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Introduction

Teacher Victimization is defined as the teachers’ perceived threat of violent and aggressive behaviors from students (Espelage et al., 2013). The prevalence rates of teacher victimization are reported high across the world, with about 80% of teachers in a study in the U.S. reporting at least one teacher victimization from students with the current or past year (McMahon et al., 2014).

Teacher victimization has been found to be associated to lower level of psychosocial and physical wellbeing (McManhon et al., 2014) and higher burnout (Erickle & Kartal, 2012).

No study has examined how family-school engagement moderates the outcomes of teacher victimization.

Very limited studies have been conducted to explore the potential protective factors for teacher victimization in China.

To address this need, the current study aims to examine:

1. The association between Chinese teacher victimization and subjective wellbeing
2. Whether teacher-home communication moderates the association between Chinese teacher victimization and their wellbeing.

Teacher Victimization Scale (TVS; Yang, Fredrick, Nickerson, Jenkins, & Espelage, 2006–2007)

Teacher Subjective Wellbeing Questionnaire (TVQ; Chun Chen, M.Ed. & Chunyan Yang Ph.D., 2015)
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Main Effects and Moderation Effects

Results

Effects of Teacher-Home Communication as Moderator

Analytic Procedure

Linear regression Models were estimated to examine (1) the association between teacher-directed bullying victimization, and (2) the moderating effect of teacher-home communication on the association between teacher victimization and subjective wellbeing.

Analyses were conducted in SPSS.

Conclusion:

Schools with a more positive teacher-home communication (e.g., respecting relationship, frequent communication and collaboration) reported better subjective wellbeing (i.e., teaching efficacy and school connectedness) than schools with a less positive teacher-home communication.

Within schools having effective teacher-home communication, teacher’s subjective wellbeing was not likely to be influenced by teacher victimization. This might suggest that although teachers experienced aggression from students, having communication with parents solely could help protect their wellbeing. This indicates that to foster a positive workplace environment for teachers, parental involvement is important.

In schools that have ineffective teacher-home communication, teacher’s subjective wellbeing significantly was related to teacher victimization. This further indicates the important protective factor teacher-home communication plays.

Implications:

1. It is important for school-based prevention program targeting violence to promote teacher subject well-being and promote teacher-home communication to protect teacher well-being.
2. Protective role of positive home-school communication could buffer the negative influence of teacher victimization on teacher’s subjective well-being.
3. Future prevention and intervention programs on teacher victimization should not only be designed around fostering teacher-student relationship and workplace environment, but also invite parents into the program, including working closely with parents on students problems (e.g., inviting parents to joint consultation), communicating effectively and listening attentively to the parents.
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