testing and
teacher accountability across all grade levels, it is possible that teachers across grades
now experience role stressors and burnout in a similar fashion (Furney et al., 2003;
Houlihan, 2002; Valli et al., 2007). Interestingly, no differences in teachers’ reported
resilience levels were found among any of the study variable. This finding merits further
investigation as scholars continue to develop an understanding of the types of factors that
increase or reduce teachers’ ability to develop resiliency.

Following the ANOVA analyses, multiple regression analyses led to the
specification of the structural equation model depicted in Figure 6.1. Generally, it was
hypothesized that role stressors would influence the dimensions of burnout, which would
then go on to impact teachers’ resilience levels. It was also posited that role overload and
role ambiguity would have a direct impact on resilience. The analyses supported the
structure of the model with the exception of the direct link between role stressors and
resilience (see Figure 6.2). The influence of the role stressors on resilience was fully
mediated through the dimensions of burnout. This finding is logical given that previous
research has found that role stressors are causally prior to the facets of burnout (Chan,
2003; Maslach et al., 2001; Pierce & Mallory, 1990).

Education has been characterized as an emotionally draining profession (Day et
al., 2007) and is becoming increasingly complex enterprise with the introduction of
government mandates and high stakes testing (Valli et al., 2007). Developing the capacity
to bounce back from stress becomes increasingly important in these environments
(Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000). The results of this investigation speak to the importance of
developing a positive school culture that supports teacher development and collaboration
in helping teachers to effectively and efficiently navigate the sociopolitical cultures of
schools (Kelchtermans & Ballet, 2002; Schempp et al., 1993). Environments in which expectations for teacher behavior are clear and consistent (reduced role ambiguity and conflict), workloads are manageable and teachers are provided an adequate amount of time to complete their tasks (reduced role overload), teacher accomplishments are praised and rewarded (enhanced personal accomplishment), and teachers do not find their work or interactions with key stakeholders to be exhausting (reduced emotional exhaustion) are most likely to foster resilient capacities so that teachers are able to cope with the stresses of their jobs in a productive and meaningful way.

While the study reported in Chapter Six has implications for inservice teachers, there is also an important message for the preparation of preservice teachers. While many teacher education programs prepare their students for the content and skills required to teach, few do an effective job of preparing preservice teachers to take on the non-teaching responsibilities that are becoming increasingly important for educators (Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013). Preparation for activities such as completing paperwork, participating on committees, supervising students in extracurricular activities, and navigating the sociopolitical realities of life in schools is critical for effective induction into the school context (Kelchtermans & Ballet, 2002; Schempp et al., 1993). The lack of preparation for these realities likely contributes to high teacher attrition rates directly and indirectly through the influence of role stressors (Conley & Woosley, 2000; Conley & You, 2009) and the dimensions of burnout (Lee & Ashforth, 1996; Tatar & Yahav, 1999). By taking directed efforts to more effectively prepare preservice teachers for the realities of school life, and create supportive, nurturing school cultures, teacher resilience can be fostered among novice and veteran teachers alike.
This study also has an important message for the understanding of the construct of resilience. While some individuals may be predisposed to being more resilient than others as was initially posited (Yonezawa et al., 2011), resilience is to some extent dependent upon and developed through the context within which one teaches. Individuals who teach in positive and supportive environments are more likely to be resilient than those who teach in adversarial, combative contexts (Mansfield et al., 2012). Toward this end, the structural equation model tested through this study indicates that environments that predispose teachers to role stressors and burnout are less likely to result in the development of resilience than those which support teacher growth and assist teachers in deriving satisfaction from their work. This speaks to the importance of developing a positive, affirming culture within schools so that organizational socialization experiences develop rather than inhibit resilience.

**Cross-Study Synthesis**

While specific insights can be gleaned from each individual study included in this dissertation, important observations can also be made by looking across the totality of the project. Broadly, the purpose of this dissertation was to develop a more comprehensive understanding of T/C role conflict and burnout. A second purpose was to investigate the relationship among role stressors and burnout and the way in which the constructs collectively predicted teacher resilience. Results of the studies indicate that teaching remains a stressful job that is characterized by high role conflict and role ambiguity with moderate levels of emotional exhaustion. These constructs are related to and reflective upon the contexts in which teachers work (Hakanen et al., 2006; Koustelios & Tsigilis, 2005; Rovegno, 1993a). As such, it can be posited that the teachers in this investigation
worked in environments that predispose them to certain types of stressors. However, teachers also reported high levels of resilience and personal accomplishment, indicating that they enjoyed their work and were able to bounce back quickly in the face of challenging work situations. In other words, while the teachers’ work led to increased stress, they were able to counteract it by deriving satisfaction from their work and remaining resilient.

The results of the studies also demonstrate that, while role stressors, burnout, and resilience are related, teachers also have different experiences with the constructs depending on demographic characteristics, such as gender, teaching level, and teaching context. Interestingly, individuals who both teach and coach did not experience significantly higher levels of role stressors and burnout than their non-coaching counterparts. As discussed in Chapter Five, this may be related to role retreatism (Millsagle & Morley, 2004), or it could be evidence of role balance whereby individuals derive benefits from filling both roles that off-set the experience of role stressors (Marks & MacDermid, 1996; O’Connor & Macdonald, 2002).

Importantly, the dissertation study has expanded upon the conceptualization of teacher resilience by indicating that teachers have relatively high levels of resilience, but that the ability to develop resilience is dependent upon the experience of role stressors and burnout. Specifically, teachers who experience high levels of role stressors and burnout are less likely to be resilient. Since role stressors and burnout are tied to the culture and support system that operates within the school context, it is incredibly important for schools to work toward developing cultures that support teachers and nurture their resilient capacities. In essence, teachers who work in positive, supportive
school cultures are more likely to be able to cope with the stressors of teaching than are those who work in environments marked by high levels of role overload, conflict, and ambiguity. These variables lead to the development of burnout, which has negative implications for teacher resilience.

In essence, one of the key findings gleaned from this study is that teacher resilience, role stressors, and burnout are related more to contextual factors operating within the sociopolitical milieu of the school than they are to an individual’s teaching assignment or whether or not one coaches extracurricular sports. Further, although not directly measured in the current investigation, occupational socialization theory would posit that the experience of these constructs is also related to individuals’ acculturation and professional socialization. Individuals who develop an affinity for teaching and derive personal satisfaction from working with children are more likely to balance their lives in a meaningful way. Similarly, teachers who are well prepared for the realities of school life and who understand the types of responsibilities they will be asked to perform as a teacher are less likely to experience problems when transitioning into schools (Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013). This preparation is especially important as the culture of schools are changing with the introduction of school- and teacher-level accountability and evaluation systems (Rovegno, 1992). If recruits are not well prepared for the realities of the schools they will be entering they are more likely to experience problems stemming from role stressors and burnout, which may lead to reality shock and the washout effect (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009; Stokking et al., 2003).

In summary, the results of this investigation speak to the need to prepare recruits for the realities of schooling and to develop environments that support and nurture their
potentials. This applies for individuals who coach as well as those who do not coach. Teachers should be encouraged to work together and collaborate in communities of practice (J. S. Brown & Duguid, 1996; O'Sullivan, 2007) so they are able to look out for and assist one another as they work toward creating innovative professional cultures that are responsive to change and embrace individuals with varying viewpoints. At the same time, school environments must be receptive to teachers’ individual perspectives and sensitive to not overloading teachers with non-teaching tasks that they find menial and peripheral to their primary function of educating children (Kelchtermans & Ballet, 2002; Schempp et al., 1993). School environments should also work toward achieving role consensus so to reduce role conflict, and clearly articulating expectations for performance so to reduce role ambiguity. Taking these steps will decrease role stressors thereby reducing burnout and increasing resilience. While it is unlikely that all of the negative stress can be removed from teaching, this investigation does indicate that reducing role stressors and burnout while increasing personal accomplishment can have a positive impact on the teaching profession.

Equally important to helping to prepare teachers for the realities of schools and promote resilience is the need to intervene when role stressors and burnout become problematic for a teacher’s work and wellbeing. As has been noted throughout this dissertation, schools are stressful environments (Day et al., 2007). As a result, it is unlikely that, despite our best efforts, researchers, practitioners, and policymakers will ever be able to completely prevent teacher stressors and burnout. When teachers experience stress and burnout, it is important that interventions be put in place in order to aid them in getting back on track and to prevent decreased teaching performance and
early career termination (Olivier & Venter, 2003; T. M. Smith & Ingersoll, 2004).

Interventions should aid teachers who have high levels of role stressors and the components of burnout. Such interventions should provide afflicted teachers with strong support structures and assistance as they work through challenges and seek to reduce perceptions of role stressors and burnout while raising feelings of personal accomplishment and building positive relationships with children (Covell et al., 2009; Pietarinen et al., 2013). These interventions can come in a variety of forms including one-on-one mentoring by colleagues within the school setting; participation in networks that include teachers, teacher educators, and administrators; recommended therapy outside of the school setting; and mandatory leave time for recuperation and recovery depending on the severity.

**Initial Insights from Phase Two**

As noted throughout this document, while the data for phase two of the study has been collected, at the completion of this dissertation the data has yet to have been fully analyzed. Nevertheless, initial insights from the interviews can be provided at this time in order to provide a snapshot of the types of trends that are emerging and their relation to those that were captured through the quantitative analysis. The first impressions reviewed in this section have been organized according to the sections of the interview guide in order to provide additional clarity and structure.

**Teacher Background Information**

Most of the participants discussed a career in teaching as something that they came to rather than something that they felt like they were destined to do. Many of the teachers began by studying something different in college and switched into teaching
after realizing that teaching was the ideal field for them. After making this switch, most of the participants seemed happy with their decision, but a couple discussed regrets and indicated that, if they could have done everything over again, they would have pursued a different field. One teacher in particular noted disappointment in his career choice and elected to take an early retirement from teaching – forgoing additional retirement benefits – in order to pursue a different career.

Many of the participants discussed the influence of key individuals in their decision to become a teacher. Many talked about having parents in the family who were also teachers, and almost all of the participants discussed an influential teacher they had and noted that they aspired to teach similarly to how this individual taught. Teachers often had sound, defensible reasons for choosing the fields in which they taught. Elementary school teachers often expressed a love for younger children, whereas high school teachers talked about how they felt as if they could related to older children better than younger ones. Similarly, subject affiliation was typically related to an interest in the field. For example, one physics teacher talked about his love for physics and the desire to help others find the same passion.

Related to current teaching placement, teachers who perceived high burnout and high role conflict often expressed dissatisfaction with their current teaching placement, relationships with colleagues and administrators, and parental involvement in the teaching process. Conversely, teachers who experienced low burnout and low role conflict were more likely to talk positively about the school culture, parents and administrators, and student and parent involvement. Teachers’ perceptions of their colleagues and administrators seemed to be closely tied to feelings of role conflict and
burnout. When teachers perceived that they were supported by administrators and were able to build a positive, nurturing school culture, they were less likely to feel stressed and burned out. Some teachers who had taught in multiple school settings that had different cultures contrasted the experiences. One elementary teacher noted that, in a previous school in which she had taught, she felt as if the administrator developed an abrasive school culture that was enforced through fear. She made a decision to leave that environment and take her current job, where the culture is much more supportive and nurturing, because she did not feel as if she could thrive under the leadership her former principal was providing.

**Teacher Role Conflict**

When asked about their typical days, most teachers discussed the need to get to school early and stay after the students left for the day. Several teachers also talked about bringing work home with them in the afternoons in an effort to get it all done. It seemed as if younger teachers and those who taught core subjects were more likely to feel pressure associated with trying to get all of their work done. However, the majority of the participants across age and disciplinary affiliation noted that they did not feel as if they had enough time to get everything done. Some also expressed a sincere sense of dissatisfaction with the structure of the teaching profession – low compensation, long days, little time for planning – that frustrated them and led them to cynicism. More often than not, these were the high role conflict, high burnout teachers.

Most of the teachers talked about the impact of teaching on their personal or family life. Some participants whose spouses were also teachers felt as if their significant others understood the pressures of teaching and supported their efforts to be a good
teacher. However, several others noted that the drive to be a good teacher had a tendency to interfere with their drive to be a good spouse or parent. This family/work interrole conflict was so profound for one teacher that she began crying during the interview because she felt as if her commitment to teaching interfered with her desire to be a good mother. Nevertheless, it became evident through the interviews that most of the participants felt as if they did not have enough time in the school day to get everything done and that they were forced to engage in teacher-related activities, such as grading and preparing lessons, outside of the school day. This frustrated several of the teachers because, as one participant noted, teachers are only contracted for a specific number of hours per day, but the structure of teaching necessitates that they spend additional time outside of their regular teaching schedule to complete work-related tasks.

Recent changes to teacher evaluation, accountability, and compensation in the state of Indiana was an especially contentious topic for these teachers. While most agreed that teacher accountability was a good thing, several also disagreed with the way in which accountability was measured and determined. One science teacher indicated that student test scores made up a significant percentage of his rating as a teacher, but he felt powerless to impact the learning of some of the children in his classes. Classroom observations were also a frustrating point for several teachers, especially when the observer did not handle the procedure in a professional manner. One teacher talked about how her principal did not ask enough questions during the pre-observation meeting in order to accurately place the lesson in context, which impacted her final observation score. Some of the older teachers, who were toward the top of the pay chart, also felt as if evaluations were being used to target and alienate them in the hopes of forcing them into
an early retirement. One experienced Spanish teacher noted that in addition to the evaluations, she felt as if she was being targeted because she was being asked to teach in multiple schools for the first time in her career.

While teachers tended to articulate different concerns with the evaluation procedure, one message was explicitly clear: there was a feeling that teachers were being held accountable to standards and using specific procedures that they did not have a hand in shaping. This was the specific concern of one middle school social studies teacher who felt as if the individuals in the state government who were imposing policies were too far removed from schools to fully understand the complexities of teaching. Similarly, one art teacher had become so disenfranchised with the educational experience that he opted into early retirement because he felt as if he was participating in a system with which he fundamentally disagreed.

**Coaching Background Information and Teacher/Coach Role Conflict**

The T/Cs who were included in the interviews all spoke highly about their coaching experiences. Most enjoyed coaching and felt as if it provided them with an outlet in order to release some of their emotions related to teaching. It was a context in which they could remain connected with children, but outside of the traditional classroom environment. These individuals discussed a love of sports and a desire to continue participating in sports at some level as reasons for pursuing coaching roles. Despite previous theory and research related to T/C role conflict, only a few of the T/Cs in this study discussed anxiety related to both role in terms of the need to perform at a high level as a coach. Only one participant explicitly articulated coaching as the reason for getting into the teaching profession.
Most noted that the responsibilities associated with teaching and coaching were cumbersome and, when asked how they were able to juggle all of the responsibilities, they found it difficult to provide a straightforward response. Some talked about effective time management skills and finding a sense of balance as important for being able to get everything done. Some of the older teachers talked about how it was easier to balance everything when they were younger. Marriage and children added additional responsibilities at home that made fulfilling both coaching and teaching responsibilities a challenge. When the responsibilities got to be too much and the home roles began to conflict with the work roles, several participants transitioned out of coaching. One teacher in particular discussed how she had coached when she was young, but pressures related to having young children forced her out of coaching. However, with her children grown and in high school, she was now able to resume some of her former coaching responsibilities.

Differences in T/Cs by subject affiliation were interesting. Although none of the non-core subject teachers explicitly said that they did not plan, they did not talk about the stresses associated with planning in the same way as the core subject teachers. They also did not talk about the need to grade student work to the extent of the core subject teachers. Therefore, non-core subject teachers may have fewer overall teaching-related responsibilities, which leaves them with more time to focus on coaching tasks. This was the message that seemed to come through in the interviews. Whereas core subject teachers had to meet specific objectives that required planning and preparation, those in non-core subjects appeared to have more flexibility with their teaching role, which allowed them to afford more time to coaching. As a result, one may tentatively surmise
that, given the current distribution of labor and accountability within the school structure, it may be easier for non-core subject teachers to assume coaching roles than it is for their core subject counterparts. However, there is also some preliminary evidence to suggest that, when a core subject teacher engages in coaching it is because they really want to and have a passion for it, whereas non-core teachers coach feel more obligated to coach. This was definitely the case for one physical education teacher who felt as if coaching was the only way that he would get a job when first applying.

**Teacher Burnout**

When asked how they feel after the school day, almost every participant used words such as “tired” or “exhausted.” Those who did not use these words tended to be from non-core subjects and talked about how they felt “alright” or “not too tired.” When put into context with some of the information reported earlier in this section, the workload taken on by teachers of core subjects seems to predispose them to higher levels of physical exhaustion than those reported by non-core subject teachers. When discussing frustrations related to teaching, a number of different concerns were raised. Some examples include the changing student demographics, the teacher evaluation/accountability systems, school culture or politics, and the inability to reach students. Regardless of the specific issue raised, it is important to note that most of the teachers were frustrated with issues that related to teaching environments or interpersonal relationships rather than the act of teaching itself. However, one concern related to teaching that was brought up by a few participants was the deskilling of the teaching workforce. These individuals felt as if new government policies made it so they had to teach specific content in a specific way, which reduced flexibility and creativity.
While frustrating aspects of the teaching job varied, when asked how they derived satisfaction from their work, the participants generally talked about one thing: the children. Helping students learn, seeing excitement when they got a concept for the first time, and hearing from previous students who credited them for success or interest in a topic were all at the top of the list of satisfying experiences for teachers. In fact, even some teachers who were extremely frustrated with certain elements of their jobs conceded that, despite the frustration and stress, the children they worked with made their jobs worthwhile. These participants seemed willing to put up with more stress than one would expect because they knew that, at the end of the day, they were doing it for the students.

When asked about transitioning out of teaching, most participants noted that they hoped to remain in schools for the foreseeable future. While some teachers explained that they were not sure if they would be able to spend the rest of their lives working under the current circumstances (e.g., frustrating with state mandates), they wanted to continue in teaching with the hopes that things would start to change for the better. Only a handful of participants talked about other jobs and these were often still associated with schooling. One elementary school teacher discussed the completion of his principal’s and his desire to work his way into administration. One high school physical education teacher discussed the opportunity to become an athletic director in the future. Only a handful of teachers, such as the elementary art teacher mentioned previously, felt the need to get entirely out of the educational experience.
Teacher Resilience

After discussing teacher role stressors and burnout, the interview script turned to focus on resilience. The purpose of these questions was to ascertain if the teachers felt as if they could juggle all of their varying roles and responsibilities and, if they were, how they did it. The majority of the teachers did feel as if they were able to juggle everything, but there were some differences by perceived levels of role conflict and burnout. Those teachers that were experiencing high role conflict and burnout were more likely to say that they were unable to juggle everything successfully. Similarly, when asked if they felt as if they were resilient, those teachers that were experiencing high levels of role conflict and burnout seemed less likely to agree that they were. Again, these feelings seem to relate back to the teacher’s feelings about the school culture and administration. Teachers working in positive environments were more likely to agree that they were resilient than those who were working in challenging contexts.

For the teachers who indicated that they were resilient, a follow up question was posed to determine how they were able to maintain balance and bounce back. Interestingly, many participants started off by saying that they did not know and there were more long pauses during this segment of the interview across participants than there were in other segments. After thinking about it some, many participants discussed having support networks (both inside and outside of school). The importance of maintaining organized work and family lives was also discussed across participants as was the need to have something to engage in to take one’s mind off of teaching. For example, one participant talked about gardening as an activity that she engaged in to take her mind off of teaching-related stress. This allowed her to recover and reenergize. Similarly, several
teachers talked about the importance of taking some personal time. One teacher said that when she got home from school she sat on the couch for 20 minutes with a cup of hot tea and just decompressed before moving into any after school activities.

Finally, persistence was a theme that was brought up throughout the interviews. The teachers often talked about not thinking about it and just finding a way to get through stress. From their perspective, to be a teacher you needed to be able to work through things and keep moving forward. Again, at the end of the day, the children they worked with made teaching a worthwhile experience, so as long as they maintained that connection with students it was worth finding a way to cope with the mental, emotional, and physical labor involved in teaching. This is best illustrated through the response given by one teacher who was a little confused with the question about resilience. From his perspective, resilience was a prerequisite to teaching and that if you were not resilient you needed to find a way to build resiliency or get out of teaching.

**Conclusions and Final Thoughts**

The purpose of this section was to provide some preliminary insight into the lives and careers of teachers – with a specific focus on role stressors, burnout, and resilience - that was garnered through interviews. While additional analyses will be necessary to confirm or refute the initial impressions provided here, there are some initial conclusions that can be drawn based on the analyses that have been done to date. While teachers live varied and divergent careers, some elements of their experience seem common or shared. For example, many get into teaching because they want to work with children and have either teachers in the family or an influential figure in their background. Teachers also
seem to derive the greatest amount of satisfaction from their work with children and these interactions make all of their negative experience worthwhile.

The changes in state assessment and evaluation policies appears to be a common, stressful experience for teachers, as is the length of the work day and feelings of exhaustion that accompany working in schools and with children on a daily basis. Most directly related to the work done in this dissertation in a broader sense, interviews shed light on the importance of developing a nurturing, supportive school culture. When the school culture promotes collegiality and is open to the introduction of new ideas, teachers talk more positively about it and seem less likely to express feelings of burnout and role conflict. Conversely, when administrators and colleagues are abrasive, difficult to work with, and unsupportive, teachers are more likely to become frustrated with their work and, in some cases, leave schools. This is an incredibly important point because it demonstrates that the culture of the school has a direct effect on teachers work and that teachers in less than optimal working conditions are probably not able to teach to the fullest extent of their potential. This supports the quantitative findings related to the importance of a positive workplace culture that reduces role stress and burnout as well as the conclusions presented in Chapter Six related to creating a more positive environment in which teachers can work.

**Toward Role Socialization Theory**

The investigation was framed using a combination of role theory (Linton, 1936; Merton, 1957; Parsons, 1951) and occupational socialization theory (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b; Templin & Schempp, 1989b). The combination of these two theoretical frameworks was viewed advantageous because of the way in which they work together to
explain the lived experiences of T/Cs and NCTs. Role theory lays the groundwork for a socially constructed, context-specific definition of individuals’ work roles. The theory explains which expectations for role performance influence individuals’ actions and the way in which key stakeholders (i.e., role-sets) have expectations that do not always align and can lead to role stressors (Merton, 1957; Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013; Stryker, 2001). Role theory also accounts for the ways in which individuals manage multiple roles through salience hierarchies (Stryker, 1968) or role balance (Marks & MacDermid, 1996). These constructs have become important for understanding interrole conflict, such as T/C role conflict, and account for instances in which individuals’ engage in role retreatism (Millslagle & Morley, 2004).

A key assumption in role theory is that individuals are prepared for role performance through socialization (Conrad, 2004; Hindin, 2007). This socialization includes training for the technical aspects of role performance as well as preparation for the more informal, sociopolitical realities associated with navigating the social milieu of the workplace (Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013). As such, understanding the construction and maintenance of social roles requires an articulation of the socialization process which underlie role performance and reflect cultural, societal, and contextual norms. Relative to education and specific to physical education, occupational socialization theory presents a well-established approach to understanding socialization that can be used to understand how physical education teachers’ acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization underlies their identity as educators and accounts for their actions and behaviors in the context of schools (Curtner-Smith, 2009; Lawson, 1986; Templin & Schempp, 1989b). Occupational socialization
theory also articulates socialization as a dialectical process in which the individual is able to question and challenge the socialization experiences to which they are exposed (Schempp & Graber, 1992). As such, the perspective breaks from more traditional, functionalist models of socialization which posited that individuals were passively socialized into the roles which they perform in society (Merton et al., 1957).

In essence, the combination of role theory and socialization theory provides researchers interested in teachers’ work with a perspective that allows for the examination of teacher stress, burnout, and resilience. It allows for the connection of role stressors and burnout and the explanation of how the workplace culture can promote or inhibit the development of resilience. This was supported in the study presented in Chapter Six, which illustrated that role stressors and burnout collectively predict teacher resilience. Similarly, the tenants of role theory and occupational socialization theory support the Chapter Five finding that T/Cs do not automatically express higher levels of role stressors and burnout than NCTs. Rather, as emphasized by Richards and Templin (2012), the context of the school and the social construction of the roles of teacher and coach are important for understanding whether or not role stressors and burnout become problematic for the T/C. If the T/C is not supported and held accountable for performance in both roles, they are more likely to experience negative effects that may lead to role prioritization and role retreatism (Millsagle & Morley, 2004; Stryker, 1968). Similarly, T/Cs’ acculturation and professional socialization experiences may predispose them to role stressors if they grew to prefer one role over the other and prioritize performance in that role (Richards & Templin, 2012).
While role theory and occupational socialization theory provide a logical and theoretically sound approach to understanding T/Cs and NCTs experiences and work-lives, to date few studies have explicitly combined the two frameworks. Recent publications by Richards and colleagues (Richards & Templin, 2012; Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013) have begun to theorize using both frameworks and have demonstrated the increased flexibility that including both theories provides scholars and researchers. When combined with these articles, the present dissertation lays the foundation for an amended theoretical framework for understanding teacher socialization in education that draws upon key constructs in both role theory and teacher socialization theory. Referred to here as role socialization theory, the new perspective allows scholars to articulate key elements of the socialization process as well as the influence of that process on the development and maintenance of social role.

Role socialization theory also allows for researchers to understand the impact of role-sets on teachers during occupational socialization in a more explicit manner. For example, numerous studies have demonstrated that physical education is a marginalized subject in many school environments (Lux & McCullick, 2011; A. Sparkes et al., 1993). This can be attributed to numerous factors including the social construction of physical education as a blue-collar subject (Hoyle, 1986; Schempp et al., 1993), government policy influencing school content (Valli et al., 2007), and the socialization experience of key stakeholders in the educational process. The inclusion of key constructs within role theory adds another layer to the explanation of marginality. Through role theory the influence of role-sets and the social construction of the role of physical education teacher within the context of schooling are further drawn out. This allows for elaboration on the
way in which varying expectations for physical education and the actions and behaviors of physical education teachers can cause role stress and lead to increased feelings of marginality. Figure 7.1 provides a visual representation of some of the advantages of combining role theory and occupational socialization theory.

While the brief introduction of role socialization theory is not intended to be comprehensive, it does lay the foundation for the more complete development of the perspective in future works. Importantly, role socialization theory is better conceptualized as an amalgamation of role theory and occupational socialization theory rather than a novel theory proper. As such, several of the assumptions and hypotheses related to each of the original frameworks are still relevant to role socialization theory. Similarly, several of the limitations of both role theory and occupational socialization theory are transferred to role socialization theory. One significant limitation of both perspectives is the lack of valid and reliable psychometric instruments that can be used to test theoretical hypotheses. Through the validation of the ICS-T/C, this dissertation has taken an important step toward filling this void. The ICS-T/C provides researchers with a valid and reliable tool that can be used in the measurement of T/C role conflict, which have not been available in the past. Survey instruments to measure other constructs posited through role socialization theory, such as marginalization and isolation, should be developed through future research.
Figure 7.1. Visual representation of several major tenants of role theory and occupational socialization theory as well as some of the advantages to combining both perspectives using the newly articulated role socialization theory.

### Elements of Socialization Theory
- Dialectical and Teacher Agency
- Acculturation
- Professional Socialization
- Organizational Socialization
- Reality Shock and Washout
- Marginality and Isolation
- Workplace Cultures

### Elements of Role Theory
- Social/Occupational Role
- Role Conflict, Ambiguity, and Overload
- Role Balance and Salience Hierarchies
- Role Sets and Organizational Context
- Accountability and Rewards for Role Performance
- Teacher Burnout
- Teacher Resilience

### Advantages of Role Socialization Theory
- Flexibility in understanding the workplace culture and lived experiences of teachers
- Effective interpretation of interrole and intrarole stressors in the workplace
- Understanding of the influence of role-sets (e.g., colleagues, administrators, students, and parents) in the educational process
- Connection between role stressors, burnout, resilience, and attention
- Importance of role consensus in reducing role stressors and promoting a positive, supportive workplace culture for new and veteran teachers
- Elaborated understanding of the social construction of the dual role teacher/coach
- Importance of role stressors and burnout in understanding teacher resilience across teaching and coaching roles
Limitations and Future Directions

While this investigation has provided significant insight into role stressors, burnout, and resilience, it is not without its limitations. Limitations specific to each study are discussed in the limitation sections in Chapters Four, Five, and Six. This section will cover some of the general limitations of the entire dissertation. First, as with all survey research, the analyses conducted as part of this dissertation are limited by the self-report nature of the study. It is possible that some teachers may have responded in ways that do not align with the actual feelings of role stressors, burnout, and resilience. It is also possible that some teachers may have responded to the survey questions without fully reading and reflecting upon the choices that they were making.

A second limitation of this study was the cross-sectional nature of the design. Since role stressors, burnout, and resilience change over time, it is probable that a longitudinal investigation that surveyed teachers across multiple time points would have yielded more accurate results. Such a design would account for regular variations among study variables due to factors such as the time of the school year. Similarly, having multiple data points would have allowed the researchers to account for variations in teachers’ mood due to good and bad work days. Similarly, T/Cs may process role conflict and other stressors different depending on whether or not they are in-season when responding to questions (T. D. Ryan, 2008). Perhaps the most effective way to collect data about teachers’ impressions of the constructs evaluated through this study would be to utilize ecological momentary assessment (Carson et al., 2010). Using devices such as PDAs, smart phones, or tablet PCs, ecological momentary assessment applications prompt teachers to respond to questions about how they are feeling a pre-planned time.
points throughout the school day. This provides the researchers with data in real time, which eliminates variation that occurs when asking retrospective questions (Brewer et al., 1991).

A third limitation of the study was that the respondents constitute a convenience sample rather than a truly random sample. Essentially, any teacher in the three school districts sampled was invited to participate in the study. Those who decided to participate may have been motivated to do so because they were feeling particularly stressed and wanted to vent or were not feeling stressed and wanted to express their sense of satisfaction with their job. Since there was no incentive for participation in the phase one survey, individuals who were not motivated to participate may not have responded. As a result, the findings may have been different if a truly random sample had been available.

Another key limitation of this study is the reliance on a sample drawn from teachers within a relatively small geographic region within the American Midwest. As a result, the responses of the teachers in this study may not reflect the experiences of teachers in other geographic locations in the United States or abroad. To further complicate the issue of extrapolation, just prior to the initiation of this study Indiana announced a large-scale teacher evaluation and assessment program and incentivized teacher performance through merit pay. As was gleaned through the initial interpretation of preliminary qualitative data analyses, this teacher evaluation system was viewed with great skepticism among teachers and many perceived it to be a great source of stress. Therefore, the teachers’ in this study likely responded differently than would individuals teaching in different circumstances.
Despite the limitations articulated above and those discussed in Chapters Four, Five, and Six, this investigation contributes significantly to the literature related to teachers’ lives and careers. In addition to the results of the specific results of the studies, another contribution of this dissertation is the directions for future research that it provides. Specific directions for future research are articulated along with the studies presented in Chapters Four, Five, and Six. This section aims to discuss directions for future research more generally.

One important finding of this investigation is that role stressors and burnout play an important role in understanding teachers’ experiences and ability to develop resilience. As such, future researchers should investigate the antecedents and outcomes of the constructs. If researchers are able to identify the specific contextual factors that promote or inhibit role stressors recommendations could be made for changes in school contexts to protect teachers from role stressors and burnout. A second but related direction for future research is to examine the sociopolitical factors that promote role balance among T/Cs as well as those that lead to role prioritization and role retreatism (Millslagle & Morley, 2004). The model forwarded by Richards and Templin (2012) presents several testable hypotheses related to individual- and socialization-level factors that could serve as a starting point for this research. Once researchers are able to better understand the factors that contribute to T/C role conflict recommendations for promoting role balance can be forwarded so to better protect dual role T/Cs.

Related to the current investigation, future researchers should consider adopting role socialization theory as a theoretical lens through which to examine the lives and careers of teachers. While role socialization theory is yet to be fully articulated, previous
work by Richards and colleagues (Richards & Templin, 2012; Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013) and this dissertation provides evidence to support the combination of role theory and organizational socialization theory in the study of teachers. As future researchers continue to examine teacher socialization and the influence of the sociopolitical contexts of school on teachers’ lives and careers, it is recommended that role socialization theory be adopted as a framework for studying and interpreting teachers’ experiences.

As role socialization theory continues to take form an important step will be the development of survey instruments intended to measure the constructs and hypotheses that it proposes. For example, marginality has been documented among physical education teachers in numerous qualitative studies, but to date no attempt has been made to quantify the experience of marginality or to validate a survey instrument intended to measure the construct. Similarly, no reliable and valid measures of isolation, school and community support, or teaching/coaching orientations exists in the extant literature. The validation of the ICS-T/C in the current dissertation presents an important step toward filling this gap, but future studies should strive to identify and validate measures for other constructs so that role socialization theory can be informed by quantitative as well as qualitative approaches to inquiry.

Finally, the current investigation provides for a quantitative understanding of teachers’ experiences with role stressors, burnout, and resilience. However, as has been demonstrated in the initial insights derived from the phase two interviews, much can be learned through qualitative study as well. Often, the most effective way to answer a research question is through the combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches to
collecting and interpreting data. Whereas quantitative methods allow the researcher to make concrete connections between variables through inferential statistical procedures, qualitative methods allows a more in-depth exploration of the people involved in the study and their lived experiences. In a sense, qualitative inquiry gives faces to the statistics used in quantitative methods. As such, it is recommended that future researchers continue to explore role stressors, burnout, and resilience from a mixed method perspective in order to more comprehensively answer research questions that are posed.

**Conclusions and Final Thoughts**

The researcher has elected to conclude this dissertation with a quotation that was also provided in the opening chapter:

Teachers matter. They matter to the education and achievement of their students and, more and more, to their personal and social wellbeing. No educational reform has achieved success without teachers committing themselves to it; no school has improved without the commitment of teachers; and although some students learn despite their teachers, most learn because of them – not just because of what and how they teach, but, because of who they are. (Day et al., 2007, p. 1).

The significance of this quotation rests in the acknowledgment that teachers are important for the equation and wellbeing of our children. Without teachers, education would not be possible. Yet teachers are often undervalued, underpaid, and overworked in our society. Rarely do teachers enter the profession for the money – more often they seek teaching positions because they love working with children and value the educational process. Teachers are truly remarkable individuals who have dedicated their lives to preparing and socializing the next generation of humankind. Despite the important role that teachers
play in our society, rarely is their hard work formally acknowledged. Further, as
government agencies continue to put pressure on school systems, teachers are being
subjected to new stresses that have not been prevalent in previous generations.

To further complicate the lives of teachers, schools are not always the most
hospitable and inviting of workplaces. Often teachers feel intellectually and physically
isolated, undervalued, overburdened and, depending on their subject affiliation, at times,
marginalized. As the results of this dissertation indicate, the institution of schooling and
key stakeholders involved in the enterprise must take more direct steps toward the
recognition and appreciation of teachers’ work. Teachers should be held accountable for
their performance, but evaluations should be conducted in a safe environment and
coupled with support for improvement. Everyone involved in education – parents,
teachers, children, administrators, community members – are interested in education of
our youth and this task is better approached by working together rather than in isolation
of or in competition with one another.

*Non satis scire*
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Appendix A

District-Level Administrator Permission Email

Dear SCHOOL DISTRICT RESEARCH COORDINATOR,

We are excited to announce the voluntary opportunity for teachers in your district to participate in a research study involving their experiences with work related burnout and the complexity of being both a teacher and athletic coach. We are interested in talking with all teachers in your schools (those who coach as well as those who do not coach) and would like to discuss the study with you in person. In anticipation of a meeting, we have provided some information below to outline the purpose of the study as well as what teachers would be required to do if they choose to participate.

**Purpose of study:** to develop a more complete understanding of the ways in which teacher/coaches who teach across a multitude of academic subjects and sports experience role conflict and burnout, and how their experiences compare to non-coaching teachers

**Requirements for the study if your teachers decide to join:**
- Attend an informational meeting or meet separately with a researcher
- Completion of a 15-25 minute survey related to burnout, role conflict, and resilience

Please feel free to contact Kevin Andrew Richards at karichar@purdue.edu or 860-681-5498 if you would be willing to meet with us.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Thomas Templin
Professor
Department of Health and Kinesiology
Purdue University
Dear SCHOOL PRINCIPAL,

We are excited to announce the voluntary opportunity for your teachers to participate in a research study involving their experiences with work related burnout and the complexity of being both a teacher and athletic coach. We are interested in talking with all teachers in your school (those who coach as well as those who do not coach) and are hoping that you would be willing to give us permission to speak with your teachers during the first of last 15 minutes of a regularly scheduled staff meeting. Also, if you are willing, we would like for you to share the email addresses of your teachers with us. During the meeting, we will explain to the teachers that this is a voluntary opportunity and they will be given the right to opt out of participating. Below we have included an overview of the study as well as information related to what teachers who agree to participate would be required to do.

**Purpose of study:** to develop a more complete understanding of the ways in which teacher/coaches who teach across a multitude of academic subjects and sports experience role conflict and burnout, and how their experiences compare to non-coaching teachers

**Requirements for the study if your teachers decide to join:**
- Attend an informational meeting or meet separately with a researcher
- Completion of a 15-25 minute survey related to burnout, and role conflict, and resilience

Please feel free to contact Kevin Andrew Richards at karichar@purdue.edu or 860-681-5498 if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Thomas Templin
Professor
Department of Health and Kinesiology
Purdue University
Appendix C

Overview of Study for Teachers

Purdue University Research Overview

Purpose of Research

The purpose of this investigation is to develop a more complete understanding of the ways in which teachers and teacher/coaches who teach across a multitude of academic subjects and coach various sports experience their work. We are interested in how all teachers, those who coach as well as those who do not coach, are able to juggle all of their teaching and non-teaching responsibilities and whether or not they feel as if they have enough time in their day to complete all of the tasks that have been assigned.

Specific Procedures

We have permission from your school district to ask you to be involved in this study. If you agree to participate, will be asked to do the following things:

1. Complete a 15-25 minute online survey about your lived experiences as a teacher and some of the challenges that you face.
   a. The survey also includes some background questions related to your teaching career, the school(s) at which you teach, and your involvement in extracurricular roles such as that of coach.
2. Next fall you may be invited to participate in a 45-60 minute interview that will delve deeper into your lived experiences. The purpose of the interview is to help us better understand your perspective and how you cope with the stresses of teaching and involvement in extra-curricular activities. Participation in the interview is not mandatory and you can be in the study without participating in the interview.
   a. If you complete the survey you may receive an email from us asking if you would like to participate in an interview and you will be free to decline.
3. If you participate in the initial interview, you may be invited to participate in one or two follow-up interviews. The purpose of these interviews is to continue the conversation started in the first interview. Participation in the follow-up interviews is not mandatory and you can participate in the first interview without participating in the follow up interviews.
   a. If you participate in an initial interview you may receive an email asking if you would like to participate in a follow up interview and you will be free to decline.

Informed Consent

This research has received a waiver of written consent for the survey, so you will not be asked to sign a consent form for in order to take the survey. Instead, the first page of the online survey will provide an overview of the study and consent will be assumed if you decide to continue on to take the survey. If you decide to participate in an interview, you will be asked to offer written consent at the time of the interview.
Confidentiality Statement

Your participation in this research as well as the responses you provide on the survey and in the interviews is confidential. When reporting results to your administrators or publishing results in academic journals we will only report information in aggregate or for particular groups (e.g., men vs. women). No individual data will be reported. Further, no one will know the specific responses you gave because all of the data will be de-identified and your name will be replaced with a code number. Therefore, when taking the survey or responding in an interview we encourage you to be candid and honest.

Risks and Benefits

The risk of being involved in the study is minimal. The only potential risk is that you may feel uncomfortable answering certain survey or interview questions. If this occurs you can feel free to skip the question. It is also unlikely that you will receive any direct rewards from participating in the study. Results of the study will be shared with your administrators in the hopes that it may provide them with a more complete understanding of the lived experiences of teachers (recall that no individual-level data will be reported. Data will only be reported in aggregate).

Contact Information:

Thank you very much for inviting us to your school to discuss our research plan. We hope that you will consider participating in our study. If you have any questions about this research project, you can contact K. Andrew Richards (413-358-1075 or karichar@purdue.edu) or Dr. Thomas Templin (765-494-3178 or ttemplin@purdue.edu). If you have concerns about the treatment of research participants, you can contact the Institutional Review Board at Purdue University, Ernest C. Young Hall, Room 1032, 155 S. Grant St., West Lafayette, IN 47907-2114. The phone number for the Board is (765) 494-5942. The email address is irb@purdue.edu.

Sincerely

K. Andrew R. Richards
Doctoral Candidate
Purdue University

413-358-1075
karichar@purdue.edu
Appendix D

TO BE INCLUDED IN THE ONLINE SURVEY RESEARCH PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Understanding Teacher/Coach Role Conflict and Burnout
Dr. Thomas J. Templin
Purdue University
Department of Health and Kinesiology

You are invited to participate in a research study being conducted by Purdue University’s Department of Health and Kinesiology. You were selected as possible subjects because of you are a teacher in counties surrounding Purdue University in Indiana. We request that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study. The principal investigator of this study is Dr. Thomas J. Templin and the co-investigator is K. Andrew Richards.

Purpose of Research

The purpose of this investigation is to develop a more complete understanding of the ways in which teachers and teacher/coaches who teach across a multitude of academic subjects and coach various sports experience role conflict and burnout. Specifically, we are interested in how you are able to juggle all of your teaching and non-teaching responsibilities and whether or not you feel as if you have enough time in your day to complete all of the tasks that have been assigned to you. Furthermore, we would like to learn about your overall resilience and the degree to which you are happy with your current teaching and non-teaching related assignments.

Specific Procedures

If you agree to be in the study, you will be asked to do the following things:

1. You will be asked to complete a 20-25 minute survey about your experiences with role conflict, burnout, and your overall level of resilience as a teacher.
2. You may be invited to participate in a 45-60 minute interview that will delve deeper into your experiences with role conflict, burnout, and resilience. The purpose of the interview is to help us better understand your perspective and how you cope with the stress of teaching and extra-curricular activities. Participation in the interview is not mandatory and you can be in the study without participating in the interview.
3. You may be invited to participate in one or two follow-up interviews after the initial interview. The purpose of these interviews is to continue the conversation started in the first interview. Participation in the follow-up interviews is not mandatory and you can be in the study without participating in the interview.

Duration of Participation
The study will begin in June 2012 and will be completed by May 2014.

Risks

While participating in the study, the risks for you are minimal but may include:
1. Discomfort in responding to survey or interview questions related to role conflict, burnout, or resilience
2. You may feel like participating in the study is taking too much time.
3. Breach of confidentiality is a risk, but safeguards are in place to minimize this risk as outlined in the confidentiality section below.

Benefits

It is not likely that there will be any direct benefits for participating in this investigation. However, potential benefits include increased self-awareness of the impact of role conflict and burnout in your life. By becoming more self-aware, you may be more apt to take steps to buffer against role conflict and burnout in your own life.

Compensation

You will not receive payment for taking part in this study.

Confidentiality

The project's research records may be reviewed by departments at Purdue University responsible for regulatory and research oversight. Here are the measures taken to maintain confidentiality:
1. When completing the survey if you are uncomfortable with any question, you can leave the answer blank. When participating in the interview you can skip any question or stop the interview at any time. You are also welcome to discuss the concern with the researcher.
2. To avoid the sharing of your personal responses to survey and interview questions, all information will be recorded immediately and kept confidential. All interviews will be transcribed by the research team and then the audio files will be destroyed. All interviews will be conducted in a quiet, semi-private location.
3. All records gathered during the study will be maintained in locked filing cabinet inside the principal investigator’s locked office in order to promote confidentiality. Only members of the research team will have access to the data in this location. Additionally, all identifying information will be removed from the records and replaced with a code number. These unidentified records will be maintained indefinitely.
4. No individual level survey or interview data will be reported. Data will only be reported in aggregate. That is, information from the data set as a whole or from specific subgroups (e.g., male or female teachers).
5. Pseudonyms will be used to refer to all teachers in reports of the research in order to maintain confidentiality.

Voluntary Nature of Participation

You do not have to participate in this research project. If you agree to participate you can withdraw your participation at any time without penalty. Your decision to participate or not, or withdraw from the study will not affect your job or relationship with Purdue University.

Contact Information:

If you have any questions about this research project, you can contact Dr. Thomas Templin (765-494-3178 or ttemplin@purdue.edu) or K. Andrew Richards (860-681-5498 or karichar@purdue.edu). If you have concerns about the treatment of research participants, you can contact the Institutional Review Board at Purdue University, Ernest C. Young Hall, Room 1032, 155 S. Grant St., West Lafayette, IN 47907-2114. The phone number for the Board is (765) 494-5942. The email address is irb@purdue.edu.

Documentation of Informed Consent

I have had the opportunity to read this consent form and have the research study explained. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the research project and my questions have been answered. I am prepared to participate in the research project described above. By continuing to the survey I am providing my consent to participate in the study.
Dear TEACHER,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our investigation. As discussed, the URL at the bottom of this email will take you to an online survey that will ask you questions about your job satisfaction, burnout, and conflict you experience from trying to juggle several different responsibilities related to your school roles. The entire survey should not take you any longer than 15-25 minutes. If you encounter a question that makes you feel uncomfortable or that you would prefer not to answer, please feel free to skip it.

**Link to Online Survey:** (INCLUDE LINK TO ONLINE SURVEY)

Thank you again for agreeing to take the survey and if you have any questions please feel to contact Kevin Andrew Richards at karichar@purdue.edu or 860-681-5498

Sincerely,

Thomas Templin
Professor
Department of Health and Kinesiology
Purdue University
Appendix F

Teacher Background Questionnaire

Are you currently working as a Pre-Kindergarten through 12th grade teacher?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Gender
- Male (1)
- Female (2)

Racial/Ethnic Affiliation
- African American (1)
- Asian American (2)
- Caucasian (3)
- Hispanic (4)
- Mixed Race (5)
- Native American Indian (6)
- Other (7)

What is your age (in years)
- 25 years or less (1)
- 26-30 years (2)
- 31-35 years (3)
- 36-40 years (4)
- 41-45 years (5)
- 46-50 years (6)
- 51-55 years (7)
- 55-60 years (8)
- 61-65 years (9)
- 66 years or more (10)

Marital Status - Are you (or have you ever been) married
- Currently married (1)
- Widowed (2)
- Divorced (3)
- Separated (4)
- Never married (5)

How many children do you have at home?
Highest level of degree attained
- Bachelor’s degree (1)
- Some Master’s level work (2)
- Completed Master’s degree (3)
- Doctoral level work (4)
- Educational Specialist (5)
- Doctoral degree (6)

At what school level are you currently teaching?
- Elementary school (1)
- Middle school (2)
- Junior high school (3)
- High school (4)
- Multiple Levels (please specify) (5) ________________

How many years have you been teaching?

In your time as a teacher, how many different schools have you taught in?

What level of socioeconomic status of the students best fits your current school (i.e., the school building in which you are primarily assigned)?
- Low (1)
- Middle (2)
- Upper-Middle (3)
- High (4)

How would you describe your current school setting (i.e., the school building in which you are primarily assigned)?
- Urban (1)
- Suburban (2)
- Rural (3)
- Other (Please specify) (4) ________________

Please identify for your teaching areas. For each area in which you teach write the percentage (%) of your overall teaching load dedicated to that subject. For example, someone who spends an equal amount of contract time teaching English and Art would write 50% in the space in front of English and 50% in the space in front of Art. The loads for the individual areas should sum to your total contract time.
- English (1)
- Mathematics (2)
- Science (3)
- Social Studies (4)
- Communications (5)
- Physical Education (6)
- Foreign Language (7)
What is the average number of students in the classes you teach?

What is the average length of the classes you teach in minutes?

On average, how many hours a day do you spend teaching classes?

On average, how many hours a day does your school provide you to prep?

Approximately how many hours a day do you spend preparing for teaching related tasks (both inside and outside of school time)?

How would you classify your administrative support for teaching?
- Very Poor (1)
- Poor (2)
- Fair (3)
- Good (4)
- Very Good (5)

How would you classify your parental support for teaching?
- Very Poor (1)
- Poor (2)
- Fair (3)
- Good (4)
- Very Good (5)

On average, how often do you deal with student discipline problems as a teacher?
- Never (1)
- Rarely (once a month) (2)
- Sometimes (twice a month) (3)
- Often (once a week) (4)
- All of the Time (on a daily basis) (5)

How would you describe your current motivation as a teacher?
Very Low (1)  
Low (2)  
Moderate (3)  
High (4)  
Very High (5)  

Ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, please rate the degree to which you agree with the following sentence: "The recent changes in state teacher evaluation system have had a positive impact on my experiences as a teacher"

Strongly Disagree (1)  
Disagree (2)  
Undecided (3)  
Agree (4)  
Strongly Agree (5)  

Do you expect to leave the school where you are currently working voluntarily in the near future?

Will definitely leave (1)  
Probably will leave (2)  
Undecided (3)  
Probably will not leave (4)  
Definitely will not leave (5)  

If you believe that you are likely to leave the school where you are currently working, when do you believe you will leave?

Within 1 year (1)  
Within 1 to 3 years (2)  
Within 3 to 5 years (3)  
Within 5 years or more (4)  
Undecided (5)  

Beyond teaching, what other roles do you have in your school? (check all that apply)

Lunch monitor (1)  
Hall monitor (2)  
Traffic monitor (3)  
Athletic coach (4)  
Administrative responsibilities (5)  
Extracurricular club advisor (6)  
School committee member (7)  
Study Hall Monitor (10)  
Library Duty (11)  
Wellness Coordinator (12)  
Bus Duty (13)  
Recess Duty (14)  
Enrichment Specialist (15)
Are you currently or have you ever coached extracurricular school sponsored sports while also teaching? (IF NEVER COACHED IS SELECTED, SKIP TO THE END OF THE BACKGROUND SURVEY)

- Currently teaching and coaching (1)
- Formerly taught and coached (2)
- Never coached (3)

If you are no longer coaching, what influenced you to give up your coaching responsibilities? (Check all that apply)

- Personal/family reasons (1)
- Children at home (2)
- Professional/school reasons (3)
- Too much work to both teach and coach (4)
- Didn't enjoy coaching (5)
- Other (Please specify) (6) ____________________

At which levels have you coached an extracurricular school sponsored sport (Check all that apply)?

- Elementary (1)
- Middle School (2)
- Junior High School (3)
- High School (4)

If you have coached at the high school level while also teaching, have you coached varsity or junior varsity sports?

- Coached varsity sports (4)
- Coached junior varsity sports (5)
- Coached both varsity and junior varsity sports (6)

For how many years have you taught and coached an extracurricular school sponsored sport at the same time?

At how many different schools have you coached?

Have you ever coached in a different school than the one in which you taught?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Have you ever coached in a different school district/corporation than the one in which you teach?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
What extracurricular school sponsored sports have you coached? (Check all that apply)

- Boys' Basketball
- Girls' Basketball
- Baseball
- Softball
- Boys' Volleyball
- Girls' Volleyball
- Football
- Boys' Lacrosse
- Girls' Lacrosse
- Boys' Track and Field
- Girls' Track and Field
- Boys' Cross Country
- Girls' Cross Country
- Boys' Gymnastics
- Girls' Gymnastics
- Cheerleading
- Dance Team
- Boys' Soccer
- Girls' Soccer
- Wrestling
- Boys' Golf
- Girls' Golf
- Boys' Tennis
- Girls' Tennis
- Boys' Swimming/Diving
- Girls' Swimming/Diving
- Boys' Ice Hockey
- Girls' Ice Hockey
- Rope Jumping Team
- Field Hockey
- Other (Please Specify)

On average, how many hours a day would you prepare for your coaching responsibilities (including time spent both in and outside of school)?

Have your coaching roles been paid or volunteer positions?

- Paid
- Volunteer
- Both paid and volunteer

How would you classify your administrative support for coaching?

- Very poor
- Poor
How would you classify your parental support for coaching?
- Very poor (1)
- Poor (2)
- Fair (3)
- Good (4)
- Very Good (5)

How would you classify your level of motivation when coaching?
- Very Low (1)
- Low (2)
- Moderate (3)
- High (4)
- Very High (5)

In your opinion, which of the following are important benefits of coaching (check all that apply)?
- Financial rewards (i.e., increased pay) (1)
- Opportunity to work with children (2)
- Opportunity to stay connected with particular sports (3)
- Professional challenges (4)
- Connection to school or community (5)
- Other (6) __________________

When coaching and teaching at the same time, did you expect to give up some or all of your coaching roles voluntarily in the near future?
- Will definitely give up some coaching roles (1)
- Probably will give up some coaching roles (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Probably will not give up some coaching roles (4)
- Will definitely not give up some coaching roles (5)

If you believe that you would give up some coaching roles in the near future, when would you give them up?
- Within 1 year (1)
- Within 1 to 3 years (2)
- Within 3 to 5 years (3)
- Within 5 or more years (4)
- Undecided (5)

When teaching and coaching at the same time, what was your preference between the roles of teacher and coach?
- Strongly prefer teaching (1)
- Prefer teaching (2)
- Slightly prefer teaching (3)
- Prefer both roles equally (4)
- Slightly prefer coaching (5)
- Prefer coaching (6)
- Strongly prefer coaching (7)
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Teacher Role Stressors Survey

The purpose of this survey is to discover how educators view their jobs and the people with whom they work closely.

Directions: Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you believe the statement is very inaccurate, record a 1 (one). If you believe the statement is very accurate, mark a 7 (seven). Responses are on a 7-point Likert-scale ranging from Very Inaccurate (1) to Very Accurate (7).

1. Role Ambiguity (1: Very inaccurate, 7: Very accurate)
   a. I feel certain about how much authority I have.
   b. I know that I have divided my time properly.
   c. I know what my responsibilities are.
   d. I know exactly what is expected of me.

2. Role Conflict (1: Very inaccurate, 7: Very accurate)
   a. I often work under incompatible policies and procedures.
   b. I often have to buck a rule or policy to carry out my work.
   c. I often receive incompatible requests from two or more people.

3. Role Overload (1: Very inaccurate, 7: Very accurate)
   a. There isn’t enough time during my regular workday to do everything that’s expected of me.
   b. I am rushed in doing my job.
Appendix H
Teacher/Coach Role Conflict Scale

The purpose of this survey is to discover how educators view their jobs and the people with whom they work closely.

Directions: Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you strongly disagree with the statement, record a 1 (one). If you strongly agree with the statement, mark a 7 (seven). Responses are on a 7-point Likert-scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7).

1. "In general, I like coaching for this school"
2. In general, I like working at my job. ("Job" includes both your primary occupation & coaching combined)
3. I will likely give up some or all of my coaching role(s) within the next two years.
4. "Because of the amount of energy I spend in coaching, I often come to class too tired to do some of the things that I would like to do"
5. "Because teaching is demanding, at times I am irritable while coaching"
6. "My teaching schedule makes it difficult to perform my coaching duties"
7. "In general, I like teaching at this school"
8. "I frequently think about leaving this school or school district"
9. "Because coaching is demanding, at times I am irritable while teaching"
10. "In teaching, I have so much work to do that it takes away from my coaching"
11. In general, I don't like my job. ("Job" includes your primary occupation and coaching combined)
12. "I intend to stay in the teaching profession for the foreseeable future"
13. "I intend to stay in the coaching profession for the foreseeable future"
14. All in all, I am satisfied with my job. (Again "job" includes your primary occupation and coaching combined)
15. "Coaching takes up time that I would spend involved in my teaching role."
16. "I am often preoccupied with an aspect from the classroom while I am coaching"
17. "All in all, I am satisfied with teaching"
18. "I will likely give up some or all of my teaching role(s) within the next two years"
19. "It is likely that I will explore career opportunities other than coaching or teaching"
20. "My coaching makes it difficult to be the kind of teacher I'd like to be"
21. "After teaching, I go to my practices or games more fatigued than I would prefer"
22. "All in all, I am satisfied with coaching"
23. "I will likely search and apply for a job with another district within the next year"
24. "I am often preoccupied with an aspect of my coaching while I am in the classroom"
Preference for teaching or coaching role
1. On a scale from 1-7, which best describes your preference between the coaching role and teaching role (1=strongly prefer teaching role, 4=prefer both roles equally, 7=strongly prefer coaching role)
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Modified Maslach Burnout Inventory – Educators Survey

The purpose of this survey is to discover how educators view their jobs and the people with whom they work closely.

Directions: Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, write a “0” (zero) in the space before the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by writing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way. Responses are on a 6-point Likert-scale ranging from Never (0) to Everyday (6).

1. I feel emotionally drained from my work
2. I feel used up at the end of the workday
3. I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job
4. I can easily understand how my students feel about things
5. I feel that I treat some students as if they were impersonal objects
6. Working with people all day is really a strain for me
7. I deal very effectively with the problems
8. I feel burned out from my work
9. I feel I’m positively influencing other people’s lives through my work
10. I’ve become more callous toward people since I took this job
11. I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally
12. I feel very energetic
13. I feel frustrated by my job
14. I feel I’m working too hard on my job
15. I don’t really care what happens to some students
16. Working with people directly puts too much stress on me
17. I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my students
18. I feel exhilarated after working closely with my students
19. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job
20. I feel like I’m at the end of my rope
21. In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly
22. I feel students blame me for some of their problems
23. I am too tired to think clearly
24. I have difficulty concentrating
25. My thinking process is slow
26. I have difficulty thinking about complex things
27. I feel I’m not thinking clearly
28. I feel I’m not focused on my thinking
29. I feel tired
30. I have no energy for going to work in the morning
31. I feel physically drained
32. I feel fed up
33. I feel like my “batteries” are “dead”
34. I feel burned out
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Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale

For each item, please mark an “x” in the box below that best indicates how much you agree with the following statements as they apply to you over the last month. If a particular situation has not occurred recently, answer according to how you think you would have felt. Responses are on a 6-point Likert-scale ranging from Not at all (0) to True nearly all the time (6).

1. I am able to adapt when changes occur.
2. I have at least one close and secure relationship that helps me when I am stressed.
3. When there are no clear solutions to my problems, sometimes fate or God can help.
4. I can deal with whatever comes my way.
5. Past successes give me confidence in dealing with new challenges and difficulties.
6. I try to see the humorous side of things when I am faced with problems.
7. Having to cope with stress can make me stronger.
8. I tend to bounce back after illness, injury, or other hardships.
9. Good or bad, I believe that most things happen for a reason.
10. I give my best effort no matter what the outcome may be.
11. I believe I can achieve my goals, even if there are obstacles.
12. Even when things look hopeless, I don’t give up.
13. During times of stress/crisis, I know where to turn for help.
15. I prefer to take the lead in solving problems rather than letting others make all the decisions.
16. I am not easily discouraged by failure.
17. I think of myself as a strong person when dealing life’s challenges and difficulties.
18. I can make unpopular or difficult decisions that affect other people, if it is necessary.
19. I am able to handle unpleasant or painful feelings like sadness, fear, and anger.
20. In dealing with life’s problems, sometimes you have to act on a hunch without knowing why.
21. I have a strong sense of purpose in life.
22. I feel in control of my life.
23. I like challenges.
24. I work to attain my goals no matter what roadblocks I encounter along the way.
25. I take pride in my achievements.
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Email Invitation for Participation in Interviews

Dear Teacher

We hope you had a great summer and that the coming school year will be filled with success. As you recall, you participated in a study which focused on your work experiences and the stresses you experience as a teacher. Thanks again for your participation in the first component of our investigation. We had over 400 teachers and teacher/coaches from the area complete the survey and we sincerely appreciate your participation. This initial survey showed some very interesting results that will be shared with you at the end of the study relative to teacher burnout, role conflict, and resilience.

The second part of our research involves the collection of qualitative data that aims to gain a more in-depth understanding of teachers' experiences with their daily jobs including any stress that they may experience. If you are willing, we would like to invite you to participate in a face-to-face interview with a member of the research team as a follow up to the survey that you completed. This interview would last approximately one hour and can be scheduled at a time and place that is convenient for you. With your consent, we would like to audio record the interview and, after transcribing the conversation, the audio recordings will be deleted and a code number will replace your name on the transcript. **If you are able to participate in an interview, we will be able to provide you with a $20.00 Amazon gift card to compensate you for your time.** We will provide the gift card at the date and time of your interview.

If you are interested in participating in an interview, please complete the brief survey through the link that follows to let us know where and when would be most convenient for you. If you are not interested in participating, you can indicate that by clicking the "unsubscribe" button below or indicating that you do not wish to participate in the survey and we will not contact you again in the future. If you would prefer not to participate, there will not be any consequences.

If you have any questions about the interviews prior to completing the survey you may contact Kevin Andrew Richards (karichar@purdue.edu or 413-358-1075) who can provide you with information.

Thank you for your time and we hope to have the opportunity to speak with you.

**Follow this link to the Survey:**
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Interview Informed Consent Paperwork

RESEARCH PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM
Understanding Teacher/Coach
Role Conflict and Burnout
Dr. Thomas J. Templin
Purdue University
Department of Health and Kinesiology

You are invited to participate in a research study being conducted by Purdue University’s Department of Health and Kinesiology. You were selected as possible subjects because of you are a teacher in counties surrounding Purdue University in Indiana. We request that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study. The principal investigator of this study is Dr. Thomas J. Templin and the co-investigator is K. Andrew Richards.

Purpose of Research

The purpose of this investigation is to develop a more complete understanding of the ways in which teacher/coaches who teach across a multitude of academic subjects and sports experience role conflict and burnout, and how their experiences compare to non-coaching teachers. Specifically, we are interested in how you are able to juggle all of your teaching and non-teaching responsibilities and whether or not you feel as if you have enough time in your day to complete all of the tasks that have been assigned to you. Furthermore, we would like to learn about your overall resilience and the degree to which you are happy with your current teaching and non-teaching related assignments.

Specific Procedures

If you agree to be in the study, you will be asked to do the following things:

1. You will be asked to review all the information provided and ask any questions that remain prior to agreeing to be in the study. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to sign this informed consent document.

2. You will be asked to participate in a 45-60 minute interview that will discuss into your experiences with role conflict, burnout, and resilience. The purpose of the interview is to help us better understand your perspective and how you cope with the stress of teaching and extra-curricular activities.

3. You may be asked to participate in one or two follow-up interviews after the initial interview. The purpose of these interviews is to continue the conversation started in the first interview. Participation in the follow-up interviews is not mandatory and you can be in the study without participating in the follow up interviews.
Duration of Participation

The study will begin in June 2012 and will be completed by May 2014

Risks

While participating in the study, the risks for you are minimal but may include:
1. You may be uncomfortable discussing issues related to resilience, role conflict, and burnout with the research team
2. When participating in the interview, you may feel uncomfortable answering the questions.
3. You may feel like participating in the study is taking too much time.
4. Breach of confidentiality is a risk, but safeguards are in place to minimize this risk as outlined in the confidentiality section below.

Benefits

There not likely that there will be any direct benefits for participating in this investigation. However, potential benefits include increased self-awareness of the impact of role conflict and burnout in your life. By becoming more self-aware, you may be more apt to take steps to buffer against role conflict and burnout in your own lives.

Compensation

You will receive a $20.00 iTunes gift card as compensation for your participation in the study. This gift card will be given to you at the date and time of your interview.

Confidentiality

The project's research records may be reviewed by departments at Purdue University responsible for regulatory and research oversight. Here are the measures taken to maintain confidentiality:
1. When participating in the interview you can skip any question or stop the interview at any time. You are also welcome to discuss the concern with the researcher
2. To avoid the sharing of your personal responses to interview questions all interviews will be transcribed by the research team and then the audio files will be destroyed. All interviews will be conducted in a quiet, semi-private location.
3. All records gathered during the study will be maintained in locked filing cabinet inside the principal investigator’s locked office in order to promote confidentiality. Only members of the research team will have access to the data in this location. Additionally, all identifying information will be removed from the records and replaced with a code number. These unidentified records will be maintained indefinitely.
Voluntary Nature of Participation

You do not have to participate in this research project. If you agree to participate you can withdraw your participation at any time without penalty. Your decision to participate or not, or withdraw from the study will not affect your job or relationship with Purdue University.

Contact Information:

If you have any questions about this research project, you can contact Dr. Thomas Templin (765-494-3178 or ttemplin@purdue.edu) of K. Andrew Richards (860-681-5498 or karichar@purdue.edu). If you have concerns about the treatment of research participants, you can contact the Institutional Review Board at Purdue University, Ernest C. Young Hall, Room 1032, 155 S. Grant St., West Lafayette, IN 47907-2114. The phone number for the Board is (765) 494-5942. The email address is irb@purdue.edu.

Documentation of Informed Consent

I have had the opportunity to read this consent form and have the research study explained. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the research project and my questions have been answered. I am prepared to participate in the research project described above. I will receive a copy of this consent form after I sign it.

__________________________  __________________
Participant’s Signature          Date

________________________________________
Participant’s Name

__________________________  __________________
Researcher’s Signature          Date
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Acknowledgement of Compensation

I, _______________________, hereby acknowledge that I have received compensation in the amount of a $20.00 Amazon Gift Card for my participation in the study titled “Understanding Teacher/Coach Role Conflict and Burnout” for which Dr. Thomas J. Templin is the principal investigator. I have been informed of the requirements of the study and understand that in exchange for the $20.00 Amazon Gift Card I will be participating in a face-to-face interview with a member of the research team. This interview will last for 45-60 minutes and has been scheduled at a time and place that is convenient for me. I also understand that I can cease participation in the interview at any time and/or elect not to answer certain questions that are asked of me. Further, I understand that, while the research team may ask me to participate in a follow up interview, I am not obligated to do so. Should I agree to participate in a follow up interview, I understand that I will not receive further compensation beyond that which has already be given to me.

__________________________________ (Name)

__________________________________ (Signature)  ___________ (Date)
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Invitation to Participate in a Follow Up Interview

Dear TEACHER,

Thank you for participating in the first round of interviews. If you are willing, we would like to invite you to participate in a second face-to-face interview with a member of the research team. This interview would last a maximum of 45 minutes to an hour and can be scheduled at a time and place that is convenient for you. The purpose of this interview would be to ask follow up questions related to your experiences with role conflict and burnout. With your consent, we would like to audio record these interviews and, after transcribing the conversation, the audio recordings will be deleted and a code number will replace your name on all transcriptions.

If you are interested in participating in the interview, please complete the Doodle poll through the following link in order to provide your availability (LINK TO POLL TO CHECK FOR AVAILABILITY). If you would prefer not to participate, there will not be any consequences or recourses.

Please feel free to contact Kevin Andrew Richards at karichar@purdue.edu or 860-681-5498 if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Thomas Templin
Professor
Department of Health and Kinesiology
Purdue University
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Teacher Stressors Initial Interview Guide

[Before turning on the voice recorder, begin with the written consent form and present the teacher with the gift card]

Hello [interviewee] my name is [interviewer] it’s nice to [meet you or see you again]. I want to take a minute to review the purpose of this interview: We are interested in learning more about how you handle the multiple roles that you perform before, during, and after the school day. We are also interested in your feelings of satisfaction with your job as a teacher. The information we gather will help us to better understand the lives and careers of teachers and will be used in possible research publications. Anything you say will be kept strictly anonymous. That is, we will transcribe this conversation and then remove your name and any identifying information from the interview and replace it with a code number. The interview should take between 45 minutes and an hour.

I also want you to know that your participation in this interview is entirely optional. There is no penalty for not participating, and you may drop out of the study at any point. During the interview you may see me taking notes – these notes help keep me on track and insure I don’t repeat questions that I would like to ask. We are also recording the conversation. The recording will be deleted after we have transcribed our conversation. In addition, if you say something during the interview and decide later that you do not want us to use it, we can delete these comments.

Do you have any questions about the interview or any of the other information I have given you before we begin? Let’s get started.

Teaching Background Information
1. Why did you enter teaching?
   a. Were there any people in your life who influenced your decision?
   b. What attracted you to the particular subject that you are currently teaching?
2. Tell me a little about teaching at your school
   a. Tell me about the students and your relationship with them
   b. Tell me about the administrators and your relationship with them
   c. Tell me about your colleagues and your relationship with them
   d. Do you feel like your subject is viewed as important by others in the school? Explain.
3. Are you currently or have you ever coach school sports while also teaching? [Use this question to determine whether or not the coaching questions are asked]

Coaching Background Information – Now let’s talk a little about your role as a coach [for T/Cs and former T/Cs only – skip this section for NCTs]:
1. Tell me a little about your [current or previous] coaching assignment
a. Why are you happy or unhappy with your [current or previous] coaching assignment(s)?

2. How did you get into coaching?
   a. Were there any people in your life who influenced your decision to become a coach?
   b. What attracted you to the particular sport that you are currently coaching?
   c. Do you feel like your sport is viewed as important by others in the school?

**Teacher Role Conflict** – Let’s talk a little about your role as a teacher and the responsibilities that you are asked to perform on a daily basis:

1. How do you define your role as a teacher: What do you view as important to your job?
   a. Why do you define teaching in this way?
   b. What other individuals that you have interacted with have helped you to shape it in this direction?

2. Take me through your typical day: What are some of the roles and responsibilities that you are expected to perform?

3. Do you feel as if you have enough time to get everything done?
   a. If not, how do you handle completing your tasks?

4. How does your role as a teacher impact your family/personal life?

5. What about your job makes it easier or more difficult than other lines of work that you might imagine yourself in? Explain.

6. How do you feel like you are able to meet various expectations for your job that are held by others (e.g., teachers, students, parents, and administrators)?

7. How have changes in the structure of teacher pay and reward structures in Indiana impacted your ability to effectively perform your job?

**Teacher/Coach Role Conflict** – I am interested in knowing about how your role as a coach is viewed in relation to your role as a teacher [for T/Cs and former T/Cs only – skip for NCTs]:

1. Which role do you believe is more important: teacher or coach?
   a. What has led you to evaluate those two roles in this way?
   b. Which role do your fellow teachers recognize you for the most?
   c. Which role do you believe your administrators hold you most accountable for?

2. When you were hired, what was the expectation for coaching vs. teaching?

3. Do you identify most as a teacher or a coach?
   a. To which of your roles do you give the highest priority? Why?
   b. If you could choose between just teaching or coaching, which would you choose and why?
   c. How, if at all, have others helped to shape your view of your priority role?

4. How [are you or were you able to] juggles the responsibilities of teaching and coaching?
Teacher Burnout – Now that we have talked a little about your role as a teacher [or teacher/coach], I would like to talk a little about the stress that you experience as part of your job

1. When you go home in the afternoon, how do you feel?
   a. To what degree do you feel excited or exhausted at the end of the work day?

2. To what degree do you find that your job as a teacher [or teacher/coach] frustrates you?
   a. What contributes to this frustration?

3. To what extent do you find yourself becoming frustrated with your co-workers and administrators?
   a. How does the stress you experience as part of your job impact your level of frustration?

4. How accomplished do you feel in your current job as a teacher [or teacher/coach]?
   a. To what degree do you feel like you are making a difference in the lives of your students [and student athletes]?

5. How long can you see yourself continuing in your current role as a teacher [or teacher/coach]

6. Have you ever thought about leaving the teaching profession [or teaching and coaching professions] and moving into another line of work?
   a. If you have decided to leave your post, what brought you to this decision?
   b. Would you consider leaving coaching and remaining in teaching to give yourself more time [teacher/coaches only]

Teacher Resilience – The last thing that we are interested in is the degree to which you are able to manage with the varying roles and responsibilities you are required to perform as a teacher [or teacher/coach]

1. How are you able to balance all of things across your life that you are engaged in on a daily basis?

2. How effectively are you able to cope with the stress you experience related to your job?

3. How resilient do you find yourself to be in the face of stress?
   a. When you experience conflict in your job how do you respond or navigate it?
   b. What factors in your school or life contribute to your ability to be resilient?

4. Do you bounce back quickly from a setback, or does it take you some time to recover.
   a. Can you provide an example?

5. How effectively are you able to work though roadblocks and challenges in your daily work?

6. To what degree do you believe that you are able to achieve your work related goals even when you experience challenges?
Summary and Closure – Thank you for your time this [afternoon or morning]. As we get ready to finish up there are a couple of final questions that I would like to ask:

1. Can you tell me a quick story that you characterizes you of your life as a teacher [and coach]?
2. Is there anything else about your role as a teacher [and coach] that you would like to tell me about that we have not had a chance to cover this afternoon?
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Follow-Up Interview Topics

The follow-up interviews will serve the following purposes:

1. Gathering additional information related to how issues of role conflict and burnout impact the life of the individual teacher
2. Asking follow up questions related to the teacher’s interactions with administrators, colleagues, and students and how these interactions impact feelings of role conflict
3. Delving deeper into participants’ role prioritization and how that prioritization impacts their work in each role
4. Developing a more complete understanding of the participant’s background and how that relates to role conflict and burnout
5. Understanding how the teacher manages the various roles he/she are required to perform throughout the school day and how time restraints impact the degree to which he/she perform their roles to the best of his/her abilities
6. Asking follow up questions related to the participant’s job satisfaction and how he/she maintains motivated in his/her role
7. Understanding how social relationships impact the participant’s feelings of role conflict, burnout, and job satisfaction
8. Addressing topics introduced by the participant in the initial interview that were not covered completely
9. Giving the participant an opportunity to introduce topics that the/she wants to discuss, but could not be covered in the initial interview
10. Discussing any other topics related to the research questions that were not addressed in the initial interview

NOTE: Follow up interviews will be very individual in nature and will focus on gathering additional information from topics discussed with participants in the initial interviews. Therefore, it is difficult to provide specific interview questions.
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- Assisted with instructional design and student evaluation.

EDCI 429: Teaching of Physical Education in Secondary Schools (3 semesters)
- Served as a college supervisor for preservice physical education students.

EDCI 435: Student Teaching in Physical Education (3 semesters)
- Served as a college supervisor for health and physical education student teachers.

EDCI 589: College Teaching Workshops Series I (3 semesters)
- Assigned with instructional design and student evaluation.

Graduate Student Mentoring

HK 326: Foundations of Adapted Physical Education (2 semesters)
- Served as content mentor

PES 112: Aquatic Movement Forms (2 semesters)
- Served as observation mentor

RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

Thesis/Dissertation


**Peer-Reviewed Publications**


**Book Chapters**


**Published Conference Abstracts and Proceedings**


**Non-Peer Reviewed Publications**


**Publications In Review and In Preparation**


**Ongoing Research**

Richards, K. A. R., & Templin, T. J. Understanding teacher/coach role conflict and burnout.

Richards, K. A. R., Eberline, A. D., Templin, T. J., & Graber, K. The role of professional organizations in graduate student professional socialization.

Levesque-Bristol, C., Richards, K. A. R., Nelson, D., & Sass, M. Understanding the benefits of college-level service-learning courses

Levesque-Bristol, C., Nelson, D., & Richards, K. A. R. IMPACT: The result of large scale course redesign on a university campus.

Gaudreault, K. L., & Richards, K. A. R. A professional development program intended to decrease physical education teachers’ feelings of marginality.

**Peer-Reviewed Oral Presentations**


- Da Matta, G., Hemphill, M. A., & Richards, K. A. *Creating space for democratic education in physical education: Developing excellence in PETE programs.*
- Lorente-Catalán, E. *Fostering student responsibility for self-assessment and marking: A case study in PETE.*
- Martínez-Álvarez, L. *Autobiographical narrative as a tool to understand the sources of pedagogical practice in defining the practicum.*


   • Presented at the Eastern District Association of AAHPERD Regional Conference, Feb. 2008, Newport, RI
   • Presented at the Indiana Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance Conference, Nov. 2010, Indianapolis, IN

   • Presented at the Massachusetts Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance State Conference, Nov. 2006, Worcester, MA

Peer-Reviewed Poster Presentations


2. Richards, K. A. R., & Templin, T. J. (2012, October). Reconceptualizing Teacher-Coach Role Conflict in Physical Education Teacher Education. Presented at the National Association for Sport and Physical Education PETE Conference, Las Vegas, NV.

**Invited Presentations**


   - Accepted at the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance Conference, April 2014, St. Louis, MO.


8. Templin, T. J., & Richards, K. A. R. (2013, February). *University-school partnerships: A study of continuing professional development and teacher change.* Presented at the Department of Curriculum and Instruction Forum, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.


   - Presented at the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance Conference, April 2013, Charlotte, NC.


Guest Lectures


3. Richards, K. A. (2010, November). *The role of induction assistance in the socialization of a beginning physical education teacher.* Presented at Purdue University in HK 668: Seminar in Exercise Physiology, Dr. Sean Newcomer.


Grants – Funded


**Grants – Not Funded**


**SERVICE**

**Professional Committees/Offices**

**National**

2012-Present, Graduate and Professional Student Development Committee, Professional and Organizational Network

2012-Present, Doctoral Student Member, Research Consortium Board of Directors, AAHPERD

2012-Present, Public and Legislative Affairs Committee, AAHPERD

2012-Present, Public Policy Advisory Committee, NASPE
2008-Present, Alliance Assembly, AAHPERD National Convention
  • Student Delegate, St. Louis, MO, April 2014
  • Student Delegate, Charlotte, NC, April 2013
  • Alternate Student Delegate, Boston, MA, March 2012
  • Student Delegate, San Diego, CA, April 2011
  • Student Delegate, Indianapolis, IN, April 2010
  • Student Delegate, Tampa Bay, FL, March 2009
  • Student Delegate, Fort Worth, TX, March 2008

2013, Ad Hoc Committee on the Delegate Assembly, AAHPERD

2009, Middle School Teacher of the Year Committee, NASPE

State

2010-Present, Chair, Advocacy Chair, Indiana AHPERD

2008-2010, Council for Middle School Physical Education, Indiana AHPERD

2007-2008, MAHPERD Council for Future Professionals, Massachusetts AHPERD

Purdue University

2011-Present, Graduate Student Representative, Recreational Sports Advisory Board, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN

2010-Present, Purdue Graduate Student Government Academic and Professional Development Committee, West Lafayette, IN
  • 2011-2012, Committee Chair

2010-Present, Purdue University Academic Appeals Committee, West Lafayette, IN

2012, Purdue University, Graduate School Faculty Mentoring Award Selection Committee, West Lafayette, IN

2012 and 2011, Purdue University, 1923 Helping Students Learn Award Selection Committee, West Lafayette, IN

2011, Purdue University Graduate Student Organization Grant Allocation Committee, West Lafayette, IN

2011, Chair, Purdue University Graduate Student Excellence Award Committee, West Lafayette, IN
Department of Health and Kinesiology

2008-2013, Health and Kinesiology Graduate Student Organization (HK-GSO), Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN
- 2013, Purdue Graduate Student Government Representative
- 2009-2011, President
- 2008; 2011-2012, Member

Advocacy

2009-2013, Attended NASPE’s “SPEAK Out! Day,” Washington, DC

February 2013, Attended the American Heart Association’s “Heart on the Hill Day” as the IAHPERD representative, Indianapolis, IN.

February 2012, Attended the American Heart Association’s “Healthy Heart Awareness Day” as the IAHPERD representative, Indianapolis, IN.

February 2010, Assisted Tippecanoe County (IN) school teachers in developing advocacy efforts focused on retaining physical education in the district

April 2010, Advocated for physical education at a meeting of the Benton County (IN) Board of Education

March 2009, Advocated for physical education at a meeting of the Indiana State Board of Education

Reviewing/Editing

2013-Present, Peer Reviewer, Journal of Teaching in Physical Education

2013-Present, Peer Reviewer, Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance

2013-Present, Peer Reviewer, Journal of Teacher Education

2012-Present, Peer Reviewer, Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved

2011-Present, Peer Reviewer, Current Issues in Education

2013, Peer Reviewer, American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE)
- Reviewed submissions to the K-12 and Pre-College Engineering Division

2013, Peer Reviewer, AAHPERD
- Reviewed advocacy focused proposals submitted to the various branches of AAHPERD

2013, Peer Reviewer, AERA
- Reviewed presentation submissions to the Research on Learning and Instruction in Physical Education Special Interest Group Special Interest Group of AERA
2013, Peer Reviewer, Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network Conference
  • Reviewed presentation submissions to the POD Network Conference

2012, Peer Reviewer, Research Consortium of AAHPERD
  • Reviewed presentation submissions to the Pedagogy Division of the Research Consortium of AAHPERD

2010 & 2012, Graduate Student Reviewer, AERA
  • Reviewed presentation submissions to the Research on Learning and Instruction in Physical Education Special Interest Group Special Interest Group of AERA

Program Reviews


4. Richards, K. A. R. (2013). Changes in graduate student self-efficacy as a result of attending a college teaching workshop series. Submitted to the Center for Instructional Excellence at Purdue University.

3. Velasquez, J. D., Richards, K. A. R., Ivic, R., & Parker, H. (2012). Students’ experiences in the biomedical engineering program at Purdue University. Submitted to the Department of Biomedical Engineering, Purdue University.

2. Logsdon, R., Richards, K. A. R., Robinson, M., Hylton, B., Hoover, F., Keller, C., & Templin, T. J. (2012). Graduate student space needs, wants, and feasibility survey. Submitted to the Graduate School at Purdue University

1. Richards, K. A., & Velasquez, J. D. (2011). Undergraduate student experiences in the Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU) program at Purdue University. Submitted to the College of Engineering at Purdue University.

Professional Organizations

2012-Present, Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network in Higher Education
2010-Present, International Association for Physical Education in Higher Education (AIESEP)

2009-Present, American Education Research Association (AERA)
  • Research on Learning and Instruction in Physical Education Special Interest Group

2008-Present, Indiana Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (IAHPERD)

2006-Present, American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (AAHPERD)
  • 2006-Present, National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE)
  • 2006-2010, American Association for Physical Activity and Recreation (AAPAR)

2006-2008, Massachusetts Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (MAHPERD)

COURSEWORK HIGHLIGHTS

**Physical Education Pedagogy**
  • HK 539: Pedagogical Studies in Physical Education
  • HK 537: Analysis of Teaching and Coaching in Physical Education
  • HK 590: Research in Sport Pedagogy
  • HK 590: Physical Activity and Public Health
  • HK 634: Seminar in Physical Education Curriculum Theory
  • HK 580: Philosophy of Sport and the Body
  • HK 690: Reform in Physical Education
  • HK 690: Pedagogical Research in Physical Education

**Sociology and Education**
  • HK 600: Readings: Research on Teachers
  • EDCI 580: Foundations of Curriculum
  • SOC 570: Sociology of Education
  • SOC 600: Development of Sociological Theory
  • SOC 602: Contemporary Sociological Theories
  • EDPS 576: Methods for Teaching Students with Severe Disabilities

**Educational Research**
  • STAT 501: Experimental Statistics I
  • STAT 502: Experimental Statistics II
  • SOC 680: Advanced Social Research Methods in Sociology
  • HK 590: Qualitative Research in Sport Pedagogy
  • EDCI 615: Qualitative Research Methods in Education
  • EDCI 616: Advanced Qualitative Research Methods in Education
  • HK 600: Metasynthesis of Qualitative Research
  • COM 590/682: ANOVA and Regression
  • EDPS 638: Factor Analytic Procedures
  • SOC 686: Qualitative Methods in Sociology (Audit)
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