Teacher Victimization and Subjective Wellbeing: Modulating Role of Teacher-Home Communication
Chun Chen, M.Ed. & Chunyan Yang Ph.D.
University of California, Santa Barbara, Department of Counseling, Psychology, and School Psychology

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 (McManus et al., 2014)
➢ Teacher victimization has been found to be associated to lower level of psychosocial and physical wellbeing (McManus et al., 2014) and higher burnout (Driklis & Kartal, 2012)
➢ No study has examined how family-school engagement moderates the outcomes of teacher victimization

Results

Main Effects and Moderation Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>School Connectedness (Lower)</th>
<th>School Connectedness (Higher)</th>
<th>Teacher Victimization (Lower)</th>
<th>Teacher Victimization (Higher)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Communication</td>
<td>-0.23 (0.25)</td>
<td>0.22 (0.25)</td>
<td>-0.12 (0.25)</td>
<td>0.12 (0.25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effects of Teacher Communication as Moderator

- **Overall**: Teacher’s overall connectedness level is higher when teacher-home communication is more positive. Teacher-home communication acted as a protective and even a strong moderator for teacher’s school connectedness.
- **When teacher-home communication is positive**: No significant association b/w teacher victimization and school connectedness.
- **When teacher-home communication is negative**: Significant association b/w teacher victimization and school connectedness.

Discussion and Practical Implications

Conclusions:
➢ 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:
➢ It is important for school-based prevention program targeting violence to promote teacher subjective well-being and promote teacher-home communication to protect teacher well-being.
➢ Protective role of positive home-school communication could buffer the negative influence of teacher victimization on teacher’s subjective well-being.
➢ 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 family partners (e.g., inviting parents to join joint consultation), communicating effectively and listening attentively to the parents.

Analytic Procedure

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

Analyses were conducted in SPSS.

Methods

Sample
1,711 teachers recruited from 58 schools across eight provinces in mainland China
- 94.5% from Public Schools; 5% from Private Schools
- From 7th grade to 12th grade
- Average Year of Teaching: 14.23 (9.92)

Outcome Measures:
➢ Teacher Subjective Wellbeing Questionnaire (Renshaw et al., 2015)
➢ School Connectedness (4 items): e.g., “Teachers listen to the concerns of parents.”

Predictive Variables
Teacher Victimization Scale (TVS): Yang, Fredrick, Nickerson, Jenkins & Xie, 2018
➢ 7 subscales: Physical; Relational; Verbal; Cyber; Sexual Harassment; and Personal Property Offenses

Moderating Variable
Teacher-Home Communication (subscales from Delaware School Climate Scale – Home version; Furr et al., 2016)
➢ 4 items: e.g., “Teachers listen to the concerns of parents.”

Control Variables
Teacher and school demographic backgrounds
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