Abstract

The Impact of Teachers’ Perceived Behavioral Integrity of their Supervisor on Teacher Job Satisfaction in Modern Orthodox Jewish Day Schools

This study focuses on teacher job satisfaction in Modern Orthodox Jewish day schools and how it is impacted by a teacher’s perception of their supervisor’s word-deed alignment, also called “perceived behavioral integrity,” the extent to which a supervisor’s behavior matches the values and vision he or she articulates. The literature suggests that there is a strong relationship between perceived behavioral integrity, trust, and job satisfaction. Based on surveys of 230 full-time teachers in Modern Orthodox Jewish day schools, this study considered the degree to which perceived behavioral integrity predicts teacher job satisfaction, taking the role of trust into account. It also investigates predictors of perceived behavioral integrity, with a focus on supervisory guidance (the degree of supervision provided to the teacher), frequency of mission communication to the teacher (the degree of communication about the mission to the teacher), and length of a teacher’s tenure in their current position. This study calls to the attention of day school leaders – both lay and professional – perceived behavioral integrity, given the significant implications for Modern Orthodox Jewish day schools, including retention of teachers, teacher performance, and teacher attitudes.
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Behavioral integrity is the degree to which one demonstrates word-deed alignment. It is the extent to which there is congruence between the values espoused by a person and the values enacted by that person. As Simons (1999, 2002) found, behavioral integrity is critical to the success of organizations. As such, understanding both espoused values and enacted values of organizations is critical to understanding organizational success and the factors contributing to this success. Mission statements are, perhaps, the most common form of an organization’s espoused values and are therefore critical to understand and will help lay the foundation for this study.

Today, if you go to any company’s website, you can find a link to its mission statement. It is widely accepted, and even taken for granted, as a requirement for any well-thought-out organization. There have been many studies conducted about the need for a mission statement and its impact on

“Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?”

“That depends a good deal on where you want to get to,” said the Cat.

“I don’t much care where,” said Alice.

“Then it doesn’t much matter which way you go,” said the Cat.

- Lewis Carroll’s Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Behavioral integrity is the degree to which one demonstrates word-deed alignment. It is the extent to which there is congruence between the values espoused by a person and the values enacted by that person. As Simons (1999, 2002) found, behavioral integrity is critical to the success of organizations. As such, understanding both espoused values and enacted values of organizations is critical to understanding organizational success and the factors contributing to this success. Mission statements are, perhaps, the most common form of an organization’s espoused values and are therefore critical to understand and will help lay the foundation for this study.

Today, if you go to any company’s website, you can find a link to its mission statement. It is widely accepted, and even taken for granted, as a requirement for any well-thought-out organization. There have been many studies conducted about the need for a mission statement and its impact on
organizational success. However, the results of the studies are conflicting. Some early studies conclude that mission statements positively impact performance (Campbell, 1992; Campbell & Yeung, 1991; Pearce III & David, 1987), while other studies found that the impact was inconclusive, if not insignificant (Bart, 1996).

Nonetheless, continued research identifies that the primary benefit of mission statements is internal to the organization. That is, mission statements are an important tool for mission implementation, as they enable organizations and their employees to focus their efforts and make decisions that enable mission achievement (Bart, 1996; Bart & Baetz, 1998; Williams, 2008). It is primarily in that way that mission statements impact performance.

Common sense seems to support the research. It is logical to claim that the presence of a mission enables an organization to make strategic decisions that will allow them to be successful. Not having a mission likely means an organization has no direction and may not make decisions in a strategic way. With direction and focus, organizations can make decisions that bring them closer to actualizing their mission.

Additionally, research indicates that how mission is communicated is critical as well (Bart, 1997; Bart, 2001; Bart & Tabone, 2000; Fairhurst, Jordan, & Neuwirth, 1997; Wonnacott, 2004). The existence of a mission statement on the company website does little to ensure mission communication. Any organization can put its mission statement on its brochures, but do they articulate it to prospective employees during the hiring process? Are employees reminded of the organization’s values?
Even if mission and organizational values exist and are communicated internally, there is no guarantee that organizations will succeed. Espousing values is part of the equation. The other part is enacting those values. Do the leaders operate in a manner that is aligned to the organization’s mission and that is consistent and predictable based on its organizational values? Do they “walk the talk?”

Perceived behavioral integrity, a term popularized by Simons (1999), refers to “the perceived degree of congruence between the values expressed by words and those expressed through action.” It is the extent to which a person perceives another person’s word-deed alignment. His research indicates that a lack of congruence, a lack of word-deed alignment, leads to employees not trusting managers, and managers therefore becoming ineffective at influencing their subordinates. Simons (2002) later argued that a lack of perceived behavioral integrity can lead to lower employee performance, attendance, and retention.

This underscores the importance of whether the employees perceive that espoused values are being enacted by their supervisors. Do the employees perceive an alignment between the values their supervisor espouses and how their supervisor acts?

The answers are significant and meaningful as they relate to job satisfaction and performance. Further research concluded that perceived behavioral integrity is positively related to job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and retention, and is negatively related to poor health, stress, and absenteeism (Davis & Rothstein, 2006; Prottas, 2008). It seems clear that perceived
behavioral integrity is critical to the success of organizations, because of its impact on employees.

This research will consider the impact perceived behavioral integrity has on employees as it pertains to Jewish day schools. More specifically, this study will research the relationships between perceived behavioral integrity, mission communication, job satisfaction, length of current tenure, trust of supervisor, and supervisory guidance. It will also look at the extent perceived behavioral integrity predicts job satisfaction in Jewish day schools when the possible effects of stress outside of the workplace are controlled for. Within that, we will ask what impact trust (of one’s immediate supervisor) has on this relationship? Does it mediate or moderate this relationship? Lastly, this study will research how mission communication predicts perceived behavioral integrity.
Chapter 2 – Literature Review

The present study seeks to understand how teachers’ perception of their supervisor’s behavioral integrity – alignment between the supervisor’s words and deeds – relates to teacher job satisfaction. Espoused values, shared through a school’s mission statement and other mechanisms, are one way in which values are communicated. At times organizations intend to send messages about their values and principles, and at other times messages are sent unintentionally. Regardless, those messages impact people’s perception of the organization and for what it stands, and the people impacted are both internal and external to the organization.

Definition of espoused values

According to Schuh and Miller (2006), on the most basic level, “Espoused values are found in organizational documents such as annual reports, strategic plans, or mission statements” (p. 721). While espoused values appear in documents other than mission statements, numerous sources express the communicative value of mission statements (Bart, 1996; Bolon, 2005; Ireland & Hitt, 1992; Toftoy & Chatterjee, 2004). From a historical perspective, David and David (2008) note that

Typically, these statements are now public declarations which suggest that Drucker’s (1973) original recommendation that a mission should be a simple statement of purpose has either been
supplemented or replaced with the mission as a marketing or public relations tool directed at stakeholders. Thus, the mission statement has become an important part of managing the organization-stakeholder relationship – it communicates the firm’s identity to stakeholders. (p. 207)

Bartkus, Glassman, and McAfee (2000) state simply, “We view a mission statement solely as a communication tool” (p. 28). Elaborating on this, Brown and Yoshika (2003) claim, “More than a statement or a symbol, the mission is a tool that provides a clear, compelling statement of purpose that the organization disseminates both internally and externally” (p. 5).

Similarly, Swales and Rogers (1995) explain that mission statements stress “values, positive behaviors, and guiding principles within the framework of the corporation’s announced belief system and ideology” (p. 227, emphasis in the original). Additionally, Schein (1992) comments that mission statements are artifacts that indicate an organization’s “espoused values, norms, and rules that provide the day-to-day operating principles by which the members of the group guide their behavior” (p. 27). Lastly, Campbell and Yeung (1991) explain that while one purpose the mission statement is to serve as a strategic management instrument, its other prime function is as a communication instrument.

Beyond mission statements, when discussing organizational identity, Albert and Whetten (1985) remark that information about organizations often disseminated via official documents such as annual reports and press releases, public identity is also often conveyed through
signs and symbols. An identity distinctive framework highlights questions surrounding that choice and modification of these symbols, such as logos and sales slogans, product packaging, and the location and appearance of the corporate headquarters. (p. 95)

Similarly, Peters and Waterman, Jr. (1982) claim that values are more frequently espoused and disseminated in softer ways, such as through metaphors and stories.

It is not enough to simply focus on what organizations say. People’s perceptions of an organization are not only shaped by the messages the organization intends to send. Gioia, Schultz, and Corley (2000) cite Fombrun and Shanley (1990) who say, “Regardless of the initial purpose of the projected images, however, outsiders develop their own images (transient impressions) of the organization from their idiosyncratic interpretations and from other available information obtained from media sources and other agents” (p. 70). As such, it is important to recognize that espoused values are not only what an organization intends to transmit as their values, but what others actually receive. This is true of interactions with customers, competitors, employees, regulatory institutions, and media, for example (Gioia et al., 2000).

In summary, Wonnacott (2004) says,

Schein (1992) maintains that culture can be analyzed on three levels. These levels are: artifacts that visibly show the organization’s structure, the espoused values shown in statements of goals and philosophy, and the underlying set of assumptions shared by the members of the group. These underlying
assumptions are the ultimate source of value and action in the group. They create an ideology that, form the group views of human nature, of interpersonal relationships and of society itself. This ideology of the culture serves as a prescription for action and reflects aspirations as well as the current reality. In this way, the ideology functions as a guide to the members of the organization. (p. 20)

It isn’t just the mission statement which conveys organizational values to others internally and externally, but mission statements can play a larger role, and they are likely the method of values espousal discussed most.

**History of Mission Statements**

As Peters and Waterman (1982) note, it has been almost 40 years since the concept of mission statements began being used extensively. In 1994, Bain and Company, a consultancy, asked 500 firms to rate which management tools they utilized out of a list of 25 possible tools. They found that mission statements were the most utilized management tool on the list (Bart & Baetz, 1998).

From there, it was not long before mission statements found their way into the non-profit sector as a strategic tool. In 1994, the Association of American Colleges found that approximately 80% of all universities and colleges were creating or revising their own mission statements (Morphew & Hartley, 2006). Similarly, in his research on the mission statements of hospitals, Bolon (2005) stated, "For years, it has been identified as the first step in the strategic
planning process, superseding and providing a foundation for the development of strategies, plans, and programs” (p. 2).

Part of the spreading of the use of mission statements from the for-profit sector to the non-profit sector stemmed from the Government Performance Results Act of 1993. As described on the White House website, included in the strategic plans demanded of federal agencies and departments is, "a comprehensive mission statement covering the major functions and operations of the agency” (1993). Later, some states mandated this for non-profit hospitals, community colleges, and public universities as well. As Dezmidt and Prinzie (2009) conclude, in addition to the for-profit sector, mission statements are practically universal in the non-profit sector, including health care providers, public agencies, youth services, recreation organizations, and libraries.

**Importance of Espoused Values**

Independent of their prominent role within behavioral integrity which will be discussed later, espoused values are critical to an organization’s success. They provide significant forms of communication both internally and externally to the point where espoused values can even impact productivity and profitability (Stevens, 1999). As Parry and Bryman (2006) argue, “Effective top managers could build a strongly unified culture by articulating a set of ‘corporate’ values, perhaps in a vision or mission statement…. This would supposedly set up a domino effect: higher commitment, greater productivity, more profits” (p. 727).

**External importance.** Based on the definitions of mission statements referenced above, it is apparent that espousing values via mission statement
has a clear purpose externally. Palmer and Short (2008) emphasize that mission statements, “shape perceptions of key external constituents” (p. 456). They “capture aspects of how organizations see themselves as well as how they want others to view them” (p. 454). Similarly, Ireland and Hitt (1992) state that mission statements help organizations focus on what is important to them, and communicate that to itself and its stakeholders.

This extends beyond mission statements to other forms of espousing values. Hatch and Schultz (1997) argue that “Statements of top managers simultaneously affect organizational identity and image” (p. 356). As mentioned earlier, Fairhurst et al. (1997) caution that “In the absence of frequent communication of mission, vision, and values, an organization’s identity cannot take hold. In the absence of a strong organizational identity, the countervailing forces of the environment are more likely to prevail” (p. 245). Lastly, Whetten (2006) writes, “…organizations are best known by their deepest commitments – what they repeatedly commit to be, through time and across circumstances” (p. 224).

Espousing values provides organizations with the opportunity to enhance how they are perceived externally (Schuh & Miller, 2006). While people may have certain perceptions of an organization, communication externally affords organizations the opportunity to reinforce some of those perceptions or change others. Kabanoff and Daly (2002) cite Sutton and Callahan (1987) and Siehl and Martin (1990) when they state that espoused values are “used to enhance organisations’ reputations or images, that is, their external legitimacy” (p. 98).
One clear additional benefit to effectively communicating and espousing organizational values externally is attracting resources and garnering support. On a personnel level, what an organization articulates can help attract people to the company who share those values and can push those who are not aligned away (Collins & Porras, 1996; Williams, 2008). Brown and Yoshioka (2003) found that the prospect of participating in something one believes in attracts employees, and that mission attachment was positively associated with satisfaction and intention to stay with the organization. Denton (2001) states, “A clear ideology... attracts people and repels those whose personal values are incompatible” (p. 313). With the right people on board, organizations can more successfully maintain their behavioral integrity.

Furthermore, Moore (1995) notes that if a manager’s expressed values resonates with a particular community, there is a strong likelihood that the community will support the manager. This is true for organizations on the whole, as well. Similarly, Weiss and Piderit (1999) note that “Explicit communication can help to attract resources and overcome opposition from other organizations” (p. 197).

**Internal importance.** While organizational communication is often done very publicly, the importance of the values being espoused is most significant internally. As Morsing (2006) elaborates, even when corporate communications are directed at an external audience (as are many mission statements), an important part of the communication is received internally. That is, the mission statement is a form of self-talk “through which the organization recognizes and confirms its own image, values and assumptions” (p. 177). When discussing
mission statements in higher education, Conway et al. (1994) claim that, “What matters is the meaning a mission statement has for the people inside the institution” (p. 30).

Organizational productivity can be impacted by espoused values in several ways. Articulating organizational values can motivate employees (Conway, Mackay, & Yorke, 1994) and can provide a shared value system. As Morphew and Hartley (2006) state, “A shared sense of purpose has the capacity to inspire and motivate those within an institution and to communicate its characteristics, values, and history to key external constituents” (p. 457). Or as Brown and Yoshioka (2003) sum up, “At least three basic principles influence employee attitudes toward the mission: awareness, agreement, and alignment” (p. 8).

In research specific to mission statements, one medium for espousing values, researchers note motivating and inspiring employees as one of their most critical roles. Bart (1997, 1998), Brown and Yoshioka (2003), Ireland and Hitt (1992), Pearce and David (1987), and others point out that unifying, motivating, and inspiring employee effort towards accomplishing the mission is a prime reason for creating a mission statement. Similarly, Toftoy and Chatterjee (2004) state, “Upon completion, the mission statement... rallies everyone towards one purpose under one common company banner” (p. 43). Lastly, Palmer and Short (2008) note that a well-crafted mission “provide(s) a source of inspiration to internal stakeholders” (p. 456).

Beyond providing a unifying source of motivation and inspiration, espoused values offer guidance and clear instruction to employees. For some, the importance here lies in the guidance espoused values provide organizations

To others, though, espoused values provide a constant source of instruction and guidance to organizations and employees (David & David, 2008; Davies & Glaister, 1997; Desmidt & Prinzie, 2009; Ireland & Hitt, 1992; O’Gorman & Doran, 1999; Palmer & Short, 2008; Pearce III & David, 1987; Wonnacott, 2004). In fact, mission statements are generally regarded as the first step in the strategic planning process (Cochran, David, & Gibson, 2008). Drucker (1992) states that a mission statement “focuses the organization on action” (p. 162). Bart (1997) points out that in by promoting shared values and behavioral standards, “A mission statement acts as a declaration of philosophy whose purpose is to influence both thought and deed” (p. 11). Drohan (1999) says that a main reason corporations create mission statements is “to guide current, critical, strategic decision making” (p. 97). Additionally, Toftoy and Chatterjee (2004) claim that a business “without a mission is like a traveler without a destination” (p. 43). Simply put, clearly articulating an organization’s mission enables employees and others associated with the organization to distinguish between activities that will help meet the organization’s goals and those that will not.

Similarly, in research trying to link mission statements to firm performance of large Canadian companies, Bart and Baetz (1998) claim that mission statements help sharpen a firm’s focus and enable the firm to allocate resources in a more strategic manner, and further guide the actions of both the
firm and individuals. The study conducted by Davies and Glaister (1997) with regard to 96 UK business schools and their mission statements recognize that mission statements help ensure that there is consistent corporate direction throughout the entire organization. Other significant internal benefits of mission statements include providing a basis for assessing individual and organization performance (Edem, Spencer, & Fyfield, 2003), and allowing potential employees to align their own values with the organization’s values (Collins & Porras, 1996; Peters & Waterman, Jr., 1982).

Mission statements in particular, and espoused values in general, can serve many important purposes in an organization. As Mullane (2002) states, “Creating and using a mission statement can foster a shared value system, a focus on common objectives, teamwork, behavioral guidelines, and emotional commitment to the company” (p. 449). Williams (2008) gives a pragmatic summary of the numerous benefits of espoused values. She says,

As Cross (1991) points out, “Persuasion, the ability to win over an audience and inspire action is, after all, the underlying goal of most corporate correspondence, whether it’s trying to create an image, keep goodwill, or collect an overdue bill” (p. 3). Mission statements are decidedly persuasive: If corporate communicators cannot persuade their constituencies to read their mission statements and respond to them appropriately—whether that means faithfully working for the corporation, buying its stock or products, or believing it is a contributing member of a community or society—
then the efforts of those communicators have been wasted. (p. 100)

**Mixed Findings on Mission Statement Impact on Performance**

The widespread use of mission statements stems from the belief that utilizing them as a management tool is effective and leads to better performance by the organization (Dezmidt & Prinzie, 2008). Bart and Tabone (1998) claim that “The conclusion of most commentaries on mission statements is that they are an essential factor contributing to an organization’s enduring success” (p. 54). However, the findings on the impact mission statements have on firm performance is mixed.

The earliest research on mission statements and firm performance was performed by Pearce III and David (1987). They did a content analysis of the mission statements of the top performing firms in the Fortune 500 and compared it to the mission statements of low performing firms. They found that higher performing firms had more comprehensive mission statements and often included certain components, such as corporate philosophy and self-concept.

Other research in the field similarly studied the content of mission statements, and by the mid-1990’s researchers were suggesting what mission statements should look like based on the link between content and performance (Bart, 1996). Additionally, the research focused primarily on the business world, before turning to the hospital industry, and finally segments of higher education (Saley, 2006).

Other researchers studied the mere existence of a mission statement. As Bart (1996) describes,
Klemm, Sanderson, and Luffman (1991) found no significant differences in the performance of firms in terms of employee turnover or profits when comparing firms that had mission statements with those that did not. In contrast, Campbell (1989, 1993), and Campbell and Yeung (1991) reported that the behavior standards specified in the mission statement of British Airways had ‘dramatically changed the performance of the airline’” (p. 212). Bart (1997) further concluded that many firms find success without possessing mission statements. Additional research called into question the value of mission statements. In a study of 136 large organizations in Canada, Bart and Baetz (1998) found that there was no significant difference in performance between those firms with mission statements and those without. Earlier, Klemm et al. (1991) came to the same conclusion in their research.

**Importance of Mission Communication**

If mission statements are most important internally, how and when the mission is communicated should play a central role in its effectiveness. Yet several studies highlight challenges to mission communication. A common problem with mission statements and their impact that is noted by the literature is the content. Often, the mission statements are too broad, ambiguous, or abstract, leaving too much interpretation up to the employees supposedly implementing the mission (Collins & Porras, 1996; Desmidt & Prinzie, 2008; Edem et al., 2003; Ingram, 2006). This leads to organizational decision-making that lacks focus and unified direction, and exemplifies how mission statements,
if not utilized properly, can hamper organizational success (Desmidt & Prinzie, 2009; Stewart, 1999).

An additional challenge noted is that the mission statements seem to be a formality more than a management tool. It is sometimes created by boards or others who have no role in the implementation of the mission, and then ignored – never being revisited, revised, or updated (Glasrud, 2001). It isn’t referred to during decision-making (Toftoy & Chatterjee, 2004), isn’t used to recruit aligned employees, and isn’t communicated internally to shape shared vision (Fairhurst et al., 1997). This only reinforces the belief that the mission statement is nothing more than a formal requirement for every organization.

Further studies demonstrate that while possessing a mission statement is universally adopted, mission communication is not as universally adopted. Ingram (2006) cites research done by Extensity in Europe that found that only 56% of business leaders believe all of their employees are aware of their mission statement, 41% don’t monitor whether they’re being fulfilled, and 20% of businesses have ditched them. In their research on what leads to employees actively managing the meaning of company mission statements, Fairhurst et al. (1997) found that it is usually only a crisis or change effort that forces employees to reflect on who they are as an organization. Additionally, they found that even when companies embark on campaigns revolving around their mission, vision, and values, most levels of management receive no training on how to communicate them in their everyday conversations.

Stewart (1999) came to similar conclusions when he studied the effectiveness of mission statements in five Catholic elementary schools in
Illinois. He interviewed pastors, principals, teachers, and parents, and found that while they had almost all read the mission statement at some point, they had not revisited it since. The findings also showed that most people were unclear as to what the process of mission creation was and who was included. In Wonnacott’s study (2004) on the congruence between one school’s espoused values in its mission statement and its educational practices, several teachers admitted that they had never read it before being interviewed for the study.

Fairhurst et al. (1997) claim that “in the absence of frequent communication of mission, vision, and values, an organization’s identity cannot take hold. In the absence of a strong organizational identity, the countervailing forces of the environment are more likely to prevail” (p. 245). When employees are involved in managing the communication of the mission and values of an organization, the employees become committed to the organization and the values it stands for (David & David, 2003).

According to research, the frequency of communication of the mission statement is most impactful. Bart (1997) states, “The ‘joy of mission statements,’ however, rests on frequent communication” (p. 11). Saley (2006) references other studies by Bart (2000) which found a positive relationship between the total number of methods used to communicate mission and firm performance.

Beyond frequency, the method of communication has been found to be impactful in terms of the organization’s performance effectiveness. In a study determining linkages between the innovativeness, company mission, employee commitment, and organizational learning practices of 339 firms, Bart (2004)
found that the most effective forms of communication were personal explanations, posters and plaques, and employee manuals. Annual reports were found to be a common method of mission communication, but were also found to be ineffective. Bart concluded that the existence of mission statements without procedures for employees to learn and internalize the mission may very well be ineffective.

The benefits of espoused values are clear. However, they are only valuable to the extent that they align with enacted values. As Williams (2002) puts it, the impact of organizational values “lies not in and of the values themselves, but in the coordinated actions and behaviors they are known to encourage and foster” (p. 221). Similarly, Brown and Yoshioka (2003) claim, “At least three principles influence employee attitude toward the mission: awareness, agreement, and alignment” (p. 8). Collins and Porras (1996) add, “Building a visionary company requires 1% vision and 99% alignment” (p. 76). Enacted values, it seems, are what justify and give meaning to espoused values. Without values being enacted, the espoused values are meaningless.

**Enacted Values**

As previously mentioned, enacted values are those that guide what people actually do, not just those values they claim guide them (Bolman & Deal, 2003). As Schuh and Miller (2006) say, “Organizational values are either enacted or espoused. Enacted values involve a theory-in-use that explains behavior, which neither the institution nor the individuals may explicitly understand” (p. 721). These values actually shape every decision made by employees on every level of the organization (Peters and Waterman, 1982).
After all, as Yaghi (2008) states, “Making decisions is not a mechanical matter; rather, it is a human activity in which people’s values are involved” (p. 24).

Beyond this definition of enacted values as what people and organizations put into practice, there are other implications of this concept. When recounting the development of organizational management, Stevens (1999) describes, when codes did not turn out to be the problem-solving panacea, companies began to realize more was needed to create an ethical organization. They realized that a culture in which ethical values were embedded in the organization, enacted by employees, and perhaps summarized by a code, was needed for a quality company. (p. 113)

Further, Denton (2001) claims, “True identity concerns how you are really operating. It is not about mission statements, executive directives, or grandstanding on what you would like the group to focus on, but rather how the group is truly acting reacting, and deciding” (p. 313). As such, people use enacted values to gain a sense of what an organization is really about. This perception is perhaps more important than any objective measure of values.

Yet, the true importance of enacted values is only in relation to espoused values and the perceived congruence between the two. Simply having a mission statement or committing to articulating values is not enough. It must be accompanied by behaviors that support those values (Edem et al., 2003). As Peters and Waterman, Jr. (1982) explain, “An effective leader must be the master of two ends of the spectrum: ideas at the highest level of abstraction and actions at the most mundane level of detail” (p. 287). Similarly, it is the
effective institution that successfully marries its values to its actions, and acts with behavioral integrity, or word-deed alignment.

**Behavioral Integrity**

**Definition of behavioral integrity.** Psychologists and philosophers have developed many ways to articulate what we go through internally when making decisions on how to behave. One such explanation is, as Argyris and Schon (1974, 1996) explained, that there are two types of personal theories that guide a person’s behavior. The first are *espoused theories*. They are what people say to “try to describe, explain, or predict their behavior” (Bolman, Deal 2003, p. 163). The second are *theories-in-use*. These are what actually guide what people do. They are implicit rules that steer people to act as they do (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

The degree of alignment between the two types of theories is what Simons (1999, 2002) calls “behavioral integrity.” He states that behavioral integrity is “the perceived degree of congruence between the values expressed by words and those expressed through action. It is the perceived level of match or mismatch between the espoused and the enacted” (Simons, 1999, p. 2).

This description is not only applicable on an individual level, but on an organizational level as well. Organizations’ behaviors are expected to match their words. Simons (1999) explains that for organizations, behavioral integrity is

the extent to which a perceiver believes that the organization and/or the managers in it represent themselves and their motivating values accurately in their communications with
employees. BI involves the extent to which a manager ‘walks her talk’, and, conversely, the extent to which she ‘talks her walk.’ (p. 2)

Similarly, Davis and Rothstein (2006) state that

Behavioral integrity concerns the fit between what the manager says and what the manager does, and includes the perception of managerial behavior that is supportive of the organization’s mission and value statements as well as employees’ perception that the manager acts in accordance with how someone who holds the position of manager ‘ought’ to act. (p. 408)

**Importance of behavioral integrity.** As mentioned earlier, there is great value in an organization being aligned with its values and consistently acting with behavioral integrity. Much has been written about the need for organizations to be aligned – with their missions and with their values. In fact, numerous studies have examined the impact behavioral integrity, or a lack thereof, has on organizations and how successful they are. In their study of non-profit health care providers, Bart and Tabone (1998) found that strong performance was often correlated with those providers who sought to ensure alignment between their mission statements and their organizational processes. They were not the only ones making this case.

Denison (1990) argued that when organizations consistently translate core values into human resource policies and practices, they will achieve greater effectiveness. Others extend this claim to the broader organization. Bart (1997) found that strong performance was most often associated with
organizations who sought to align their organization’s processes with their mission statement. He noted that, “The more a company aligns structure with strategy, the greater is its success in achieving that strategy” (p. 16). Collins and Porras (1994) reported that companies that show lasting success are those which stick passionately to a set of values and create systems that compel employees to act in accord with those values.

Schuh and Miller (2006) studied the values of what they called “dominant institutions” and identified four characteristics of these values which reflect this idea. Included in these characteristics is extensiveness throughout the system. An organization whose values don’t permeate the organization is not a “dominant institution.” Collins and Porras (1996) echo this sentiment, saying, “The authenticity, the discipline, and the consistency with which the ideology is lived - not the content of the ideology - differentiate visionary companies from the rest of the pack” (p. 77).

There are external impacts of behavioral integrity as well. Schuh and Miller (2006) state, “Espoused values congruent with the surrounding culture enhance organizational reputation and strengthen external legitimacy. Values violation results in loss of credibility and relationship disengagement by those who deal with the organization” (p. 721). When studying government institutions, they found that alignment of espoused and enacted values greatly impacted the public’s perception of the appropriateness and success of a given implementation. Yet there are other significant implications of the existence or lack of behavioral integrity within organizations.
**Impact on employees.** Researchers have studied the impact of behavioral integrity on an organization’s employees more than its impact on any other aspect of an organization. In his study of 200 business managers and their perceived behavioral integrity, Raelin (1994) found that, “Inconsistency derived from ideals that are not carried out, though not as serious as contrary behavior, can lead to cynicism in the work environment regarding the true motives of the manager” (p. 46). In another study referenced by Prottas (2008), Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) found that employee performance and attitude were related to whether they felt that the reward allocation and decision making processes were fair (i.e. when rules and procedures used aligned with those espoused).

There are other attitudinal consequences of a perceived lack of behavior integrity within an organization. In addition to the finding that if employees are aligned with the organization’s mission they will be intrinsically motivated (L. Williams, 2008), Prottas (2008) concluded that when organizations are consistent in their actions and behave in a manner aligned with their espoused values, employees feel less stress and possess higher levels of organizational commitment.

Prottas (2008) also found that a higher degree of perceived behavioral integrity was related to higher levels of job satisfaction, and other studies corroborate this (Brown & Yoshioka, 2003). Further, job satisfaction has been shown to be a critical factor in employees’ behaviors. Studies have demonstrated the impact of job satisfaction on job performance, motivation,
stress, absenteeism, health, and organizational citizenship behavior (Davis & Rothstein, 2006).

**Trust.** Perhaps the most important impact behavioral integrity has on employee attitude is with regard to trust. Many have studied what alignment means to building trust and the consequences of a lack of trust in an organization and/or its manager. As early as 1967, McGregor observed that inconsistencies between words and deeds decreased trust (Simons, 1999). This has been reinforced by numerous studies, including Fairhurst et al. (1997) who researched how employees make meaning out of their organizations’ mission statements.

In a study by Kouzes and Posner (1993), they propose that managers earn and strengthen their credibility when they simply do what they say they will do. And McCune (1998) suggests that “Even small disparities between words and actions create distrust” (p. 14). Rousseau and McLean Parks (1993) proposed that “Contract violation erodes trust, [and] undermines the employment relationship yielding lower employee contributions (e.g. performance and attendance) and lower employee investments (e.g. retention, promotion)” (p. 36). Simons (2002) states that the consequences of such contract violation “should apply to the broader phenomenon of behavioral integrity” (p. 24).

In their meta-analysis, Davis and Rothstein (2006) sum up the research by concluding that the better the alignment between words and actions, the greater credibility a manager has and the more an employee will trust the manager. And Simons (1999, 2002) points out the benefits that higher levels of
trust have demonstrated in prior research. According to Kouzes and Posner (1993), credibility is a prerequisite for developing employee loyalty and commitment. Further, they claim that employees must have deep trust in their leader if they are to willingly change their attitudes, values, assumptions, and commitments to bring them more closely in line with organizational values.

Additionally, Simons (1999) states that "A consequence of managers' low credibility is that the managers' words lose effectiveness as an instrument of change. Leaders' exhortations of a new mission or a new focus are processed by employees as simply a new dogma or corporate presentation, and are not translated into action" (p. 5). Robinson (1996) found that a breach in alignment between words and actions reduced trust which in turn reduced employee performance, intent to remain with the organization, and civic virtue behavior. McCune (1998) summed it nicely, saying, "Trust may not be the fuel of capitalism, but it is the lubricant. It allows all of the parts to work together smoothly. Distrustful workers are less committed and effective than those who trust" (p. 11). The way to maximize that trust is through high levels of behavioral integrity.

**Employee Behaviors.** Beyond attitudes, the behaviors of employees have been found to be influenced by behavioral integrity. Employee performance can be significantly impacted. Raelin (1994) concluded his study of business managers and their behavioral integrity by saying that "Consistency of belief and action can go a long way to spur effective accomplishment by any team or organization" (p. 50). This is supported by the study conducted by Johnson and O'Leary-Kelly (2003) where they found a significant negative
correlation between psychological contract breach, which occurs when employees perceive that an organization is not living up to the principles and values it claims to ascribe to, and in-role performance. Similarly, O’Rielly, Caldwell, Chatman, Lapiz, and Self (2010) studied the effectiveness of a new strategic initiative in the world of medicine as it relates to consistency in leadership support for the initiative. They found that performance gains required leaders on multiple levels to effectively communicate the new initiative and ensure its implementation. If the actions of the leaders did not show commitment to their employees through their actions, the new strategy’s success was at risk. In this study, organizational support as described led to the improvement of patient satisfaction.

Behavioral integrity has also been found to have an impact on employees’ rates of absenteeism, their intent to leave an organization, and on the ethical intentions of team leaders (Prottas, 2008; White & Lean, 2006). Dineen, Lewicki, and Tomlinson (2006) studied the impact behavioral integrity had on the relationship between supervisory guidance – defined as providing instruction to employees – and organizational citizenship behaviors. They found that this relationship is in fact dependent on the level of perceived behavioral integrity of the managers. When there were higher levels of perceived behavioral integrity, employees minimized deviant behaviors and maximized citizenship behaviors when provided with supervisory guidance. Deviant behaviors increased when behavioral integrity was low.

Little has been researched regarding alignment and behavioral integrity specifically within schools. What has been researched is consistent with the
literature on organizations in general. Their success is impacted by the degree of institutional alignment and behavioral integrity. By analyzing documents, observations, and stakeholder interviews, Stewart (1999) studied the effectiveness of mission statements in five Catholic elementary schools in Illinois. He found that a lack of congruence between a school’s mission and its organizational culture could limit the effectiveness of the educational institution. Further, he discovered that if a school adopts a mission statement that does not align with teacher practices, “student achievement may be negatively affected” (p. 11).

Like organizations, perhaps the greatest impact a perceived lack of behavioral integrity could have on a school is on the faculty. As referenced earlier, the research conducted on organizations shows that employees could be impacted in numerous ways, including performance, commitment, retention, and health. These impacts on schools, and on Jewish day schools in particular, could be significant.

Some of the existing research also identifies potential causes of a lack of behavioral integrity. At times, the language used within the organization does not match the reality, and that leads to an erosion of behavioral integrity (Simons, 1999). Other times, the managers and employees don’t share organizational values, leading them to act in ways that are incongruent with their organizations’ values (Smidts, Pruyn, & van Riel, 2001; Wonnacott, 2004; Yaghi, 2008).

Desmidt and Prinzie (2008) found that
organizational members seldom reflect on the information provided by the mission statement, explain the mission statement to other organizational members, make linkages to extend programs or practices, communicate about the mission statement with any enthusiasm or adapt the mission statement to their personal work situation. (p. 5)

They further concluded (2009) that without having the information of what an organization values, people will draw their own incorrect conclusions. A lack of shared meaning and understanding of the organization’s values will most likely lead to a lack of alignment.

Overall, organizations will get more out of their employees when the organizations and its leaders display behavioral integrity (Schuh & Miller, 2006). As Bart and Baetz (1998) concluded, the more aligned an organization’s structure, systems, and procedures were to its mission, the greater the impact on performance in general and on employee behavior in particular. Not only is this organizational alignment necessary, but the leaders and organizations must enact the values they espouse in order to maximize employee attitudes, behaviors, and overall performance.

It is important to note that this study focuses on the impact of perceived behavioral integrity on employees. As such, the research cited is weighted heavily towards the business world. When looking at schools, studies remind us that the impact the variables have on student learning is critical. If teachers are impacted, one would expect that to trickle down to students and impact their learning. In their study of twelve elementary schools in Chicago, Bryk and
Schneider (2002) conclude that school communities with high levels of trust were more likely to show significant improvements in student learning and achievement. Research by Daly and Chrispeels (2008) concluded similarly. While an exhaustive literature review on the impact of behavioral integrity and trust on student learning, and the use of student learning as a variable, are beyond the scope of this study, readers of this study should be mindful of the impact this study’s variables could have on students and their learning.
Chapter 3 – Research Questions and Hypotheses

The research clearly highlights the importance of perceived behavioral integrity. The findings primarily come from the for-profit sector and non-profit sectors other than education. This study will focus on the field of education, and specifically Jewish education. Similar findings in Jewish day schools would promote perceived behavioral integrity as an important area of focus for school leaders.

As such, this study focuses on the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between employees’ perceived behavioral integrity (PBI), frequency of mission communication, job satisfaction, length of current tenure, trust of supervisor, and supervisory guidance?

   Based on previous research it is expected that higher levels of PBI would be associated with frequency of mission communication, greater job satisfaction, higher levels of trust in supervisors, and more supervisory guidance. It is further expected that the longer the relationship between the employee and the school, the lower the levels of PBI.

2. If the possible effects of stress outside of the workplace are controlled for, to what extent does PBI predict job satisfaction in Jewish day
schools? To what extent does trust of one’s immediate supervisor mediate the relationship between PBI and job satisfaction.

*It is expected that PBI will predict job satisfaction and that levels of employee trust in their supervisors will mediate that relationship.*

3. How do length of current tenure, frequency of mission communication, and supervisory guidance uniquely predict PBI?

*It is hypothesized that frequency of communication of mission, supervisory guidance, and length of current tenure will independently contribute to PBI, with frequency of mission communication and supervisory guidance positively contributing and length of current tenure negatively contributing.*
Chapter 4 – Methods

Participants

Criteria for inclusion in study. The non-random sample consisted of full-time, Judaic and general studies, teachers at Modern Orthodox day schools. For this study, the definition of Modern Orthodox day schools included both Modern Orthodox schools and Centrist Orthodox schools, as defined by Schick (2014) in his Census of Jewish Day Schools in the United States. See Appendix A for the full definitions. For the purposes of this study, the distinctions between the two were not significant.

There are several theoretical reasons for the choice of this sample for the present study. This study focuses on full-time teachers, as opposed to part-time teachers, since mission communication potentially plays a critical role. Judging behavioral integrity requires a substantial understanding of the values being espoused and being enacted. Part-time teachers run the risk of missing opportunities to receive those messages. Additionally, in order to ensure ample time for teachers to be exposed to espoused and enacted values, only teachers who have been teaching in their current school for at least the past year were included. The study included teachers of both Judaic and general studies, including classroom teachers and specialists. This study primarily focused on the perspectives of teachers as they relate to word-deed alignment of supervisors and job satisfaction. Therefore, the sampling for this study was
agnostic to the study, looking broadly at teachers, regardless of whether they taught Judaic studies or general studies.

For this study to be generalizable to the Modern and Centrist Orthodox Jewish communities, this study targeted teachers in Modern and Centrist Orthodox schools, regardless of division (i.e. pre-schools, lower schools, middle schools, and high schools). While different schools may espouse different values, the focus here is on the perceived alignment of espoused and enacted values and its impact on job satisfaction, regardless of the actual values.

**Characteristics of the sample.** For this study, it was important that the sample be representative of teachers in Modern and Centrist Orthodox Jewish day schools. The total sample included 230 full-time teachers, 73% of whom were female, and 92% of the sample identified as being Jewish. As shown in Figure 1, 18% of participants were between the ages of 20-30, 27% were between the ages of 31-40, and over half of the sample were over the age of 40 (55%).

Approximately one third of the teachers (34%) have been teaching 10 years or less, another third (33%) have been teaching between 11-20 years, and the final third of teachers (33%) have been teaching for over 20 years (see Figure 2.) With regard to their current position, 38% of teachers indicated they had been there for no more than five years, 24% had been in their current positions for 6-10 years, and 38% had been teaching in their current positions for over 10 years, as shown in Figure 3.
When asked what subject they taught, 34% reported teaching only Judaic studies, 46% reported teaching only general studies, and 20% reported teaching both (see Figure 4.)  When asked to describe the school, teachers reported on the level they taught and the size of the student body. As shown in Figure 5, few teachers taught at the pre-school level (7%), larger numbers taught at the lower school (24%) and middle school (18%) levels, and over half (51%) taught at the high school level.
Small schools (with 200 or fewer students) represented only 15% of the sample, 50% of teachers taught at mid-sized schools (with between 201-500 students), and 35% of the teachers taught at large schools (over 500 students). The size categories are further broken down in Figure 6.

Figure 6
Size of School by Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-200</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-500</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 500</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedures

Recruitment of participants. Each participant was a full-time teacher in a Modern Orthodox Jewish day school. The research conducted by Davis and Rothstein (2006) on perceived behavioral integrity and employee attitudes found a significant and much stronger relationship when employees responded about their direct supervisors than when they responded about top management. Since there are a greater number of interactions (both word and deed), it is the perception of the word-deed alignment of an employee’s direct supervisory that has the greatest impact on employee behavior. As such, this study asked teachers to respond to the survey only about their direct supervisor.

In recruiting participants, a link to the survey was posted to online forums for teachers of Modern Orthodox day schools (grades Pre-K – 12) in North
America. The forums included the Lookstein Center for Jewish Education’s LookJed Online Discussion Group, the JedLab Facebook group, and YUEducate – Yeshiva University’s School Partnership online forum. Participants were provided online consent (Appendix B) prior to continuing to the rest of the online survey.

Each teacher completed the survey consisting of demographic questions, a Behavioral Integrity scale, a Trust scale, a Supervisory Guidance scale, a Mission Communication scale, a Job Satisfaction scale, and a Stress Outside the Workplace scale. All information was anonymous and was collected online through Survey Monkey. No known risks beyond everyday life are associated with this project. The results of the study were shared with participants, when requested.

This study followed a nonexperimental design, as the researcher did not manipulate the independent variables, except to control for external factors (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). Further, the sample was a non-random one, as volunteer participants were not randomly assigned to conditions. Rather, all participants received the same assessment measures.

**Measures**

The following provides a detailed description of each variable, how it is operationally defined for the purposes of this study, and the method of measuring each variable, and the Cronbach alpha statistic.

**Demographic information.** Teachers were asked a number of demographic questions. These variables included sex, age (grouped in categories of 20-30, 31-40, and over 40), full-time or part-time status, length of employment as a teacher anywhere (grouped in categories of 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-20 years, and over 20 years), length of employment as a teacher in
their current school (grouped in categories of less than a year, 1-5 years, 6-10 years, and over 10 years), subjects taught (Judaic, general, or both), if the respondent is Jewish, the level of the school (pre-school, lower school, middle school, or high school), location of the school in North America (by city), and the number of students in the school (grouped in categories of 0-100, 101-150, 151-200, 201-400, 401-500, 501-750, 751-1000, and over 1000). See Appendix C for the full questionnaire.

**Perceived behavioral integrity.** Perceived behavioral integrity was measured using the Behavioral Integrity Scale developed by Simons and Parks (2002). The scale and its 8 statements were developed with the help of 46 focus groups conducted at hotels across the United States. Two sample items are “My manager practices what he/she preaches,” and “My manager shows the same priorities that he/she describes,” as shown in Appendix D. The statements are answered based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly agree*). The items reflect the core of behavioral integrity – the link between espoused and enacted values, and promise keeping. Evidence for internal consistency reliability for the Behavioral Integrity Scale is reported as $\alpha=.95$ (Simons & Parks, 2002), and in the current study it is .97.

**Trust of supervisor.** Trust of supervisor was measured using the Trust Scale created by Simons and Parks (2002). The scale includes 3 items which are answered on a 5-point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly agree*). The 3 statements are, “I would be willing to let my manager have complete control over my future in this company,” “I would not mind putting my well-being in my manager’s hands,” and “I would feel good
about letting my manager makes decisions that seriously affect my life.”
Evidence for internal consistency reliability for the Trust Scale is reported as $\alpha=.86$ (Simons & Parks, 2002). Simons (2008, personal correspondence) confirmed that there have been no extensive validity studies on this instrument, being that it is a relatively new instrument (personal correspondence as cited in Childers, 2009). In the current study, $\alpha=.93$. (See Appendix E.)

**Supervisory guidance.** In their study on the effects of supervisory guidance (defined as providing instruction to employees) on employee organizational citizenship behavior in banks, Dineen et al. (2006) developed a scale asking employees to agree or disagree with four statements about the training provided to them by their supervisors. As shown in Appendix F, statements included items such as, “My supervisor initiates training and offers advice about what is appropriate to do in our department,” and, “My supervisor coaches me on how to do ‘the right thing’ on the job.” Answers ranged from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly agree*). Evidence for internal consistency reliability for the Supervisory Guidance Scale in their two samples is reported as $\alpha=.88$ and .87, respectively (Dineen et al., 2006). In the current study, $\alpha=.91$.

**Frequency of mission communication.** As discussed above, Bart (2004) identified the three most effective forms of mission communication: personal explanations, posters and plaques, and employee manuals. To measure the frequency of use of these methods for mission communication, teachers were asked to indicate the frequency with which each method was used for this purpose. They answered on a 5-point Likert scale, from 0 (*not at all*) to 4 (*very frequently*). Scores were added for each item to create a score that
reflected total amount of exposure to mission communication in these forms. (See Appendix G.)

**Job satisfaction.** In his study on the relationship between perceived behavioral integrity and employee attitudes, Prottas (2007) utilized the scale used by the Family & Work Institute in their National Study of the Changing Workforce in 2002. This study used the sub-scale measuring job satisfaction, which was measured by three items, all using Likert scales. As shown in Appendix H, the items are: “All in all, how satisfied are you with your job?”

, scored on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (Not satisfied at all) to 4 (Very satisfied); “Taking everything into consideration, how likely is it that you will make a genuine effort to find a new job with another employer”, scored on a 3-point scale including “Very likely” (1), “Somewhat likely” (2), and “Not at all likely” (3); and “Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide?”

, scored on a 3-point scale including “Definitely not take same job” (1), “Have second thoughts” (2), and “Take same job again without hesitation” (3). Items were standardized, averaged, and scored so that the greater satisfaction was represented by higher values. Prottas (2007) reported internal consistency reliability for the scale they used to measure job satisfaction as $\alpha=.71$ and in the current study it is .79.

**Stress outside the workplace.** This study controlled for stress outside of the workplace because of its potential impact on job satisfaction (Prottas, 2008). To do so, teachers completed the Holmes-Rahe Social Readjustment Rating Scale (Holmes & Rahe, 1967). The scale was developed to measure
individual levels of stress. All participants were given a list of 43 “stressors,” which ranged from more positive stressors such as getting married, to more negative stressors, such as death of a spouse. Each participant was asked to consider his or her life over the past year and check those “stressors” on the scale that he or she has experienced. Using the rating developed by Holmes and Rahe, each stressor endorsed was assigned a number between 0-100 reflecting its assumed impact on the participant’s stress levels. Total scores were computed by adding up the “stress points” of the participant. Therefore higher scores reflected greater levels of stress. Lastly, due to the fact that this study focuses on Jewish day schools, the item asking about a “major change in Church activities” has been broadened to ask about a “major change in religious activities” (Appendix I). The Cronbach alpha in the current study is .72.
Chapter 5 – Results

Analytic Plan

All data was screened for outliers, unusual scores, data entry errors, singularity, multicollinearity, and univariate normality. In order to identify any unusual scores, descriptive statistics were calculated for each item that was administered and were screened to identify any out of range scores. Multicollinearity was examined by looking at the intercorrelations between the variables to ensure none of the variables were too highly correlated (e.g. >.9). Data was also screened for singularity to ensure each variable was created independently, from separate items, and therefore that correlations were not artificially inflated. We screened for normality by creating histograms for each variable and visually analyzing them. We then reviewed the skew and kurtosis statistics for each variable. Skewness and kurtosis statistics that were greater than +/-1 but less than +/-2 were considered mildly skewed or kurtotic. Those in excess of +/-2 were considered strongly skewed or kurtotic (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Finally we screened the data for outliers using Tabachnick and Fidell’s criteria for identifying outliers. Scores in excess of 3.27 standard deviations away from the mean on any variable were considered potential outliers. Cronbach alphas were then calculated for each multi-item variable as a measure of reliability.
In order to test for Hypothesis 1 the correlation coefficients between perceived behavioral integrity and trust, supervisory guidance, frequency of mission communication, job satisfaction, and length of current tenure were computed.

The role that trust in one’s supervisor may play in the relationship between perceived behavioral integrity and job satisfaction (Hypothesis 2) was explored to determine if trust acts as a mediating variable (see Figure 7.) To test mediational hypotheses, Baron and Kenny (1986) recommend that one test three regression equations: first regressing the criterion (i.e., job satisfaction) on the predictor (i.e., perceived behavioral integrity); second, regressing the mediator (i.e., trust in one’s supervisor) on the predictor; and third, regressing the criterion on both the predictor and the mediator. The effects of stress outside the workplace were controlled for in the previous analyses to ensure they were not accounting for any of the associations. In order to meet the criteria for mediation, the predictor must significantly predict the criterion and the mediator, and the relation between the predictor and the criterion must be substantially reduced when controlling for the effects of the mediator. Furthermore, the mediator needs to significantly predict the criterion even after controlling for the effect of the predictor.
In order to identify which factors independently predict perceived behavioral integrity (Hypothesis 3), a multiple regression with length of current tenure, frequency of mission communication, and supervisory guidance as the predictors and perceived behavioral integrity as the criterion was conducted. (See Figure 8.)

**Power Analysis**

A power analysis was conducted based on the design and methodology of this study in order to determine the appropriate sample size. Cohen (1988, p. 56) suggests that, "when the investigator has no other basis for setting the
desired power value, the value .80 be used.” Given five predictors (independent variables), that I posit will account for a small to medium proportion variance in the criterion \(R^2=.08\), using a significance criterion of \(p< .05\), and a power of .80, then a sample size of 166 people will be required to have adequate power. For small to medium bivariate correlations \((r=.2)\) a sample of 190 would be required. The current sample size includes over 200 individuals.

**Screening the Data and Descriptive Statistics**

Prior to testing hypotheses, all data were screened for outliers, unusual scores, data entry errors, singularity, and multicollinearity. Each variable was then screened for normality, and there was little evidence that any of the variables were substantially skewed or kurtotic. Several univariate outliers were identified so all analysis were conducted with and without the outliers. Given that the results were similar for the analysis with and without the outliers, and due to the fact that some univariate outliers are expected in any large data set (Tabachnick & Fidel, 2013), all analyses are presented with the outliers included. Cronbach alpha was obtained as a measure of internal consistency for all the variables studied. Next, descriptive statistics and intercorrelations between the variables were obtained, as shown in Table 1. One notable pattern within the correlation matrix that emerged is that there were moderate to strong intercorrelations between trust, guidance, mission, and satisfaction.

Prior to conducting any analyses, age and sex effects were explored. There were no significant differences between males and females on any of the variables studied. There were significant age effects on teachers’ levels of trust, \(F(2,245) = 4.61, p<.05\). Follow up tests revealed that teachers in the 20-30 age
bracket reported significantly higher degrees of trust of their supervisor than teachers above the age of 30. There were also significant age effects on teachers’ levels of job satisfaction, $F(2,242) = 6.29, p<.01$. Follow up tests revealed that teachers over the age of 40 reported significantly greater job satisfaction than teachers in the 21-40 age bracket. As would be assumed, there were significant age effects on the length of time teachers were in their current positions, $F(2,245) = 37.04, p<.001$. Follow up tests revealed that each of the three age brackets differed significantly in length of time in their current positions, with younger teachers reporting shorter lengths of time and older teachers reporting longer lengths of time. Therefore, given that Hypothesis 2 has stress as a predictor and satisfaction as a criterion, the analyses were run controlling for age to ensure that the association is not due solely to the shared age effects.
### Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics and Correlations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perceived Behavioral Integrity</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Trust in Supervisor</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervisory Guidance</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Frequency of Mission Communication</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Length of Current Tenure</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stress Outside the Workplace</td>
<td>105.68</td>
<td>90.47</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.24***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 focused on the correlates of perceived behavioral integrity. Perceived behavioral integrity was significantly and strongly correlated with trust of one’s supervisor ($r = .59, p < .001$), supervisory guidance ($r = .53, p < .001$), and job satisfaction ($r = .54, p < .001$). PBI is weakly to moderately correlated to frequency of mission communication ($r = .20, p < .01$), but only marginally, negatively correlated with tenure at current school ($r = -.12, p = .08$). When teachers’ perceptions of their supervisors’ behavioral integrity were higher, they were more likely to trust their supervisor, see them as providing supervisory guidance, and reported higher levels of job satisfaction. They also reported greater frequency of mission communication from their school.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 was that perceived behavioral integrity (PBI) will predict job satisfaction when controlling for stress outside the workplace, and that this association will be mediated by levels of trust in one’s supervisor. PBI significantly predicted job satisfaction ($\beta = .54, p < .001$) and trust in one’s supervisor ($\beta = .59, p < .001$) when controlling for stress outside the workplace. When examining both PBI and trust in one’s supervisor simultaneously, the effects of trust of one’s supervisor on job satisfaction ($\beta = .27, p < .001$) were not more pronounced than the effects of PBI ($\beta = .39, p < .001$). Thus it did not meet the criteria for mediation. Rather, it appeared that both PBI and trust of one’s supervisor were independent predictors of job satisfaction. When age was entered as a control variable, it did not change the pattern of results and therefore was not included in the analysis. Both PBI and trust in one’s
supervisor seem to predict job satisfaction independently. Rather than trust being the reason why PBI leads to job satisfaction, PBI and trust in one’s supervisor seem to have an additive effect on job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 3**

In support of Hypothesis 3, length of time in current tenure, frequency of mission communication, and supervisory guidance significantly predicted perceived behavioral integrity, $F(3, 225) = 30.58, p < .001, R^2 = .29$. When examining the independent contribution of each predictor, the only significant contributor was supervisory guidance, $\beta = .54, p < .001$. However, both length of current tenure ($\beta = -.05, p = .34$) and frequency of mission communication ($\beta = -.03, p = .62$) did not significantly predict perceived behavioral integrity above and beyond the effect of supervisory guidance. Teachers who reported high levels of supervisory guidance also tended to report high levels of behavioral integrity within their supervisors.

**Secondary Analysis**

In order to determine if demographic characteristics of the sample influenced the relationship in Hypothesis 2 between the two predictors (perceived behavioral integrity and trust in one’s supervisor) and the criterion (job satisfaction), a series of hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted. These hierarchical multiple regressions examined the interaction of the predictors with three demographic characteristics in predicting job satisfaction, while controlling for our control variable, stress outside the workplace. The interactions were analyzed for perceived behavioral integrity (X a demographic characteristic) predicting job satisfaction while controlling for trust and stress.
outside the workplace, and for trust predicting job satisfaction (X a demographic characteristic) while controlling for perceived behavioral integrity and stress outside the workplace.

The demographic characteristics studied were sex, age, and subjects taught (i.e., Judaic studies or general studies). For each characteristic, there was reason to believe that the characteristic could impact how trust and perceived behavioral integrity relate to job satisfaction. They are potentially meaningful moderators. In their meta-analysis, Davis and Rothstein (2006) hypothesized that since studies showed that women are generally more idealistic and more sensitive to ethical issues, gender may be a moderator in the relationship between perceived behavioral integrity and employee attitudes such as job satisfaction. They found that the correlations for men and women were different, though the difference was not significant. After noting their own small sampling of studies, this study sought to explore this potential difference in gender sensitivity towards trusting their supervisors or towards word-deed alignment.

Additionally, age could potentially be a factor. In their research on well-being, Blanchflower and Oswald (2008) demonstrated that there is a U-curve when respondents in 80 countries were asked how satisfied they were with life in general. Once people reached adulthood, life satisfaction declined until it hit a low in their 40s or early 50s. Life satisfaction then increased from that point until the very last years, often reaching levels higher than as a young adult. This study sought to clarify if age would impact how PBI and trust relate to job satisfaction. Would there be a decline as teachers aged?
Lastly, would there be a difference between those who teach exclusively Judaic studies and those who teach exclusively general studies? Does the content of their classes impact their sensitivity to perceived behavioral integrity and trust due to the fact that they are teaching in Jewish day schools? To my knowledge, no research has investigated this. Yet one could anticipate that what matters to a Judaic studies teacher might differ from what matters to a general studies teacher, and that could have impacted how teachers responded to questions about PBI.

A similar analysis was conducted for Hypothesis 3. A series of hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted to examine the interaction of the predictors (tenure in current school, frequency of mission communication, and supervisory guidance) with the same demographic characteristics in predicting perceived behavioral integrity, while controlling for our control variable, stress outside the workplace. These interactions were then analyzed.

Within Hypothesis 3, too, the demographic characteristics are potentially meaningful moderators. When studying perceived behavioral integrity and its relationship to length of tenure, frequency of mission communication, and supervisory guidance, perceptions could be different based on demographic characteristics. Salomon (2010) interviewed 129 Judaic studies teachers who were either pre-service or early in their careers. She found that the main reason for entering into Jewish education was the desire to influence Jewish children religiously. As such, perhaps people teaching Judaic studies are more sensitive to word-deed alignment in Jewish day schools, and therefore subject
taught could moderate this relationship between frequency of mission communication and perceived behavioral integrity.

While not seen in any other study, the predictive nature of the frequency mission communication might be stronger for those who teach Judaic studies. Additionally, maybe age interacts with perceptions of mission communication or guidance in predicting the behavioral integrity of their supervisor. Once again, although there is a dearth of literature in this area, it is possible that older teachers, rely less on the messages communicated by their mentors in evaluating their integrity.

Lastly, could it be that women and men respond to supervisory guidance in different ways that might impact perceived behavioral integrity? Studies have shown that females are more communal in nature and are generally guided by their needs to connect to others, but males tend to be more self-focused and tend to be guided by internal states (Cross & Madson, 1997). Therefore, females may rely more heavily on receiving support and guidance from their supervisor in order to form positive evaluations of them. Like in the secondary analysis for Hypothesis 2, this study investigated the potential impact these demographics had on the stated relationships.

To perform these hierarchical regressions, the main effect of the predictor, moderator, and any control variables were entered. Step two involved entering the centered product term of the predictor and the moderator. Given five possible predictors and three possible moderators, this resulted in 15 different hierarchical multiple regressions.
Table 2 represents the results of all 15 interactions. Almost every relationship was not significantly impacted by the demographic characteristics. There was only one instance where a demographic characteristic moderated the association between a predictor and the criterion. The only relationship moderated was the impact age has on the relationship between perceived behavioral integrity and job satisfaction. We examined this association for the three age groups separately. For each age category, the relationship was still significant and positive, but to different degrees. The strongest association between perceived behavioral integrity and job satisfaction was found in teachers in the 31-40 age group (β=.56) indicating that perceptions of PBI were strongest for those teachers. The association between perceived behavioral integrity and job satisfaction was still significant in the other two age categories, but not quite as high, with teachers in the 20-30 age bracket having the next strongest association (β=.46) and teachers in the over 40 age bracket the least strong (β=.29). All associations were still significant, but to varying degrees.
Table 2

*Impact of Demographic Characteristics on Relationship between Predictors and Criteria*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. PBI x Sex</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Stress, Trust</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PBI x Age</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Stress, Trust</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>4.56*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PBI x Subject Taught</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Stress, Trust</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Trust x Sex</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Stress, PBI</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Trust x Age</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Stress, PBI</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Trust x Subject Taught</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Stress, PBI</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tenure x Sex</td>
<td>PBI</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tenure x Age</td>
<td>PBI</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tenure x Subject Taught</td>
<td>PBI</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mission Communication x Sex</td>
<td>PBI</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mission Comm. x Age</td>
<td>PBI</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Mission Communication x</td>
<td>PBI</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Supervisory Guidance x Sex</td>
<td>PBI</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Supervisory Guidance x Age</td>
<td>PBI</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Supervisory Guidance x Subject Taught</td>
<td>PBI</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Stress = Stress Outside the Workplace; Trust = Trust in One’s Supervisor; PBI = Perceived Behavioral Integrity.
Chapter 6 – Discussion

Hypothesis 1

The results of this study demonstrate the importance of perceived behavioral integrity in Jewish day schools. The relationships between PBI and other important variables are significant, and the ramifications are considerable. Most of the correlations in Hypothesis 1 were confirmed. As was found in the research conducted by Simons (2002), David and Rothstein (2006), and Prottas (2008), this study found that PBI was related to trust of one’s supervisor, supervisory guidance, job satisfaction, and frequency of mission communication.

These variables seem to work in conjunction with each other and support each other. The results clearly show that considering these variables is critical for day school leaders. Together they create a learning environment where teachers will thrive, and therefore one which gives students the best chance to succeed. Certainly, that alone should be enough to encourage day school leaders to focus on, and emphasize, word-deed alignment.

Hypothesis 2

When looking deeper into the nature of these relationships, the study confirmed the predictive nature of PBI, as anticipated in Hypothesis 2. Previous research on PBI had been conducted in businesses in general (Raelin, 1994; Davis & Rothstein, 2006; Prottas, 2008), banks (Dineen, Lewicki, & Tomlinson, 2006), and hotels (Simons, 1999; Childers, 2009). This study discovered that
the same is true within Jewish day schools. PBI was found to predict job satisfaction in Jewish day schools. Further, PBI was found to predict trust in one’s supervisor.

The study also concluded that trust in one’s supervisor did not mediate the relationship between PBI and job satisfaction. The importance of PBI is not because it leads to trust which leads to job satisfaction. It is not sequential. Rather, PBI leads to job satisfaction while trust in one’s supervisor simultaneously leads to job satisfaction.

Because of the serious implications of job satisfaction in general confirmed in previous research (Davis & Rothstein, 2006), the importance of PBI and trust in Modern Orthodox Jewish day schools is clear. If we want to retain our best teachers, if we want teachers to maximize their performance, experience less stress and sickness, be absent less, and demonstrate organizational citizenship behaviors, day school leaders must pay attention to the factors and give thought to how they are promoting both within their schools. Ultimately, a lack of trust, or a perception of word-deed misalignment of supervisors will likely have a negative impact on the education provided to their students (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Daly & Chrispeels, 2008).

While the data did not support the hypothesis that the relationship between PBI and job satisfaction is mediated by trust of one’s supervisor, it is logical that both PBI and trust lead to job satisfaction. Both contain similar attributes, such as clarity, transparency, honesty, and consistency. And yet both are defined in the literature somewhat differently. The Trust and Behavioral Integrity scales used by Simons and Parks (2002) and utilized in this
study highlight the difference. Trust is the degree to which an employee would put their fate in the hands of their supervisor. Perceived behavioral integrity is the degree to which word-deed alignment is perceived.

These results are certainly important for day school leaders. Whether the teachers trust their supervisors or perceive word-deed alignment of their supervisors should not be an afterthought. At times, day school leaders may believe that teachers’ perceptions don’t matter. Perhaps this belief is fostered by a sense that the teachers “don’t get” administrative decisions, or that teachers are simply the equivalent to factory workers on an assembly line. This study verifies that teacher perception does matter. It may not even matter if the teachers agree or disagree with specific decisions. What is critical is if teachers trust their supervisors, and if they perceive their leaders to be walking the talk. Leaders must be conscious of this when espousing values, when making decisions, and when acting upon those decisions.

**Hypothesis 2 – Secondary Analysis**

The broad findings are important, but strong conclusions could only be drawn after secondary analysis confirmed the generalizability of the findings, and that demographic characteristics did not moderate the relationship between the predictors and the criterion. The secondary analysis performed in this study concluded that the demographic characteristics did not significantly influence the relationships in almost every situation. No matter the age, gender, or the subject taught, the predictive nature of PBI and trust in one’s supervisor remained strong in relation to job satisfaction. As such, when Modern Orthodox Jewish day school professionals and lay leaders take action to ensure alignment
and trust, it should be done across the board, with no greater emphasis on one group of teachers or another. Each group of people will likely report higher levels of job satisfaction when they perceive the word-deed alignment of their supervisors and when they trust their supervisors. That should ultimately lead to better performance, better organizational citizenship, and better retention of our teachers in our day schools.

The only time demographic characteristics impacted the relationship between a predictor and the criterion was the impact of age on the relationship between PBI and job satisfaction. Each age category was still found to have a significant relationship between PBI and job satisfaction. However, the strength of this relationship differed slightly. The relationship was strongest for teachers between ages 31 and 40. The next strongest relationship was for those between the ages of 20 and 30, and the least strong relationship was those in the over 40 category. Perhaps, teachers in the early years of their careers are primarily focused on their classrooms. Teachers have to create curricula, develop classroom management techniques, and figure out how to master the art of teaching. That is their main focus, not the word-deed alignment of their supervisors.

Teachers in the 31-40 age category are no longer solely focused on their classroom. There is a more sophisticated understanding of the school as an organization, and how it operates on a larger level. At that point, teachers become somewhat more attuned to espoused and enacted values and to the behavioral integrity of their supervisors. They know what is important to them educationally, and they have the experience to know what the school and its
leaders claim to be important to them. This is where sensitivity to word-deed alignment is at its strongest.

Once teachers reach the third age category, over 40, the strength in the relationship between PBI and job satisfaction is still significant, but to a lesser degree than it is for younger teachers. At this point in a teacher’s career, job satisfaction is not as dependent on PBI. This could be a result of learned cynicism, meaning that teachers may have experienced their share of leaders and supervisors who lack behavioral integrity, and may be more inclined to shrug it off and not base their job satisfaction on it. Alternatively, job satisfaction for teachers who have been teaching for a significant number of years may be less dependent on PBI. Perhaps they feel that while on a school-wide level, alignment and word-deed alignment is critical, they can still find meaning, purpose, and enjoyment in their classrooms with their students. There still is a significant relationship between PBI and job satisfaction, but maybe this is why it is somewhat tempered for teachers over 40 years of age.

**Hypothesis 3**

The small differences age plays in the relationship between PBI and job satisfaction aside, it is still clear that PBI and trust are independent predictors of job satisfaction. As such, PBI and trust deserve the attention of Modern Orthodox Jewish day school leaders. Since PBI is so critical to Modern Orthodox Jewish day schools, understanding what leads to PBI is equally deserving of attention. As expected the results confirmed Hypothesis 3, that supervisory guidance predicted and contributed to PBI. Although the study conducted by Dineen, Lewicki, and Tomlinson (2006) noted that the impact supervisory
guidance has on teacher behaviors is modified by PBI – meaning that if PBI is high, supervisory guidance leads to more positive organizational citizenship behaviors, but if PBI is low, it leads to more negative behaviors – this study shows that there was a direct relationship between levels of supervisory guidance and PBI. In Jewish day schools, when there was more supervisory guidance, teachers generally perceived more word-deed alignment, and vice versa. This relationship could be due to the fact that the more meaningful interactions and exchanges between a teacher and his or her supervisor, the more likely there is clarity on what values are being espoused by the supervisor. The frequent opportunities for this type of communication leave little to be assumed by the teacher. Additionally, it is possible that the greater the supervisory guidance, the more positive the relationship between the teacher and the supervisor. That could lead to the teacher giving the benefit of the doubt to the supervisor in situations where the espoused and enacted values seem to conflict. Thus, Jewish day school leaders should ensure that enough emphasis is being placed on supervisory guidance, and that supervisors receive the training to properly provide this guidance to their teachers.

Contrary to what was hypothesized in this study, the data showed no support for either frequency of mission communication or length of tenure at that school in uniquely predicting PBI, above and beyond the effects of supervisory guidance. Regarding mission communication, concluding that mission communication is of little significance is not substantiated. Firstly, there was a significant positive bivariate correlation between mission communication and PBI, however, the association with PBI was even stronger for guidance.
That suggests that there is an effect of mission communication on PBI but this effect is outshined by teacher’s perceptions of supervisory guidance. Secondly, this study measured frequency of mission communication based on Bart (2004) which identified personal explanations, posters and plaques, and employee manuals as the most effective methods of mission communication. However, mission is communicated in many ways, including less formal methods and more subtle methods than handbooks and posters. Staff meetings, unscheduled conversations between teachers and supervisors, and even decisions that are made (e.g. program choices, curricular decisions, etc.) are forms of mission communication that might be more prevalent and consequential in Jewish day schools – especially given the relatively small size of Jewish day schools. Further research focusing on these additional forms of mission communication could benefit Jewish education and enlighten Jewish day school leaders on the significance of mission communication in maintaining word-deed alignment.

This study asked about the length of time respondents have been in their current positions, and hypothesized that the longer a teacher remained at a particular school the less they would report word-deed alignment of their supervisor. The data did not support this hypothesis. Even in the bivariate correlation, there was no association between length and PBI. Future studies may want to refine this measurement to reflect the relationship with the supervisor, not the school, before concluding it is insignificant. With the emphasis of this study on the PBI of a teacher’s supervisor, the impact tenure potentially has on PBI might be impacted by the length of time a teacher has
worked with a particular supervisor. Additional research can investigate this relationship further.

In looking at the relationship between these predictors and perceived behavioral integrity, perhaps we can better understand the difference between supervisory guidance on the one hand, and length of tenure and frequency of mission communication on the other. Supervisory guidance may significantly predict PBI because of the active interactions with supervisors, and the profundity of these exchanges. Length of tenure and even the methods of mission communication studied are passive and more indirect. Values are not acquired through osmosis. As school leaders consider how their messages are being conveyed, the degree to which the messages are being actively communicated should be a point of emphasis.

**Hypothesis 3 – Secondary Analysis**

In order to better understand the generalizability of the findings related to Hypothesis 3, a secondary analysis was performed. The results demonstrated that demographic characteristics did not moderate the relationships between the predictors (supervisory guidance, frequency of mission communication, and length of tenure) and the criterion (perceived behavioral integrity). The conclusions showed uniformity across all categories of teachers. As such, the finding that supervisory guidance predicted PBI is applicable to all teachers studied, regardless of age, gender, or subjects taught. Similarly, the lack of support in the data for the predictive nature of length of tenure and frequency of mission communication in relation to PBI was consistent for all demographics.
Comments made earlier about refining future studies to better understand these two relationships remain applicable broadly.

**Recommendations**

This study has significant ramifications for Modern Orthodox Jewish day schools. The outcomes highlighted in this study are desired by schools – teachers with higher levels of job satisfaction perform better, are less stressed, are absent less, and exhibit organizational citizenship behaviors. Maybe most important of all, teachers with high levels of job satisfaction have higher retention rates. That translates into keeping our strongest teachers. For Jewish day schools, this can be critical. Having to compete with the benefits provided by public schools and the prestige offered by certain private schools often results in Jewish day schools having fewer strong candidates for teaching positions. Further, high retention rates lead to fewer resources being used for recruiting, training, and mentoring new teachers. If the resources spent on teacher recruitment and development can be minimized, those resources can be allocated elsewhere, like towards scholarships, technologies, and educational programs. For these reasons, figuring out practical steps to take in order to ensure high levels of job satisfaction is therefore extremely important.

There are concrete steps day school leaders can take to ensure high levels of PBI among the faculty. It is apparent from this study that supervisory guidance is an essential component in establishing perceived behavioral integrity. The opportunities for clarifying values that it provides, and the strong relationships it engenders can be important to PBI. This likely requires additional training and support for school leaders and supervisors to ensure
proper supervisory guidance and enhanced mentorship are employed. Further, ensuring time in school for supervisory guidance is critical. Without the time set aside for conversations, observations, and reflections, supervisory guidance will be passed over for more urgent needs such as planning tomorrow’s lesson and returning emails. Time is at a premium in schools, but the potential dividends are enormous.

Leaders should also consciously and proactively espouse their values and the values of the school and not rely on passive and subtle messages to communicate school values. Examples include direct conversations about the values of the school when interviewing prospective teachers, and discussions with current teachers articulating how specific decisions and policies reflect school values. Teachers should also be encouraged to seek clarification in situations where decisions made by school leadership seem to go against espoused values. Opportunities for these conversations, in a way that makes it safe to ask such questions, will prevent teachers from drawing their own conclusions about leaders’ behavioral integrity. To further ensure that the messaging is coming across as intended by day school leaders, they can periodically procure feedback through surveys given to teachers. The surveys can elicit feedback on espoused values and on PBI. Leaders can then identify if they need to invest more time into ensuring word-deed alignment.

Beyond PBI, this study found that trust predicted job satisfaction as well. While similar, trust is not focused on word-deed alignment, but on the degree to which a person would put their future in the hands of their supervisor (Simons and Parks, 2002). Trust is saying that one would actually allow what happens to
them to be decided by another. Those strong feelings are hard for a leader to earn, but once earned, lead to great outcomes.

There are steps day school leaders and supervisors can take to cultivate this trust. David DeSteno (2014), a professor of Psychology at Northeastern University proscribes several steps managers can take to accomplish this. Leaders and supervisors should make personal connections with their teachers. The connections do not have to be about school. Just the act of connecting on a personal level fosters the feeling that “We are in this together.” Interpersonal exchanges on a social level helps build trust (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). This means day school leaders must carve out time to talk to the teachers. They should spend time in the teachers’ lounge, sitting with them at lunch, and other similar activities. It also requires leaders opening up about themselves to the teachers (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Feeling standoffish might feel more professional, but the cost is enormous.

Day school leaders also elicit feelings of trust by being truthful and transparent. Being open about goals, directions, and even failings make people feel that if you are open about these things, you are open about everything. Often, when a supervisor admits a mistake and takes responsibility for it, teachers often feel they can trust their supervisor. And as stated earlier, trust leads to job satisfaction and all of the positive outcomes associated with it.

The responsibility for ensuring PBI in Jewish day schools does not only belong to principals and heads of school. It belongs to the lay leadership of the Jewish day schools as well. They must take the steps necessary to ensure the school is being run in ways that foster PBI and trust. Starting with the hiring of
the school’s professional leadership, lay leaders must have clarity on the school’s values and mission, and must be able to articulate it clearly to any potential hires. Further, they must do their due diligence in looking into candidates’ past experiences to see if there is a history of PBI or not. If these steps are not done properly, schools can end up with leaders who are not aligned with the school’s values. That sets the school up for a lack of institutional alignment all the way through the organization. Without alignment, the school’s mission will not be fulfilled, as decisions will be made pulling the school in different directions.

Even once hired, lay leaders are responsible to oversee school leadership, ensuring word-deed alignment and feelings of trust for all the reasons outlined in this study. Clearly developed and communicated goals and systems for oversight are crucial. These aspects of day school leaders’ jobs must be included in the performance reviews. Similarly, day school leaders must evaluate and provide feedback for other supervisors in the school, taking trust and PBI into account. One way to obtain objective data on trust and PBI is by utilizing the measures used in this study and created by Simons and Parks (2002). The stakes are too high for PBI and trust to be ignored. It is the responsibility of lay and professional leaders in every day school to attract and retain top teachers and ensure that our teachers are as effective as possible. That is how we can enable the students to learn at the highest levels possible. If these areas go ignored, the ramifications will be severe and we will be failing our students. But with word-deed alignment and trust, schools can adhere to their values and achieve their missions.
Limitations and Future Study

It has already been suggested that further research investigate how different forms of mission communication not included in this study and the length of relationship between the teacher and supervisor predict PBI. Beyond that, there are other avenues for further study that were left unexplored. As stated earlier, only teachers at Modern Orthodox Jewish day schools were included in this study. Future research can replicate the study and investigate if the findings are true for Jewish day schools of other denominations.

In order to make the findings of this study generalizable to Modern Orthodox Jewish day schools, the sampling was intentionally broad, spanning all divisions of Modern Orthodox Jewish day schools, including Judaic and general studies teachers, and treating teachers the same regardless of how long they had been teaching. Perhaps the results would be different if the study focused on more homogeneous groupings. For example, over half (56%) of the respondents were over 40 years old. Maybe given their experience, they are more attuned to PBI than younger teachers. Fifty six percent of the teachers surveyed teach in high schools, and only 8% teach in pre-schools. It is possible the results would change if those categories were studied independently and the samples were made up entirely of that demographic. Further study can investigate these more narrow samples.

Additionally, this study utilized a convenience sampling. It relied on word of mouth, email lists, and social media. Being a convenience sample, one has to ask whether this is a group that is representative of all teachers in Modern Orthodox Jewish day schools. Further, information about the location of the
schools was collected but not studied. The question was an open question and not categorical, which would allow for different specificities. Additionally, certain regions were not adequately represented, while others were represented very well. While not anticipated, it is possible that responses differ based on location. Teachers in areas where there are many Jewish day schools to choose from might feel better aligned with the school in which they teach and therefore report higher levels of PBI, while those teaching in Jewish day schools that are the only option in the area might not feel as aligned and might therefore be more sensitive to PBI. More research into these areas can have a more nationally representative sample and can categorize this characteristic or ask respondents to identify previously created geographic categories. That could shed more light on whether location is a meaningful moderator in this study.

There are other potential areas of study that became evident during this study. Distributive leadership is one such area that might shed more light on the value of trust and how it may impact job performance (Cambrun, Rowan, & Taylor, 2003). Also, while the gender of the teacher was studied, the gender of the supervisor was not. Perhaps there are differences in how supervisors are perceived, both regarding behavioral integrity and trust, depending on the gender. Other questions one could ask include what the impact of how heads of school perceive the behavioral integrity of the board is, what the impact is of hiring mission aligned teachers, and is there a deeper look one should be taking at the difference between Judaic studies teachers and general studies teacher.

While there is room for further inquiry into the area of PBI in Jewish day schools, what is certain is its importance. The impact is has on job satisfaction
mirrors its impact in other areas in the for-profit and not-for-profit sectors. Combined with earlier research highlighting the significant ramifications of job satisfaction, this study makes a compelling case to Modern Orthodox Jewish day school leaders and lay leaders that PBI should attract their attention. Leaders must focus on what contributes to teachers’ PBI of, and trust in, their supervisors in Jewish day schools. When making decisions, leaders must ensure that their espoused and enacted values are aligned, and that this alignment is clear to all. Doing this should allow our students to get the most out of their educational experience.
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Appendix A

DEFINITION OF MODERN ORTHODOX AND CENTRIST ORTHODOX SCHOOLS

In *A census of Jewish day schools in the United States* (2014), Schick defines Modern Orthodox schools as follows:

Generally, they are coeducational. Even with the recent trend to separate by gender in religious studies at the middle school level and perhaps earlier, coeducation remains a principal feature of these schools. There is a strong emphasis on both Judaics and the academic program, and the curriculum tends to include subject matter that is not included in the curricula of typical yeshivas. Hebrew language is stressed, and it is often the language of instruction in Judaic courses. Identifying with Israel and Zionism is essential in these institutions, not only in the teaching of subject matter but perhaps more critically in the attitudes that are embedded in the school. At the high school level, the expectation is that graduates will go to Israel for at least a year of seminary study, and that when they return home, they will enroll in college. (p. 15-16)

Schick defines Centrist Orthodox schools as follows:

They partake of meaningful doses of modernity, including a strong emphasis on the academic program and strong support of Israel, yet they also are pulled in the direction of the more fervently Orthodox, as is evident in the spreading tendency to divide classes by gender, either altogether or at an earlier grade than used to be the case. The outcome of Centrist Orthodox schools being pulled in two directions is that they are somewhat less modernistic and less Zionist than they used to be. Yet, they remain significantly more committed to a strong academic program and to Israel than Yeshiva World institutions. Centrist Orthodox schools are, in the main, coeducational in the sense that they enroll boys and girls, albeit with a growing emphasis on gender separation, including total gender separation at some schools. (p. 16)
Appendix B

ONLINE CONSENT FORM

You are being invited to participate in a research study titled “Impact of Perceived Behavioral Integrity on Job Satisfaction in Jewish Day Schools”. This study is being done by Avery Joel from Yeshiva University's Azrieli Graduate School of Jewish Education and Administration. You were selected to participate in this study because you are currently a full-time teacher in a Modern Orthodox Jewish day school.

The purpose of this research study is to help leaders understand the importance of the word-deed alignment of supervisors as perceived by teachers. This could have a significant impact on the job satisfaction and performance of teachers.

If you agree to take part in this study, you will be asked to complete an online survey. This survey will ask about demographics of your school, about mission communication, and about your perceptions of several other areas related to your job in your school. The survey will take you approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

You may not directly benefit from this research; however, we hope that your participation in the study may impact how leaders of Jewish day schools think about mission communication and word-deed alignment.
We believe there are no known risks associated with this research study; however, as with any online related activity the risk of a breach of confidentiality is always possible. To the best of our ability your answers in this study will remain confidential. We will minimize any risks by not asking your name and by keeping the results of the survey password protected, with access limited to the research team.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you can withdraw at any time.

If you have questions about this project or if you have a research-related problem, you may contact the researcher, Avery Joel, by calling 216-932-0220 or by emailing pbiresearch2@gmail.com. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research subject, you may contact Mr. David Wallach, Director of the Institutional Review Board at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine by calling (718) 430-2237 or by emailing david.wallach@einstein.yu.edu.

By answering “I agree” below you are indicating that you are at least 18 years old, have read and understood this consent form and agree to participate in this research study. Please print a copy of this page for your records.
Appendix C

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of Perceived Behavioral Integrity on Job Satisfaction in Jewish Day Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Demographic Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is your gender?
- Female
- Male

3. How old are you?
- 20-30
- 31-40
- Over 40

4. Are you currently a full-time teacher?
- Yes
- No

5. How long have you been teaching (at any school)?
- 0-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-20 years
- Over 20 years

6. How long have you been teaching in your current school?
- >1 year
- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- Over 10 years

7. Do you teach Judaic studies, general studies, or both?
- Judaic studies
- General studies
- Both
8. Are you Jewish?
   - Yes
   - No

9. What term best describes the level of the school in which you teach?
   - Pre-School
   - Lower School
   - Middle School
   - High School

10. In what city is your school located?

11. How many students are in your school?
   - 0-100
   - 101-150
   - 151-200
   - 201-400
   - 401-500
   - 501-750
   - 751-1000
   - Over 1000
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BEHAVIORAL INTEGRITY SCALE
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3. Behavioral Integrity Scale

Directions: Please respond regarding the manager or supervisor to whom you directly report at this point in time. Read each statement carefully, then choose the response that best applies. Do not take time to think about the questions.

12. There is a match between my manager’s words and actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. My manager delivers on promises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. My manager practices what he/she preaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. My manager does what he/she says he/she will do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. My manager conducts himself/herself by the same values he/she talks about.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. My manager shows the same priorities that he/she describes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. When my manager promises something, I can be certain that it will happen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. If my manager says he/she is going to do something, he/she will.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TRUST OF SUPERVISOR SCALE
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4. Trust Scale

Directions: Please respond regarding the manager or supervisor to whom you directly report at this point in time. Read each statement carefully, then choose the response that best applies. Do not take time to think about the questions.

20. I would be willing to let my manager have complete control over my future in this company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. I would not mind putting my well-being in my manager’s hands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. I would feel good about letting my manager make decisions that seriously affect my life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F
SUPERVISORY GUIDANCE SCALE
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5. Supervisory Guidance

Definition and Instructions

23. My supervisor initiates training and offers advice about what is appropriate to do in our department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. My supervisor coaches me on how to do “the right thing” on the job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. My supervisor initiates training and advises me about how to avoid doing the wrong thing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. My supervisor coaches me about how to avoid doing “the wrong thing” on the job. My supervisor initiates training and advises me about how to avoid doing the wrong thing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FREQUENCY OF MISSION COMMUNICATION SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of Perceived Behavioral Integrity on Job Satisfaction in Jewish Day Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. Frequency of Mission Communication

Please indicate how frequently each of the methods below was deployed for the purpose of mission communication in your school.

27. Personal explanation (e.g. face-to-face conversations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Posters/Plaques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Employee Manuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix H

**JOB SATISFACTION SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of Perceived Behavioral Integrity on Job Satisfaction in Jewish Day Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Directions?**

30. All in all, how satisfied are you with your job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Satisfied At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Taking everything into consideration, how likely is it that you will make a genuine effort to find a new job with another employer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Not Likely At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Take the same job without hesitation</th>
<th>Have second thoughts</th>
<th>Definitely not take the same job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix I

**SOCIAL READJUSTMENT RATING SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of Perceived Behavioral Integrity on Job Satisfaction in Jewish Day Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Holmes and Rahe Social Readjustment Scale</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To measure common stressors in your life, simply select Yes or No for each of the events that have happened to you in the last year.

33. Did you experience these events over the past year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Death of a spouse</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital separation</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail term</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of close family member</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal injury or illness</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fired at work</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital reconciliation</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in health of family member</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex difficulties</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain of new family member</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business readjustment</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in financial state</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of close friend</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change to a different line of work</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in number of arguments with spouse</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A large mortgage or loan</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreclosure of mortgage or loan</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in responsibilities at work</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son or daughter leaving home</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouble with in-laws</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding personal achievement</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse begins or stops work</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin or end school/college</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in living conditions</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision of personal habits</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouble with boss</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in work hours or conditions</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in residence</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in school/college</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in recreation</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in religious activities</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in social activities</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate loan or mortgage</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in sleeping habits</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in number of family get-togethers</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in eating habits</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major holidays</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor violations of the law</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>