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EXAMINING THE EFFECTS OF BUREUCRAT BASHING ON CITIZENS’ ATTITUDES AND THE MORALE OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

Practitioners and good government proponents have repeatedly decried bureaucrat-bashing for the dangers it poses to the morale of public employees. Academics, particularly public administration scholars, have posited that bureaucrat-bashing undermines Americans’ support for public programs (Barth, 2010; Garrett, Thurber, Fritschler, & Rosenbloom, 2006; Haque, 1998), their interest in a career in public service (Baldwin, 1990; Garrett et al., 2006; Ingraham & Peters, 1988; Mann, 2006), and their support for work benefits for public employees (Roberts, 2012). Furthermore, scholars have also hypothesized that bureaucrat-bashing weakens public employees’ job satisfaction (Chen & Bozeman, 2014; Garrett et al., 2006; Ting, 1997; Volcker, 1990), intrinsic motivation (Chen & Bozeman, 2014; Jahan & Shahan, 2012), and commitment to public service (Baldwin, 1990; Ingraham & Peters, 1988; Yang & Pandey, 2009).

Despite these claims, no empirical studies have quantified the effects of bureaucrat-bashing on citizens’ attitudes towards public employees, nor on the morale of public employees. The paucity of empirical research on this topic results from scholars’ struggle to define and measure bureaucrat-bashing. This dissertation addresses the research gap by clearly defining bureaucrat-bashing and measuring its effects on citizens and public employees. This dissertation also identifies the factors that influence whether members of congress frame public employees in a positive or negative light, as a means to better understand which government workers and which government agencies are most at risk of losing public support and when.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

"It finally got to the point where I got disillusioned," said Richard Swensen, 60, who retired from the Agriculture Department last year after 38 years. "You get weary of the bureaucrat-bashing."¹

Practitioners and good government proponents have repeatedly decried bureaucrat-bashing for the dangers it poses to the morale of public employees. Academics, particularly public administration scholars, have posited that bureaucrat-bashing undermines Americans’ support for public programs (Barth, 2010; Garrett, Thurber, Fritschler, & Rosenbloom, 2006; Haque, 1998), their interest in a career in public service (Baldwin, 1990; Garrett et al., 2006; Ingraham & Peters, 1988; Mann, 2006), and their support for work benefits for public employees (Roberts, 2012). Furthermore, scholars have also hypothesized that bureaucrat-bashing weakens public employees’ job satisfaction (Chen & Bozeman, 2014; Garrett et al., 2006; Ting, 1997; Volcker, 1990), intrinsic motivation (Chen & Bozeman, 2014; Jahan & Shahan, 2012), and commitment to public service (Baldwin, 1990; Ingraham & Peters, 1988; Yang & Pandey, 2009).

Despite these claims, no empirical studies have quantified the effects of bureaucrat-bashing on citizens’ attitudes towards public employees, nor on the morale of public employees. The paucity of empirical research on this topic results from scholars’ struggle to define and measure bureaucrat-bashing. This dissertation addresses the research gap by clearly defining bureaucrat-bashing and measuring its effects on citizens and public employees. This dissertation also identifies the factors that influence whether members of congress frame public employees in a positive or negative light, as a means to better understand which government workers and which government agencies are most at risk of losing public support and when.

¹ The Washington Post: 1.1.
This dissertation is organized as follows. Chapter 2 provides a brief history of bureaucrat-bashing and reviews three relevant streams of literature: (1) public opinion towards bureaucrats and the American bureaucracy; (2) value and performance differences between employees in the public sector and employees in the private sector; and (3) motivations for bureaucrat-bashing. Chapter 3 examines how members of congress frame public employees with a special focus on the role of party identification, logics of appropriateness, and public opinion. Chapter 4 reviews the literature on the effects of bureaucrat-bashing on citizens and public employees.

Chapter 5 provides hypotheses and foundational theories about whether bureaucrat-bashing affects citizens’ attitudes towards public employees, contextualizes bureaucrat-bashing within the arena of public education, and quantitatively assesses the impact of the bashing of public school teachers on public support for public school teachers. Chapter 6 provides hypotheses and foundational theories about whether bureaucrat-bashing affects the morale of public employees, and quantitatively assesses the impact of the bashing of public school teachers on the morale of public school teachers.
Chapter 2: Background and Literature Review

A Brief History of Bureaucrat-Bashing

In the more than two centuries since America’s founding, the United States has dramatically expanded its bureaucracy in an effort to address major challenges such as industrialization, poverty, war, and disease, which threaten national prosperity and peace. As public bureaucracies have proven essential for combating public crises, violent rebellion is no longer viewed as a legitimate response to perceived bureaucratic overreach. Instead, skepticism and antipathy towards public bureaucracies and bureaucrats is now frequently expressed through bureaucrat-bashing. Consisting of verbal and non-verbal forms of communication, it challenges the work ethic, competence, accountability, and/or motives of a subgroup of public employees.

The American colonists challenged the motives and the accountability of public bureaucrats—not their work ethic or competence—given that hard work and competence only have meaning insofar as public bureaucracies are viewed as legitimate. The colonists challenged the very legitimacy of bureaucracy as means for organizing government (Lowery, 1993). However, since America’s founding public bureaucracies have gained greater legitimacy, so now criticisms of public bureaucrats also target their competence and work effort.

President Jimmy Carter was the first presidential candidate to make criticizing public bureaucracies and bureaucrats central to a presidential campaign (C. T. Goodsell, 2000). Carter hoped to repeat at the federal level his success in reorganizing Georgia’s executive branch while governor (Seyb, 2001). In the process of promoting administrative reform, however, Carter struck a tone that many considered to be overly critical of public agencies and damaging to the morale of public employees (Haque, 1998).
Ronald Reagan was the harshest and most prominent critic of American bureaucracy, using his “oratory skills and reputation as the Great Communicator” to “consistently criticiz[e] and blam[e] the federal bureaucracy and career civil servants for what he perceived as America's problems” (Terry, 1997, p.53). Terry (1997) found that the Reagan administration shrewdly used metaphors to create a political drama consisting of causal stories, portraying federal bureaucracy as the villain, and Reagan as the hero who would protect the public from an oversized federal bureaucracy. The challenge for public servants, Terry (1997) argues, is not just that they were villainized by the Reagan administration, but also that they were portrayed as incapable of any positive action.

While research by Hall (2002) suggests that bureaucrat-bashing is more frequent among Republicans than Democrats, it is now common practice among electoral candidates and elected officials of all political stripes and at all levels of office in the United States (Henderson, 2004).

Perceptions of Public Employees and the Public Sector

One reason American politicians deploy bureaucrat-bashing is that Americans view the private sector more favorably than the public sector. Furthermore, a growing body of scholarship demonstrates that Americans possess an anti-public sector bias, causing them to automatically and unconsciously associate public sector organizations and employees with lower performance relative to private sector organizations and employees (Marvel, 2015, 2016).

Marvel (2015) used survey experiments to test whether Americans do indeed display an anti-public sector expectation-and evaluation bias. To assess whether respondents exhibited an expectation bias, Marvel (2015) asked them to guess how the United States Postal Service (USPS) and the Federal Express (FedEx) perform. If the subjects automatically guessed that the public sector performed worse than the private sector, then one could assume that respondents
had an anti-public sector expectation bias. The shortcoming of expectation bias as a measure is that it is impossible to know the information upon which people base their expectations. For example, a person with poor personal experiences with the USPS would have good reason to expect the USPS to perform more poorly than FedEx.

Consequently, Marvel (2015) also examined evaluation bias by assessing whether respondents, after receiving objective performance information concerning the USPS and FedEx, updated their ratings of both agencies to reflect that. If individuals received performance information that both the USPS and FedEx performed equally well, and yet individuals rated the USPS lower than FedEx, it could be assumed that the differential was due to an anti-public sector evaluation bias. Marvel (2015) found evidence of both an expectation bias and an evaluation bias. Respondents expected a lower level of performance from the USPS than FedEx, and objective performance information did not completely override their expectation bias (Marvel, 2015).

Marvel (2016) continued his research on anti-public sector bias by assessing whether Americans “automatically and unconsciously associate[d] public sector organizations with inefficiency, inflexibility, and other pejoratives, and [whether] these automatic associations color[ed] their assessments of public sector performance (p. 143).” Through a series of survey experiments, Marvel found that “individuals’ unconscious attitudes about the USPS weigh[ed] down, or taint[ed], their evaluations of Postal Service performance—performance that is, in the real world, objectively quite good” (p. 152). Moreover, neither an information treatment nor an advertising treatment affected subjects’ implicit attitudes, suggesting that Americans’ “underlying beliefs about public sector performance will be difficult to change” (Marvel, 2016, p.155).
The American public’s reverence for the private sector over the public sector is reflected in public opinion data. A national poll conducted in 2010 by the *Washington Post* found that when respondents were asked whether they “think the quality of employees in the federal government is generally higher, lower, or the same as the quality of employees who work in private business,” 44 percent said that the quality of employees is the same across both sectors, 36 percent said that the quality of employees is lower in the federal government, and only 15 percent said that the quality of employees is higher in the federal government (“Washington Post Poll,” 2010).

Respondents were also asked whether they think “federal employees generally work harder, work less hard, or work equally as hard as employees with similar jobs in private business ("Washington Post Poll," 2010).” Thirty-nine percent of respondents said that federal employees work equally as hard as employees with similar jobs in private business, 49 percent said less hard, and only seven percent said that federal employees work harder than employees with similar jobs in private business ("Washington Post Poll," 2010).

Similarly, in a study using data from public managers in the states of Georgia and Illinois, Chen and Bozeman (2014) found that only nine percent of public managers in the sample perceived that public sector workers are more talented than workers in the private sector, whereas 36 percent of public managers perceived that workers in the private sector are more talented than workers in the public sector. Furthermore, only six percent of public managers in the sample perceived that public sector workers are more creative that workers in the private sector, whereas 65 percent of public managers perceived that workers in the private sector are more creative than workers in the public sector.
Based on this research, we can surmise that Americans largely view public employees as less hardworking and less competent than employees in the private sector. That being said, the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ASCI) has found that Americans are largely satisfied with government services overall, which indirectly suggests that on balance Americans view public employees as competent.

The ASCI’s annual report is based on data from interviews in which respondents are asked to evaluate their recent experiences with products and services offered by the public and private sectors. “The data serve as inputs to an econometric model that benchmarks customer satisfaction with more than 230 companies, 43 industries, 10 economic sectors, and various services of federal and local government agencies.”\(^2\)

In 2015, local and federal government each received an ASCI score of 64 out of 100, which suggests that Americans are generally pleased with the services that they receive from government, even though local and federal government scored lower than all nine of the private sector industries that were examined. Furthermore, as is to be expected, ASCI scores varied across federal departments, which suggests that Americans’ perceptions of a government employee’s competence may vary based upon the department for which the public employee works.

For example, in 2015, police services in central cities received an ASCI score of 60 whereas solid waste management in central cities received an ASCI score of 71. In 2015, ASCI assessed 13 federal departments, and the top three scorers were the Department of Interior (75), the Department of State (71), and the Department of Defense (70). The departments with the

three lowest ASCI scores were the Department of Treasury (55), the Department of Justice (59), and the Department of Veterans of Affairs (60). Therefore, while Americans view public employees as less competent than employees in the private sector, they are generally satisfied with government services at both the local and federal levels. Customer satisfaction levels vary, however, depending on the governmental department in question.

Comparing Public and Private Sector Employees

While bureaucrats are often bashed regarding their competence, work ethic, accountability, and/or motives, there is no systematic evidence that public employees score lower on these metrics than do employees in the private sector.

Scholars have looked for differences between the quality of workers in the public sector and in the private sector. This research provides some indirect insight concerning the competence of public employees. Contrary to folklore, there is no evidence that employees in the private sector are of higher quality than employees in the public sector. In fact, studies by Phillip E. Crewson suggest that the federal, state, and local government have been able to attract employees of equal or higher quality than those in the private sector (Crewson, 1995; Crewson & Guyot, 1997). In an effort to compare entrant quality across the public and private sectors, Crewson (1995) used data from the 1979 National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY). The NLSY is a nationally representative sample of over 12,000 young men and women who were between 14 and 22 years old when they were first surveyed in 1979, and who entered the workforce in the 1980’s. Furthermore, the survey included a measure of aptitude used in the Armed Forces Qualifications Test (AFQT) to assess cognitive ability, which Crewson used to measure employee quality.
Crewson’s (1995) analysis found that “when holding sex, race, occupation and economic status constant, federal employees hired during the 1980s have AFQT percentile scores that average 5.5 points higher than private sector employees (p.635).” However, Crewson found no differences in quality between public sector employees working at the state level and private sector employees. Given that this study only measures one dimension of worker quality, more research is needed. Nevertheless, Crewson’s findings suggest that it is overly simplistic to assume that public sector employees are of lower quality than private sector employees.

Crewson and Guyot (1997) drew upon the same NLSY data that Crewson (1995) used in his research to examine whether efforts to increase diversity have imperiled worker quality in the public sector, and also whether there are differences in worker quality across the sectors within race and sex subpopulations. Crewson and Guyot (1997) employed multivariate regression models in which they controlled for sector, occupation, and economic status, similar to Crewson’s model (1995).

However, unlike Crewson’s study they did not control for sex and race, in order to assess whether higher levels of sex and race diversity in the public sector depress the quality of public sector workers below that of private sector workers. Crewson and Guyot (1997) found that “when ethnicity and gender are removed from the model, the quality advantage originally shown for the federal sector disappears” (Crewson & Guyot, 1997, p.1061). Additionally, the authors used the same model to “test its concurrent validity within race and sex subpopulations” and found that “in no subpopulation does the federal sector suffer a quality deficit compared to the private sector, and within the white subpopulation the public sector quality advantage returns (Crewson & Guyot, 1997, p.1061).” Therefore, Crewson and Guyot’s (1997) research further challenges the stereotype that public sector employees are incompetent.
Scholars have also examined the work effort of public employees. Numerous studies have found that government employees profess high levels of work motivation (Brehm & Gates, 1997; Rainey, 1983; Wright, 2004). But findings are inconclusive regarding whether differences exist in work motivation between public and private employees. Research by Gene A. Brewer and Brewer (2011) and Frank and Lewis (2004) found higher levels of work motivation in the public sector than in the private sector. Rainey (1983) found no difference in work motivation across the public and private sectors, and Buelens and Van den Broeck (2007) and Aryee (1992) found higher levels of motivation among private sector employees. Given the conflicting findings and the paucity of studies on this topic, no conclusions can be drawn about whether work motivation differs between the sectors. It is clear, however, that public sector employees “report attitudes and behaviors consistent with high motivation” (Rainey, 2009, p. 298). In light of the aforementioned research, the stereotype that public employees are lazy is rooted more in folklore than scientific evidence.

Scholars have gauged whether public employees are accountable to the public by comparing the value priorities of public bureaucrats with the value priorities of private sector employees, to see which sector places greater emphasis on transparency. Transparency is defined by Van der Wal, De Graaf, and Lasthuizen (2008) as acting openly, visibly, and controllably (Jelovac, Van Der Wal, & Jelovac, 2011; Van der Wal & Huberts, 2008). If public employees place greater weight on transparency than private sector employees, then such evidence would seem to undercut the stereotype that public bureaucrats are unaccountable to the public.

Only three studies have examined this topic, and two of the three have found statistically significant differences between the importance placed on transparency by government employees
and by employees in the private sector. In both studies, government employees placed greater emphasis on transparency (Jelovac et al., 2011; Van der Wal & Huberts, 2008).

Given that all three of the aforementioned studies on this topic use data from European samples, more research needs to be done to see if these results are generalizable to other countries. Even so, these studies call into question the stereotype that public employees are tyrannical or power-hungry, since they seem to place as much if not more importance on transparency than do employees in the private sector.

Furthermore, the finding that government employees stress transparency seems to be corroborated by a large body of research which has found that government bureaucracies are generally responsive to the promptings of political institutions (Scholz & Wood, 1998, 1999; Witko, 2013; Wood & Waterman, 1993). In fact, the behavior of government bureaucrats can be controlled through a variety of means including legislation, budgeting, legislative veto, oversight hearings, the bully pulpit of the president, reorganization powers, and political appointments.

Scholars have also compared the work-related values of public and private employees, given that public employees are commonly stereotyped as pursuing their own self-interest over the common good. One of the main ways scholars have tested this assertion is by comparing levels of public service motivation (PSM) among public and private employees.

Perry and Hondeghem (2008) describe PSM as “a specific expression of prosocial, other-oriented motives, goals, and values” that may be understood as being unique to public service or transcending sectoral boundaries (Perry & Hondeghem, 2008, p. 6). Given that PSM is a type or subset of other-oriented motives, it can be argued that PSM and self-interest are inversely
related. Consequently, the sector that expresses the highest levels of PSM possesses workers that are on average least motivated by self-interest.

The preponderance of studies comparing the work-related values of public and private employees have found higher levels of self-reported PSM and altruism among public employees, whether analyzing samples from the U.S. or abroad (Bullock, Stritch, & Rainey, 2015; Houston, 2011; Lyons, Duxbury, & Higgins, 2006; Taylor, 2010). These findings directly challenge the stereotype that public employees are primarily motivated by self-interest.

Not only do public employees report higher levels of PSM and altruism than do employees in the private sector, but public employees are also more likely to engage in altruistic behaviors outside of their formal jobs. For example, Gene A Brewer (2003) found that government employment was a positive and statistically significant predictor of civic participation as measured by involvement in civic groups. Furthermore, several studies have found that government employees volunteer more than their private sector counterparts (Ertas, 2014; Houston, 2006; Piatak, 2015; Rotolo & Wilson, 2006; Taylor, 2010). Such findings corroborate that PSM and altruism are higher among public employees than private sector employees.

**What Motivates Bureaucrat-Bashing?**

Considering that the American public is largely pleased with public programs and services, and also considering that public employees are of comparable merit to employees in the private sector, one might ask: why do elected officials and citizens alike bash bureaucrats? The literature indicates three main motivations: (1) a desire to abolish public institutions one deems illegitimate, (2) a desire to obfuscate blame for failed programs and policies, and (3) a desire to air felt grievances.
First, both Republicans and Democrats continue to challenge the legitimacy of administrative actions, albeit for different reasons (Warren, 1993). Warren (1993) notes, “while Republicans summarily condemn … the bureaucratic apparatus that administers the welfare state as illegitimate, Democrats generally defend the social welfare state as legitimate, yet attack the large defense bureaucracy” (p. 251). Although elected officials, not bureaucrats, play the central role in policymaking, elected officials and citizens bash bureaucrats for implementing policies that they feel are illegitimate, as a means to delegitimize and eventually end those policies.

Second, while elected officials sometimes bash bureaucrats for implementing policies that they do not support, elected officials also bash bureaucrats over the implementation of policies that they do support, in an attempt to escape blame for failed policies. Van de Walle, Van Roosbroek, and Bouckaert (2008) note this: “Quite often, politicians try to take the credit for policies that work, and shift the blame for policies that don’t. In the latter category, ‘bureaucrats’ are a popular target” (p. 50). Therefore, when programs and policies fail to achieve their missions, the elected officials who supported those programs and policies sometimes blame those who implement them—namely, bureaucrats.

Third, sometimes bureaucrats are bashed by elected officials and citizens alike for real or at least perceived missteps (Garrett et al., 2006; Ott & Shafritz, 1994). Despite the numerous successes of public bureaucracies, they have experienced some clear failures as well. In recent years, the federal bureaucracy has received widespread criticism for several blunders, including the “Federal Emergency Management Agency’s failures in response to Hurricane Katrina, the laxity of the Minerals Management Service that came to light in the wake of the BP oil spill, the disclosure of poor conditions and delays at Department of Veterans Affairs hospitals, and the mismanagement of the Affordable Care Act rollout” (West, 2015, p. 527). Bureaucrat-bashing in
the wake of such events is understandable and perhaps even beneficial, if it can inspire reforms that improve public value.

Summary

In summary, bureaucrat-bashing has existed since the founding of our republic (Hubbell, 1991; Yarwood, 1996). President Carter, however, was the first presidential candidate to make criticizing public bureaucracies and public bureaucrats central to a presidential campaign (C. T. Goodsell, 2000). Bureaucrat-bashing is now thought to be common practice among electoral candidates and elected officials of all political stripes and at all levels of office in the United States (Henderson, 2004). Although Americans possess an anti-public sector bias and view the private sector and its employees more favorably, they are largely satisfied with government services overall. Furthermore, while bureaucrats are often bashed regarding their competence, work ethic, accountability, and/or motives, there is no systematic evidence that public employees score lower on these metrics than employees in the private sector.

Introduction

Politicians employ many rhetorical tactics to build support for their legislative agenda. A perennial favorite is framing—a process by which an individual associates an issue or a group with a few specific anecdotes, images, or stereotypes in order to reorient the way people think about an issue or group (Chong & Druckman, 2007). Former President Ronald Reagan’s continuous reference to ‘welfare queens,’ while promoting welfare reform legislation, is one of the most poignant examples of framing. The term ‘welfare queen’ was designed to evoke an image of a “black welfare mother who breeds children at the expense of the taxpayers in order to increase the amount of her welfare check” (Kaufman, 1997, p.301). By connecting welfare recipients generally with ‘welfare queens’ specifically, Reagan hoped to gain support for legislation to curtail welfare benefits.

Politicians frame not only welfare recipients, but public employees as well. Hall (2002) analyzed floor speeches from the 103rd and 104th Congresses to determine how members of congress used terms such as ‘bureaucrat,’ ‘public servant,’ ‘government worker,’ and ‘civil servant’ to describe public employees. He found that the term ‘bureaucrat’ was used pejoratively, whereas the terms ‘public servant,’ ‘government workers,’ and ‘civil servant’ were mostly used positively. Furthermore, Hall (2002) found that Republican members of congress used the term
‘bureaucrat’ much more frequently than Democrats, accounting for “approximately 83 percent of the uses of “bureaucrat” in both the 103rd and 104th Congresses” (p. 245).

Given that the term ‘bureaucrat’ generally evokes the image of a government employee beholden to arbitrary rules and procedures (C. T. Goodsell, 2000), Hall (2002) contends that Republican members of congress frequently refer to government employees as bureaucrats in order to evoke a negative image of them, and foster support for minimizing the size and role of government.

While Hall’s (2002) research elucidates how members of congress frame public employees to shape the debate about the role of government, his research does not identify the circumstances under which public employees are referred to as bureaucrats versus other, more positive terms, such as civil servants or public employees. The aim of this paper is to fill this research gap, by identifying the conditions under which the term ‘bureaucrat/s’ is used in the Congressional Record versus the terms ‘public employee/s,’ ‘government employee/s,’ or ‘civil servant/s.’

Understanding the factors that influence whether members of congress frame public employees in a positive or negative light is important because the framing of government employees is thought to impact the public’s support for government employees and the agencies for which they work (Barth, 2010; Garrett et al., 2006; Haque, 1998). Framing has been shown to influence attitudes towards a variety of groups including persons with Anorexia, African Americans, asylum seekers, and immigrants just to name a few groups (J. Anderson & Antalíková, 2014; Crisafulli, Von Holle, & Bulik, 2008; Hochman, 2015; Richardson, 2005). Therefore, knowing the conditions that influence whether members of congress frame public

---

3 I do not examine usage of the term ‘public servant/s’ given that such term could be used for both elected officials and civil servants.
employees in a positive or negative light is vital because that information can shed light on which government workers and which government agencies are most at risk of losing public support and when.

Hypotheses

Given that Republicans use the term ‘bureaucrat’ with far greater frequency than do Democrats, I posit that the term ‘bureaucrat’ is used most frequently during discussions of policy issues for which Republicans show significantly less support for government spending than do Democrats. In line with Hall’s (2002) research, I hypothesize that Republican members of congress strategically use the term ‘bureaucrat’ to undermine public support for government spending in areas for which Republicans want little government involvement.

More specifically, I expect that the odds that the term ‘bureaucrat’ is evoked in congressional speeches is higher during discussions of welfare, health care, the environment, social security, and education than during discussions of other policy areas given that these are the areas for which Republicans have historically shown far less support for government spending than Democrats (Oldendick & Hendren, 2017).

Oldendick and Hendren (2017) for example, employed data from the General Social Survey from 1972 to 2014 to measure differences in support for government spending between Democrats and Republicans across 28 issues areas. The authors measured differences in support for government spending between Democrats and Republicans using party liberalism scores⁴ with a positive score indicating greater support for spending among Democrats than Republicans, and a negative score indicating greater support for spending among Republicans

---

⁴ The percentage of liberal responses (spending “too little” on these items) from Republicans subtracted by the percentage of liberal responses from Democrats (p.7)
than Democrats. “The larger the difference in the absolute value of these scores, the greater the differences in opinion between Democrats and Republicans” (Oldendick & Hendren, 2017, p.7).

Party differences in liberalism scores for government spending in order of magnitude were 21.6 for welfare, 11.5 for health, 10.6 for the environment, 8.8 for social security, and 7.2 for education. These findings lead to the following hypothesis:

**H1: Congressional speeches that have the word ‘welfare,’ ‘health care,’ ‘environment,’ ‘social security,’ and/or ‘education’ in the title of the speech will have higher odds of having the word ‘bureaucrat’ in the title or body of the speech.**

Republican members of congress seek not only to reduce the role of government in society through limiting government spending, but also through limiting taxation. Whether examining general attitudes towards taxation or attitudes towards specific tax policies such as federal income taxes, inheritance taxes, taxes on the wealthy, estate taxes, or business taxes, Republicans are less supportive of taxation than Democrats (Bowman, Sims, & O'Neil, 2017; Durante & Putterman, 2011; Franko, Tolbert, & Witko, 2013; Rudolph, 2009). Therefore, I expect that the odds that the term ‘bureaucrat’ is evoked in congressional speeches is higher during discussions of tax policies as Republican members of congress try to slight the work of government workers by referring to them as ‘bureaucrats’ as a means to limit taxation. These findings lead to the following hypothesis:

**H2: Congressional speeches that have the word ‘tax’ in the title of the speech will have higher odds of having the word ‘bureaucrat’ in the title or body of the speech.**

The third central tactic that Republican members of congress employ to minimize the role of government in society is through limiting government regulation. Whether examining general attitudes towards regulation or attitudes towards the regulation of specific sectors such as health care, the environment, or financial institutions, Republicans are less supportive of regulation than Democrats (Dimock, Doherty, & Tyson, 2013; Haider-Markel & Joslyn, 2017; Konisky, 2008;
Therefore, I expect that the odds that the term ‘bureaucrat’ is evoked in congressional speeches is higher during discussions of regulatory policies as Republican members of congress try undermine efforts to regulate. These findings lead to the following hypothesis:

**H3: Congressional speeches that have the word ‘regulation’ or ‘regulatory’ in the title of the speech will have higher odds of having the word ‘bureaucrat’ in the title or body of the speech.**

While Democrats are more supportive of governmental spending overall, there are two policy areas in particular for which Republicans register greater support for government spending than Democrats, crime and national defense. Therefore, I expect that the odds that the term ‘bureaucrat’ is evoked in the congressional speeches is lower during discussions of national defense and crime given that these are the areas for which Republicans have historically shown far greater support for government spending than Democrats (Oldendick & Hendren, 2017). Oldendick and Hendren (2017) found that the differences in party liberalism scores for “national defense” and “law enforcement” were -29.3 and -3.3 respectively indicating greater support for government spending among Republicans than Democrats. Given that crime and law enforcement are interrelated, I focus on usage of the term ‘crime’ in congressional speeches given that crime is considered a policy area whereas law enforcement is not. These findings lead to the following hypothesis:

**H4: Congressional speeches that have the word ‘defense’ or ‘crime’ in the title of the speech will have lower odds of having the word ‘bureaucrat’ in the title or body of the speech.**

While caustic debates on the floor of the House and the Senate garner the most media attention, the proceedings of both chambers of congress feature many ceremonies that honor current, retired, and deceased public employees. During these ceremonies, members of congress
have a longstanding history of putting aside their partisan differences and closely following what March and Olsen (2011) term “logics of appropriateness,” by universally speaking very highly of public employees. March and Olsen (2011) describe this logic as “proceed[ing] according to the institutionalized practices of a collectivity, based on mutual, and often tacit understandings of what is true, reasonable, natural, right, and good” (p. 479). This leads to the following hypothesis:

**H5: Congressional speeches that have the word ‘tribute,’ ‘honoring,’ ‘remembering/remembrance,’ ‘memorial/memory,’ ‘congratulations/congratulation,’ or ‘public service recognition week’ in the title will have lower odds of having the word ‘bureaucrat’ in the title or body of the speech.**

Since the 1990’s a growing body scholarship has examined whether public opinion impacts public policy (Burstein, 2003; Manza & Cook, 2002; Shapiro, 2011). While the strength of the relationship between public opinion and public policy varies by the salience of the policy issue, the coherence of public opinion, and in some cases, the economic status of the opinion holders, overall, as Shapiro (2011) notes, “there are a great many studies of representation and responsiveness that provide evidence for strong effects of public opinion on government policies at different levels” (p.1003). Furthermore, not only have scholars found strong effects of public opinion on public policy across different levels of government but also across different policies domains from defense policy to health care policy to environmental policy (Burstein, 2003).

Consequently, I examine the relationship between public opinion and usage of the term ‘bureaucrat/s’ in congressional speeches by including a 1 year lag of James Stimson’s measure of policy mood (Stimson, 1999). Policy mood measures aggregate public support for government programs. A higher score indicates greater support for government programs. I posit that greater public support for government programs will be negatively correlated with usage of the term ‘bureaucrat’ in congressional speeches as elected officials respond to the public’s desire for a
more active role of government in society by casting government employees in a more positive light. These findings lead to the following hypothesis:

**H6: Greater public support for government programs in the previous year will lower the odds of having the word ‘bureaucrat’ in the title or body of the speech in the subsequent year.**

Lastly, I include a control for whether there was a Republican majority in the House or in the Senate at the time of the speech, and I also include a control for whether the speech was made on the floor of the House or on the floor of the Senate.

**Explaining the Dataset**

Serving as the data for this study, the House and Senate portions of the Congressional Record detail the daily proceedings, nearly verbatim, for each chamber of congress. The Congressional Record began publication in 1873, however, only 1995 to the present are available online, in a searchable format. Consequently, I draw upon data from 1995 through 2015.

The unit of analysis for this study is individual congressional speeches. The daily proceedings of the House and the Senate are divided into numerous congressional speeches (often several dozen), which group verbal exchanges by topic. Each congressional speech contains a title, the body of the speech, and the date on which the speech transpired.

The dataset used in this analysis consists of every congressional speech in the House and Senate Congressional Record from 1995 to 2015 that contain at least one of the following four key words within the title or body of the speech: 1) ‘bureaucrat/s,’ 2) ‘government worker/s,’ 3) ‘civil servant/s,’ or 4) ‘public employee/s.’ Each congressional speech is only listed once in the dataset and is demarcated as either possessing the term ‘bureaucrat’ and not the other three terms or possessing one or more of the other three terms and not the word ‘bureaucrat.’
Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 below details the number of times each of the aforementioned keywords has appeared in the House and Senate portions of the Congressional Record during the period of 1995 to 2015. The terms are listed by the frequency of their use, from most to least frequent. The term ‘bureaucrat/s’ appeared 5,957 times, ‘civil servant/s’ 906 times, ‘public employee/s’ 872 times, and ‘government worker/s’ 609 times. The term ‘bureaucrat/s’ appeared more frequently than the other three terms combined, 5,957 times versus 2,387 times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Number of Times Each Word Appears in the House and Senate Portions of the Congressional Record During the Period of 1995 to 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucrat(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Employee(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Worker(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 below details graphically how many times the word ‘bureaucrat/s’ appears in the House and Senate portions of the Congressional Record each year during the period of 1995 to 2015. The term ‘bureaucrat/s’ was used most frequently in 1995 and 2009, appearing 804 and 664 times respectively. ‘Bureaucrat/s’ was used least frequently in 2002 and 2004, appearing 97 and 110 times respectively.
Figures 2 below details graphically the ratio of the number of times the word ‘bureaucrat/s’ appears in the House and Senate portions of the Congressional Record versus the words ‘civil servant/s,’ ‘public employee/s,’ and ‘government worker/s’ each year during the period of 1995 to 2015. A higher ratio indicates more frequent usage of the term ‘bureaucrat’ relative to the usage of the other three terms.

Within the House the term ‘bureaucrat/s’ was used most frequently relative to the other three terms in 2009 and 1998 with ratios of 89 percent and 88 percent respectively. The term ‘bureaucrat/s’ was used least frequently within House relative to the other three terms in 2002, 2003, and 2004 with ratios of 44 percent in 2002 and 54 percent in both 2003 and 2004.

Within the Senate the term ‘bureaucrat/s’ was used most frequently relative to the other three terms in 1998 and 1999 with ratios of 79 percent and 78 percent respectively. The term ‘bureaucrat/s’ was used least frequently within Senate relative to the other three terms in 2002 and 2005 with ratios of 36 percent and 39 percent respectively.
Results

Given that the dependent variable is binary—with one indicating that the term ‘bureaucrat/s’ was used in the title or body of a congressional speech and not any of the other three terms, and zero indicating that the term ‘civil servant/s,’ ‘public employee/s,’ and/or ‘government worker/s’ was used in the title or body of a congressional speech and not the term ‘bureaucrat/s’—I employed a logit model. The results from the logistic regression are shown in Table 2.

Hypothesis 1 is partially accepted. Having ‘welfare,’ ‘health care,’ ‘environment,’ ‘and/or education’ in the title of congressional speeches are all negatively correlated with the term ‘bureaucrat’ appearing in the title or body of the speech, and are all statistically significant. Congressional speeches that have ‘welfare,’ ‘health care,’ ‘environment,’ and/or ‘education’ in the title of the speech have 10.1, 17.6, 14.1, and 4.9 lower odds, respectively, of the term
‘bureaucrat’ appearing in the title or body of the speech than titles without those individual words.

In contrast to what I hypothesized, having ‘social security’ in the title of congressional speeches is negatively correlated with the term ‘bureaucrat’ appearing in the title or body of the speech, and the relationship is statically significant at the p<0.01 level. Congressional speeches that have ‘social security’ in the title have .5 lower odds of having the term ‘bureaucrat’ appearing in the title or body of the speech than titles without the word ‘social security.’

Hypothesis 2 is confirmed. Having ‘tax’ in the title of congressional speeches is positively correlated with the term ‘bureaucrat’ appearing in the title or body of the speech, and is statistically significant at the p<0.001 level. Congressional speeches that have ‘tax’ in the title have a 2.2 higher odds of having the term ‘bureaucrat’ appear in the title or body of the speech than titles without the word ‘tax.’

Hypothesis 3 is confirmed. Having ‘regulation’ or ‘regulatory’ in the title of congressional speeches is positively correlated with the term ‘bureaucrat’ appearing in the title or body of the speech, and is statistically significant at the p<0.001 level. Congressional speeches that have ‘regulation’ or ‘regulatory’ in the title have a 4.8 higher odds of having the term ‘bureaucrat’ appear in the title or body of the speech than titles without the word ‘regulation’ or ‘regulatory.’

Hypothesis 5 is partially confirmed. Having ‘tribute,’ ‘honoring,’ ‘remembering/remembrance,’ ‘memorial/memory,’ or ‘congratulations/congratulating’ in the title of congressional speeches are all negatively correlated with the term ‘bureaucrat’ appearing in the title or body of the speech, and are all statistically significant at the p<0.001 level. Congressional speeches that have ‘tribute,’ ‘honoring,’ ‘remembering/remembrance,’
‘memorial/memory,’ or ‘congratulations/congratulating’ in the title of the speech have .2, .1, .1, .1, and .3 lower odds, respectively, of the term ‘bureaucrat’ appearing in the title or body of the speech than titles without those individual words. Having ‘public service recognition week’ in the title of the speech is negatively correlated with the term ‘bureaucrat’ appearing in the title or body of the speech, but the relationship is not statically significant.

Hypothesis 6 is confirmed. Greater public support for government programs is negatively correlated with the term ‘bureaucrat’ appearing in the title or body of the speech and is statistically significant at the p<0.001 level. A one unit increase in policy mood or general support for government programs decreases the odds of having the term ‘bureaucrat’ appear in the title or body of the speech by .9.

Regarding the control variables, having a Republican majority in the House or the Senate was negatively correlated with the term ‘bureaucrat’ appearing in the title or body of congressional speeches, however, the relationship was not statistically significant. Lastly, proceedings that take place in the House are positively correlated with the term ‘bureaucrat’ appearing in the title or body of congressional speeches, and is statistically significant at the p<0.001 level. Proceedings that take place in the House have a 1.7 higher odds of having the term ‘bureaucrat’ appear in the title or body of congressional speeches than proceedings that take place in the Senate.
Conclusion

Members of congress often refer to public employees as bureaucrats in an attempt to evoke negative images of public employees and gain support for efforts to minimize the role of government in society. Given that casting public employees in a negative light is thought to undermine the public’s support for government employees and the agencies for which they work (Barth, 2010; Garrett et al., 2006; Haque, 1998), it is important to understand what factors increase the odds that members of congress will refer to public employees as bureaucrats versus
using other more positive terms such as civil servant,' 'government worker,' and 'public employee.' This paper sought to answer that question.

The results show that discussions of welfare, the environment, health care, education, regulation, and taxes each increase the likelihood that term ‘bureaucrat/s’ will be invoked. These findings suggest that public support for government employees and government agencies that work in these policy domains is likely tenuous given that discussions of the aforementioned policies areas are at an elevated risk of verbal slights from members of congress. Research by Liu, Horsley, and Yang (2012) provides some important insights regarding how government agencies can overcome negative media coverage which will likely be useful to government employees that work in these policy domains.

Liu et al. (2012) collected survey data from 881 government and business communications officials to understand how communication impacts media coverage. The authors found that for government communication officials’, media interaction, cross department support for communication, and an adequate budget for communication were all positively correlated with positive news coverage. Therefore, government agencies that work in welfare, the environment, health care, education, regulation, and taxes should consider increasing their commitment to the aforementioned actions in order to protect public support for their agencies and for their workers in the face of verbal slights from members of congress.

Ceremonial proceedings such as tributes, remembrances, memorials, and congratulatory ceremonies are at a lower risk of evoking usage of the term ‘bureaucrat’ which elucidates the importance of these ceremonies for supporting a positive image of public employees. Furthermore, congressional speeches regarding defense and social security are also at a lower risk of evoking usage of the term ‘bureaucrat’ which is likely a consequence of these policy
being distributive policies rather than redistributive policies. Redistributive policies are theorized to evoke conflict given that they take from one group and give to another, whereas distributive policies are theorized to foster an environment of compromise given that no groups are made worse off as a result of distributive policies (Lowi, 1972).

Usage of the term bureaucrat appears to be responsive to public opinion, the term is evoked less when support for government programs is increasing. This finding suggests that members of congress are responsive to public opinion and attempt to reign in government programs when support for them decreases by making greater references to public employees as bureaucrats. Conversely, when public support for government programs increases members of congress refer to government employees using more positive nouns. This findings seems to corroborate a large body of evidence that has found that elected officials are responsive to public opinion (Burstein, 2003; Manza & Cook, 2002; Shapiro, 2011).

Having a Republican majority in the House or Senate was negatively correlated with the likelihood of the term bureaucrat being invoked, but was not statistically significant. One explanation for the negative correlation between having a Republican majority in the House or Senate and usage of the term bureaucrat is that Republicans call public employees bureaucrats less often when they are in power because they shoulder greater blame for bureaucratic missteps. This finding provides tentative support for the idea that the image of public employees is more vulnerable when Republicans are not in charge of the House or the Senate, and thus, public employees should make greater efforts to demonstrate their impact during these times.

Lastly, proceedings that take place in the House have a higher likelihood of evoking the term ‘bureaucrat’ than proceedings in the Senate. This findings seems to cohere with other research which has found that the Senate is more civil in its deliberations than the House
(Uslaner, 1996, 2004). Therefore, if government employees are to improve their image, it appears that the strongest appeals need to be made to members of the House rather than to members of the Senate.

This paper is not without limitations. Given that the data are analyzed in a cross-sectional fashion, causal claims cannot be made from these findings. In future work, I plan to turn these data into a time series analysis, in which I estimate which factors predict the ratio of times the term ‘bureaucrat’ is evoked each quarter, versus 'civil servant,' 'government worker,' or ‘public employee.’ Overall, however, this paper provides key insights regarding the conditions under which the term ‘bureaucrat/s’ is used in the Congressional Record versus the terms ‘public employee/s,’ ‘government employee/s,’ or ‘civil servant/s.’ The aforementioned information is important because such information can help identify which government workers and which government agencies are most at risk of losing public support and when.
Chapter 4: Literature on the Effects of Bashing

Although scholars, practitioners, and the press have long hypothesized that bureaucrat-bashing negatively affects the morale of public employees and undermines citizens’ support for them, there is little evidence to support this claim. The paucity of empirical research on this topic is due to the fact that scholars have struggled to define, measure, and link bureaucrat-bashing to outcomes. Although bureaucrat-bashing is defined differently by different scholars, all agree that it includes negative comments about public employees (Garrett et al., 2006; C. T. Goodsell, 2000; Romzek, 2000). I define bureaucrat-bashing as verbal and non-verbal forms of communication that challenge the work ethic, competence, accountability, and/or motives of a subgroup of public employees. I choose this definition because it coheres with definitions proffered by other scholars, yet provides greater clarity so that bureaucrat-bashing can be measured and linked to outcomes.

Some of the most direct evidence we have about the effects of bureaucrat-bashing on public employees’ morale comes from Garrett et al. (2006). Garrett et al. (2006) conducted focus groups with 31 current and former senior federal executives to explore how they perceive bureaucracy bashing, and to assess its consequences on the morale and performance of government workers. The authors distinguish between two types of bureaucracy bashing: substantive bashing and “meaningless rhetoric.” They define substantive bashing as “bashing as a means to an end, such as criticizing bureaucrats as an example of why the U.S. Departments of Education and Energy should be abolished” (p.229). They describe “meaningless rhetoric” as vague criticisms of bureaucracy that are functionally and programmatically meaningless, “such as Ronald Reagan's promise to get government ‘off people's backs’” (p. 229).
The authors found that regardless of the type, bureaucracy bashing produces “frustration and hostility from senior managers toward political candidates, political appointees, and the media” (Garrett et al., 2006, p. 232). The participants reported that “bashing adversely affects policy implementation through low morale, poor recruitment, and training and by fostering an environment of distrust toward bureaucracy” (Garrett et al., 2006, p. 232). While Garrett, Thurber et al.’s (2006) research offers insights that are useful to the study of bureaucrat-bashing, it is difficult to make causal claims based on their research due to their qualitative research design.

Jahan and Shahan (2012) examined the effects of bureaucracy bashing on public service motivation in Bangladesh, through interviews with “50 senior, mid- and entry-level bureaucrats, 15 academics (who work on the administrative system of the country) and 100 prospective candidates who were thinking about entering into the job market” (p.277). The authors used the same definition of bureaucracy bashing as Garrett et al. (2006). Based on their interviews with government bureaucrats, prospective government bureaucrats, and academics, Jahan and Shahan (2012) concluded that bureaucracy bashing in Bangladesh is mostly meaningless rhetoric and that it lowers the public service motivation of government employees.

While it is difficult to make causal claims based on this research due to its qualitative research design, Jahan and Shahn’s findings seem to corroborate Garrett, Thurber et al.’s (2006) findings that bureaucracy bashing lowers employee morale among government employees. While bureaucracy bashing and bureaucrat-bashing are similar concepts the effects of the two phenomena on government employees may be different. Bureaucracy bashing focuses more on criticisms of bureaucracy as an institution or system than on criticisms of bureaucrats as individuals. Given the more personal nature of bureaucrat-bashing, it may yield more severe
consequences. Consequently, research that examines the effects of bureaucrat-bashing, specifically, is needed.

Johnson (2010, 2012) studied the relationship between bureaucrat-bashing and public employee morale, however, she used the term government bashing, while maintaining the conventional understanding of bureaucrat-bashing. Johnson (2010) defines government bashing as the extent to which government workers perceive that the press, citizens, and politicians complain about their department or agency.

Johnson (2010) examined what factors are correlated with public service motivation among city planners in the United States through the use of survey data and regression analysis. She included a control for government bashing and found that government bashing is negatively correlated with the attraction to policy making dimension of public service motivation at the .10 level. The commitment to public interest/civic duty dimension did not reach statistical significance nor did the overall measure of public service motivation. It is important interpret these findings with caution given that the Cronbach’s alpha for the public service motivation scale was .49, well below the recommended level of .70 or higher.

In a follow-up article, Johnson (2012) drew upon data from her (2010) study to take another look at what factors are correlated with public service motivation among U.S. city planners, using regression analysis. In this follow-up study, however, she included additional predictor variables to assess whether city planners’ perceived role (i.e. technical, political, and/or facilitator) influences their level of public service motivation. Johnson again included a control for government bashing and found that neither public service motivation, nor its two sub-dimensions—attraction to policymaking and commitment to public interest/civic duty—were correlated with government bashing at a statistically significant level. Given that the Cronbach’s
alpha for the public service motivation scale was .49 in this study, as it was in the previous one, these findings should be interpreted with caution. All in all, the two aforementioned studies provide some theoretical reason to believe that bureaucrat-bashing lowers public service motivation, but offer no quantitative proof.

Given that both of the studies used measures of public service motivation that lacked internal consistency, additional research is needed. Furthermore, both studies employed cross-sectional data which makes it impossible to draw causal claims from these studies. Therefore, additional research is needed, using panel data or an experimental research design.

All in all, the literature on the effects of bureaucrat-bashing is quite thin. Furthermore, the studies that do exist on this topic employ research designs that are unfit for making causal claims. That being said, there are clear reasons to hypothesize that bureaucrat-bashing negatively affects the morale of public employees and diminishes citizens’ support for public employees, based on theories from the management literature. These theories will be discussed in empirical essays five and six below.
Chapter 5: The Effects of Bureaucrat-Bashing On Citizens’ Support for Public Employees

In this essay I examine whether the bureaucrat-bashing of public school teachers affects citizens’ support for public school teachers. Public school teachers are an important case study for understanding the effects of bureaucrat-bashing, for three main reasons.

First, public school teachers are bureaucrats. Goodsell (2003) defines bureaucrats simply as “civilian government employees” (p. 84). Second, public school teachers are often accused of exhibiting qualities that are stereotypical of bureaucrats. Bureaucrats are often portrayed as lazy, unaccountable, selfish, and/or incompetent (Baldwin, 1990; Christensen & Lægreid, 2005; Hubbell, 1991; Montgomery, 1979; Van de Walle, 2004; Wright, 2001). Scholars and journalists writing about the teaching profession often claim that public school teachers are subject to similar stereotypes. Dana Goldstein notes this in her bestselling book, The Teacher Wars, writing, “Today the ineffective tenured teacher has emerged as a feared character, a vampiric type who sucks tax dollars into her bloated pension health care plans, without much regard for the children under her care” (Goldstein, 2014, p. 4).

In light of such negative stereotypes, public school teachers are often distrusted by the public. As the public signals greater distrust towards public school teachers, elected officials take greater authority over how public school teachers do their jobs (Wilson, 1989). The more public school teachers lose authority over their profession, the more their work is bound by rules and regulations. As a consequence, public school teachers fit another stereotype of bureaucrats: being driven by rules and procedures rather than by the individualized concerns of their clients (Wilson, 1989).
Third, public school teachers have a sizable impact on society. Public school teachers are the largest subcategory of public employees with nearly 3.1 million\(^5\) public school teachers nationwide. Uniformed military personnel represent the second largest subcategory of public employees with nearly 1.5 million\(^6\) uniformed military personnel worldwide, a little less than half the number of public school teachers. Additionally, elementary and secondary education represent the largest expenditure for state and local government with 21.9\% of state and local general expenditures going to elementary and secondary education\(^7\). The second and third largest categories of state and local general expenditures are public welfare, which represents 18.8\% of spending, and higher education, which represents just 10\% of spending\(^8\).

Public school teachers’ importance is apparent in the high volume of well-regarded texts using them as a case study for understanding bureaucratic behavior and public administration more broadly. *Bureaucracy* by James Q. Wilson, *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services* by Michael Lipsky, and *Cops, Teachers, Counselors: Stories from the Front Lines of Public Service* by Steven Williams Maynard-Moody and Michael Craig Musheno, are just a few among many publications that examine public school teachers as a means to understand bureaucratic behavior.

**Hypotheses and Foundational Theories**

Given that the literature on the effects of bureaucrat-bashing is thin, it is unclear whether bureaucrat-bashing will affect citizens’ attitudes towards public employees. I explore two competing hypotheses below. First, I hypothesize that bureaucrat-bashing will not affect


\(^8\) Ibid.
citizens’ attitudes towards public employees, and I provide theories from the literature to substantiate this claim. Second, I hypothesize that bureaucrat-bashing will reduce citizens’ support for public employees, and I substantiate this claim with theory.

**Reasons Bureaucrat-Bashing May Not Affect Citizens’ Attitudes**

Bureaucrat-bashing may not affect citizens’ attitudes towards public employees for three main reasons. First, “people tend to resist arguments that are inconsistent with their political predispositions, but they do so only to the extent that they perceive a relationship between the message and their predispositions” (Bartle, 1997, 2000; Hobolt, 2005; Palmer & Duch, 2001; Zaller, 1992, p. 44). Zaller calls this the resistance axiom (Zaller, 1992). If people are predisposed to view public school teachers favorably, then they will resist messages that cast teachers in a negative light, if they are able to connect the message with their predispositions about teachers.

Second, “individuals, especially well-informed ones, may possess large stores of preexisting considerations…so that even if some new considerations…are internalized, their effects will be swamped out by the effects of previously formed considerations” (Claassen, 2011; Huo, 2005; Zaller, 1992, p. 121). Zaller terms this the inertial resistance axiom (Zaller, 1992). Even if citizens internalize the bashing of public school teachers, the effects of the bashing will be washed out by the effects of citizens’ preexisting thoughts about public school teachers, should they have them.

Third, an individual’s willingness to accept a message is dependent in part upon the perceived credibility of the source (James & Petersen, 2017; James & Van Ryzin, 2017; Pornpitakpan, 2004). Therefore, if the bashing of public school teachers comes from a source that an individual believes lacks credibility, that individual will not internalize the message. This finding is important given that if few Americans view politicians as honest or ethical, politicians
may not be viewed as a credible source as a consequence. A 2012 Gallup poll asked a representative sample of Americans to rate the honesty and ethics of members of congress, senators, and state governors. Only 20 percent of the respondents rated state governors as very high or high in honesty and ethics, only 14 percent rated senators as very high or high in honesty and ethics, and only 10 percent rated members of congress as very high or high in honesty and ethics ("Congress Retains Low Honesty Rating," 2012).

Americans generally have more favorable views of the ‘American people’ in the aggregate than they do of politicians. A 2016 Gallup poll asked a representative sample of Americans to rate how much trust they have in the ‘American people’ and ‘politicians.’ Fifty-six percent of respondents stated that they have a great deal or fair amount of trust in the ‘American people,’ whereas only forty-two percent of respondents stated that they have a great deal or fair amount of trust in ‘politicians’ ("Americans' Trust in Political Leaders, Public at New Lows," 2016). Therefore, bashing that comes from citizens might be viewed as providing more credible information than bashing that comes from politicians.

Based on the three theories outlined above, several factors increase the likelihood that bureaucrat-bashing will affect an individuals’ attitudes. First, the message of bashing must not be incongruent with the individuals’ preexisting beliefs. Second, the individual must be able to connect the message with their attitudes towards the subject (in this case, public school teachers). Third, the individual must not have large stores of preexisting beliefs or considerations about the message. Lastly, the message must come from a source that the individual views as credible. If any of these conditions are not met, bureaucrat-bashing is less likely to affect an individual’s attitudes.
Reasons Bureaucrat-Bashing May Affect Citizens Attitudes

Conversely, there are also reasons to posit that the bureaucrat-bashing of public school teachers will reduce support for public school teachers. I hypothesize that bureaucrat-bashing signals to the public that public school teachers are performing poorly, and consequently, citizens’ reduce their support for public school teachers. This hypothesis is based on micro-performance theory, which posits that bad performance by bureaucrats reduces support for bureaucrats (Van de Walle & Bouckaert, 2003). Numerous studies have found statistically significant relationships between bureaucratic performance and attitudes towards bureaucrats (C. J. Anderson & Tverdova, 2003; B. Brown & Reed Benedict, 2002; Houston, Aitalieva, Morelock, & Shults, 2016; Van Ryzin, 2011).

C. J. Anderson and Tverdova (2003), for example, used data from the 1996 International Social Survey Program (ISSP) to determine what factors affect citizens’ trust in civil servants across 16 democracies. In line with their hypothesis, the authors found that countries with higher levels of corruption were less trusting of civil servants. Thus, Anderson and Tverdova’s (2003) research provides some evidence that bureaucratic performance, as measured by country-level measures of corruption, affects citizens’ attitudes towards civil servants.

Van Ryzin (2011) built on the work of C. J. Anderson and Tverdova (2003) by developing two more sophisticated measures of bureaucratic performance—process performance and outcomes performance—and assessing their relative influence on trust in civil servants across 33 nations. Assessments of process performance and outcomes performance were measured at the individual level and the country level based on data from the 2006 ISSP, the 2006 World Bank Governance Indicators, and the 2006 UN Human Development Index.

Van Ryzin (2011) found that process performance was positively correlated with citizens’ trust in civil servants in every model, whether measured at the individual level or the
country level. Outcomes performance was positively correlated with citizens’ trust in civil servants in every model except one. Furthermore, Van Ryzin (2011) found that process performance had a larger effect than outcomes performance in nearly every model.

These findings provide three important insights. First, they indicate that processes performance and outcomes performance affect citizens’ attitudes towards civil servants, not only corruption. Second, these results provide evidence that individual-level measures of bureaucratic performance effect citizens’ attitudes towards civil servants and not simply country-level measures. Third, these findings also suggest that process performance has a greater effect on citizens’ attitudes towards civil servants than outcomes performance.

Houston et al. (2016) built on the work of C. J. Anderson and Tverdova (2003) and Van Ryzin (2011) by assessing what factors correlate with trust in civil servants, using a broader range of individual-level and national-level variables than preceding authors. Houston et al. (2016) used data from 2006 ISSP, the 2006 World Bank Governance Indicators, and the 2006 Corruption Perception Index to assess what factors correlate with trust in civil servants across 21 North American and European countries. The authors included one measure of bureaucratic performance at the individual level, perceptions of government efficacy, and two measures of bureaucratic performance at the country level: government effectiveness based on the World Bank’s Government Effectiveness Indicator, and corruption based on the Corruption Perception Index. In their full model, which included all of the individual-level and country-level variables and demonstrated the best model fit, two of the three measures of bureaucratic performance were statistically significant, corruption and perceptions of government efficacy. Corruption was negatively correlated with trust in civil servants and perceptions of government efficacy were positively correlated with trust in civil servants. These findings are noteworthy given that
Houston et al. (2016) included more individual-level and national-level variables than C. J. Anderson and Tverdova (2003) and Van Ryzin (2011).

The results from the aforementioned three studies are limited by the fact that they drew upon cross-sectional data and thus do not permit drawing causal conclusions. Furthermore, all three studies used a single survey item to measure citizens’ trust in civil servants, which is problematic given that “single item measures suffer in terms of reliability and precision” in comparison to multi-item measures (Houston et al., 2016, p. 1212). Despite these limitations, these studies still provide tentative evidence that bureaucratic performance affects citizens’ attitudes towards civil servants.

There is also a fairly robust literature that examines how the performance of specific types of bureaucrats, namely police officers, affects attitudes towards them. B. Brown and Reed Benedict (2002), for example, reviewed “findings from more than 100 articles on perceptions of and attitudes towards the police” and concluded that “most research indicates that positive contact with the police improves perceptions of the police, while negative contact has the opposite effect” (pgs. 543 & 551). Brown and Reed Benedict’s (2002) conclusions provide further evidence that attitudes towards bureaucrats are influenced by bureaucratic performance.

Unfortunately, to my knowledge, no literature exists that examines the relationship between teacher performance and attitudes towards teachers. However, given that there is a robust relationship between bureaucratic performance and attitudes towards bureaucrats, there is strong reason to believe that such a relationship exists for teachers as well.

**Bashing and Debates Regarding Public Education**

In the analysis below I assess whether two different types of bashing—bashing of public school teachers by citizens and by elected officials—affects citizens’ attitudes regarding the following five outcomes: (1) support for merit pay for public school teachers, (2) support for a
salary increase for public school teachers, (3) support for teacher tenure, (4) the likelihood that citizens’ would recommend a career as a public school teacher to a close friend or family member, and (5) the perceived prestige of public school teachers. I chose these five issues because they are central to debates regarding public education. In the sections below, I briefly contextualize each of these five topics and I explain why they are central to current public discourse regarding public education.

**Merit Pay**

Merit pay for teachers is a performance-based reward in which a portion of teachers’ pay is based on student performance and/or classroom observation (Harvey-Beavis, 2003). Merit pay for teachers “was introduced after World War I, but most plans disappeared during the depression in the 1930s” (McCollum, 2001, p. 21). Merit pay schemes surged again in popularity following two major events: the Russian launch of Sputnik in 1957, and the release of the report *A Nation at Risk* in 1983 by President Ronald Reagan's National Commission on Excellence in Education (McCollum, 2001).

The successful launch of Sputnik increased concern regarding the quality of science education, and public education more broadly, and many leaders within public education viewed merit pay as a tool for improving public education in the United States and building a competitive advantage over the Soviet Union (McCollum, 2001). *A Nation at Risk*, on the other hand, directly endorsed merit pay for teachers recommending that “teacher salaries be ‘professionally competitive, market-sensitive, and performance-based’” (McCollum, 2001, p. 22).

Americans are quite supportive of the general idea of merit pay. A nationally representative poll of the American public in 2016 found that 60 percent of the public favors “basing part of the salaries of teachers on how much their students learn” (Peterson, Henderson,
Moreover, both Republicans and Democrats show strong support for merit pay with 67% of Republicans favoring merit pay as compared to 57% among Democrats (Peterson et al., 2017).

Although the American public strongly supports the general idea of merit pay, few school districts have implemented merit pay schemes. A recent study found that a mere 3.5 percent of school districts nationwide employ any type of performance pay plan for teachers (Buck & Greene, 2011). The low implementation rate of merit pay among public school teachers is due in large part to resistance from teachers and public sector unions. A nationally representative poll of public school teachers in the U.S. taken in 2016 found that just 20% of public school teachers favored merit pay (Peterson et al., 2017).

Though most public school teachers disapprove of merit pay, recent presidents, including Presidents George W. Bush, Barack Obama, and Donald Trump, have endorsed merit pay systems given their popularity among the American public and given the popularity of the broader teacher accountability movement. Thus, although few school districts have adopted merit pay systems and few public school teachers support merit pay, support for merit pay among political leaders at the highest levels keeps the issue at the forefront of current debates about public education.

**Teacher Salaries**

In public opinion polls, Americans display strong support for raising teacher salaries. A nationally representative poll in 2016 found that 65 percent of the public favors raising the salaries of public school teachers (Peterson et al., 2017). Support for raising teachers’ salaries is generally higher among the following groups: teachers versus non teachers, non-homeowners versus homeowners, younger Americans versus older Americans, Democrats versus Republicans, Blacks versus Whites, and Hispanics versus Whites (Peterson, Henderson, & West,
Those who approve of raising the salaries of teachers generally present three main arguments in support of their position.

First, teachers’ salaries are lower than the average salary of similarly educated workers. A recent report by the OECD found that in the United States “teachers’ salaries’ are between 57% and 61% of the average salaries of similarly-educated workers” (OECD, 2016, p. 6). Given both the importance of education for numerous social indicators, and the fact that women are overrepresented in the teaching profession (76 percent of public school teachers are female9), some argue that the comparatively low salaries of public school teachers are the result of gender discrimination.

In fact, gender bias motivated the integration of women into the teaching profession in the first place, a profession originally dominated by males. Large numbers of women were hired as teachers during the 1820’s as a “money-saving strategy for state and local governments” given that cultural and legal norms allowed women to be paid considerably less than men (Goldstein, 2014, p. 21). Minimizing the cost of public education was particularly important during this time, given that the prospect of raising taxes to fund public education, or any public program, was a radical idea in light of the recent American Revolution (Goldstein, 2014).

Second, many support higher teacher salaries based on the belief that offering competitive salaries is important for attracting talent to the profession. Several studies have found that the comparatively low pay of teachers relative to alternative professions affects the likelihood that college graduates will choose teaching as a profession (Bacolod, 2007; Chevalier, Dolton, & McIntosh, 2007; Manski, 1987). This effect is particularly pronounced among persons who scored well on college entrance exams and/or attended selective institutions, given

9 https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=28
that they generally have more employment opportunities than others (Bacolod, 2007). Therefore, offering a higher salary can increase the quality of teachers joining the profession, as measured by standardized test scores and the selectivity of the institutions from which teachers earned their degree, so long as those meeting such criteria are offered jobs at a higher rate than those who do not.

Third, many support raising the salaries of public school teachers based on the belief that raising teachers’ salaries will keep teachers from leaving the profession. Several studies have found that teachers turnover at a lower rate when they are paid more and/or are more satisfied with their pay (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Grissom, Viano, & Selin, 2016; Imazeki, 2005; Kersaint, Lewis, Potter, & Meisels, 2007; Stinebrickner, 1998; Weiss, 1999). Moreover, the effect of teacher salaries on teacher turnover is likely to be more pronounced for highly effective teachers than for less effective teachers for three main reasons: (1) Highly effective teachers likely have more attractive job opportunities outside of teaching than less effective teachers, (2) “More effective teachers who leave the profession have higher earnings in their new occupations,” and (3) “There is…some evidence that high-performing teachers are more likely to move into educational leadership positions” (Grissom et al., 2016, p. 246).

Given the importance of teacher salaries for gender equity and for the recruitment and retention of teachers, higher salaries remain central to current debates about public education.

**Teacher Tenure**

Teacher tenure is often misunderstood as a job guarantee. However, as Thomsen (2014) notes, “teacher tenure is…not a job guarantee. Rather, it’s a job security device protecting against termination of employment in cases where there are no grounds for termination or where the teacher has no fair opportunity to present a defense” (p.4). Teacher tenure laws generally come with two provisions, “[1] Continuing employment (i.e. contract renewal) for teachers who
Teacher tenure has a long history in the United States with teachers in New Jersey being the first to win tenure rights in 1909. During the early twentieth century teacher tenure was supported by a diverse coalition of “union leaders, school reformers, and intellectuals” who viewed tenure as a tool for eradicating “politically influenced teacher appointments” (Goldstein, 2014, p. 85). However, by the late 1960’s education reform advocates began to express concerns that teacher tenure policies were protecting too many bad teachers from termination (Goldstein 2014). Goldstein (2014) notes that during the late 1960’s, “one of the most cited statistics by supporters of community control was that over a five-year period in the mid-1960’s only 12 out of 55,000 teachers in New York City were fired for cause” (p. 148). Even members of the local teachers union believed that “there were more than 12 bad tenured teachers” (Goldstein, 2014, p. 148).

Scrutiny of teacher tenure has only increased since the late 1960’s, as a result of declining support for public sector unions and louder calls to hold teachers accountable for student performance. A nationally representative poll of the American public in 2016 found that just 31 percent of the public favors giving tenure to teachers (Peterson et al., 2017). Support for teacher tenure is generally higher among the following groups: teachers versus non-teachers, non-homeowners versus homeowners, younger Americans versus older Americans, Democrats versus Republicans, Blacks versus Whites, and Hispanics versus Whites (Peterson et al., 2014).

Furthermore, historically, “teachers have been awarded tenure virtually automatically, after a few years (usually three or less) on the job,” however, an increasing number of states are requiring that teacher tenure decisions be tied to teacher performance (Jacobs et al., 2015, p. iv).
In 2009, no states had such policies, but by 2015, 23 states had them (Jacobs et al., 2015). Given that support for teacher tenure is low and yet the majority of states award teacher tenure virtually automatically, many politicians champion ending or curtailing teacher tenure as a means to gain popular support. The efforts of these political entrepreneurs keeps the issue of teacher tenure at the forefront of debates regarding public education.

**Recommended a Career as A Public School Teacher**

Attracting talent into the teaching profession is important given that scholars have found that teachers have a long-lasting impact on students’ socioeconomic outcomes (Chetty, Friedman, & Rockoff, 2011, 2014). Chetty et al. (2014) were able to estimate the impact of teachers on students’ outcomes later in life by “linking information from an administrative dataset on students and teachers…with selected data from United States tax records” (p. 2634). The authors used the value-added (VA) approach which “evaluate[s] teachers based on their impacts on students’ test scores” (p. 2633). Chetty et al. (2014) were able to “track approximately one million individuals from elementary school into early adulthood” and found that “students assigned to high-VA teachers are more likely to attend college, earn higher salaries, and are less likely to have children as teenagers” (p. 2633-2634).

One action that might help increase the number of talented public school teachers is to increase the number of people willing to recommend a career as a teacher to others. A series of opinion polls conducted by the professional organization for educators, Phi Delta Kappa (PDK), provides some important insights regarding the willingness of Americans’ to encourage others to pursue a career in teaching.

In 2011, PDK fielded a nationally representative survey that asked Americans the following question:
“Suppose the brightest person you know said he or she would like to be a teacher. What would you most likely do: Encourage that person, discourage that person, or suggest that he or she consider other fields before deciding?” (Bushaw & Lopez, 2011, p. 10).

Seventy-four percent of respondents stated that they would encourage that person to be a teacher, twenty-three percent stated that they would suggest a different field, only two percent stated they would discourage that person from becoming a teacher, and one percent stated that they didn’t know or refused (Bushaw & Lopez, 2011).

Very similar results were found when the same question was asked by PDK in May of 1996. Seventy-three percent, stated that they would encourage that person to become a teacher (Bushaw & Lopez, 2011). Teachers, however, were less likely than the general public to state that they would encourage that person to become a teacher, with only 46 percent of teachers registering that response (Langdon, 1996). Furthermore, teachers were more likely than the general public to state that they would discourage that person from becoming a teacher with eight percent of teachers registering that response versus two percent among the general public (Langdon, 1996). Lastly, teachers were more likely than the general public to state they would suggest a different field, 42 percent of teachers registered that response versus 23 percent among the general public. It is important to note, however, that the sample size of the aforementioned poll was relatively small, consisting of just 510 respondents.

Although the 1996 PDK poll employed a small sample size, a survey of public school teachers from the state of Georgia seems to give credence to the PDK poll’s finding that teachers are reluctant to recommend their profession to others. In November of 2015, the Georgia Department of Education fielded a short survey to Georgia public school teachers, and one of the questions asked teachers the following, “If you had a student about to graduate from high school, how likely would you be to encourage teaching as a profession?” (Owens, 2015, p. 2).
Approximately 70 percent of teachers “answered that they are either unlikely or very unlikely to encourage graduates to pursue teaching” (Owens, 2015, p. 2).

While teachers and members of the general public would be expected to differ in their likelihood of encouraging others to pursue a career in teaching, polling data suggest that Americans without children in public schools do not differ from Americans with children in public schools on this question (Database). Results from a PDK poll conducted in August of 1996 found that there was only a two percent difference between adults without children in school, adults with children in public schools, and adults with children in non-public schools on how likely they would be to encourage the brightest person they know to become a teacher, if they were interested (Database). Seventy-two percent of public school parents said that they would encourage that person to become a teacher versus 74 percent among both adults without children in school and adults with children in non-public schools (Database).

Given that “college graduates with higher measured academic ability [are] less likely to enter teaching than…other graduates” and given that teachers impact students’ long-term socioeconomic outcomes, efforts to recruit more people into the teaching profession are of great interest to practitioners and policymakers (Guarino, Santibanez, & Daley, 2006, p. 200).

Perceived Prestige

Perceived prestige is generally defined as what an individual believes others think about a profession (T. J. Brown, Dacin, Pratt, & Whetten, 2006). Surveys are the main way scholars investigate how the public rates the prestige of various professions. In 2015, for example, The Harris Poll asked a representative sample of Americans to state how much prestige they find in a variety of occupations. Sixty-five percent of respondents stated that being a teacher has a great deal of prestige, a higher percentage than said for lawyers, entrepreneurs, accountants, and
business executives\textsuperscript{10}. Yet, being a teacher was rated less prestigious than being a doctor, scientist, military officer, nurse, or police officer, for example\textsuperscript{11}.

The Standard International Occupational Prestige Scales (SIOPS) is another tool that has been used to measure occupational prestige, based on data from 85 studies of occupational prestige from 60 countries (Hargreaves, 2009). SIOPS accumulated data on occupational prestige in 1977 and 1996, and the occupation prestige score assigned to teaching was consistent over the two time periods (Hargreaves, 2009). The occupational prestige score for teachers was “relatively high compared with other public service occupations (nursing, social work, police) but lower than the major professions (medicine, law and architecture)” (Hargreaves, 2009, p. 219).

Hoyle (2001) contends that three broad factors work to depress the prestige of teachers. First, the sheer size of the number of pupils that need to be taught enhances the size of the profession. The size of the teaching profession, along with the fact most teachers are financed by the public purse, serves to constrain the salaries of teachers (Hoyle, 2001). Constraints on the salaries of teachers negatively affect the quality of those entering the teaching profession. The quality and skillset of teachers influences perceptions regarding the prestige of the profession.

Second, Hoyle (2001) argues that the nature of the relationship between teachers and their pupils is unique in ways that damage the prestige of the profession. For example, teachers must grapple with an “ever-present need to maintain control [of their classroom], and the consequences of even the partial loss of control” weaken the prestige of the profession (Hoyle, 2001). Furthermore, pupils eventually leave their teachers behind, and forever associate them “with their childhood rather than their adulthood” (Hargreaves, 2009, p. 222).

\textsuperscript{10}http://media.theharrispoll.com/documents/Prestigious\_Occupations\_Data\_Tables.pdf
\textsuperscript{11}http://media.theharrispoll.com/documents/Prestigious\_Occupations\_Data\_Tables.pdf
Third, Hoyle (2001) contends that “the goals of education are diverse and diffuse” which serves to lower the prestige of teachers since “specialization is still the dominant source of prestige” (p. 141).

Clearly, the prestige of teaching as a profession is relevant to teacher recruitment and retention. One of the most oft-repeated ideas for raising the prestige of teachers is to increase teacher pay, given that the other elements of Hoyle’s (2001) model are more difficult to modify.

**Research Design**

I conducted a survey experiment to test both the effects of bashing and the effects of praise on citizens’ attitudes towards public school teachers. I chose to examine the effects of both bashing and praise on citizens’ attitudes, not solely bashing, because both phenomena exist in the ‘real world,’ and thus understanding both types of responses allows for a richer and more precise analysis.

I chose to employ a survey experiment to examine my research question because “experimental designs provide a solution to the problem of endogeneity” (Bouwman & Grimmelikhuijsen, 2016, p. 111). Endogeneity may stem from a variety of causes that are all too common in observational studies, including omitted variable bias, two-way causation, selection effects, and common method bias (Bouwman & Grimmelikhuijsen, 2016; Druckman, Green, Kuklinski, & Lupia, 2006). In fact, concerns regarding common method bias have yielded a flurry of articles over the past decade in the public administration literature, aiming to assess and address this threat (Favero & Bullock, 2015; Jakobsen & Jensen, 2015; Meier & O’Toole, 2013). The number of articles in public administration and political science using an experimental approach has increased dramatically over the past decade, due in part to increased concern regarding the problem of endogeneity (Druckman et al., 2006; Grimmelikhuijsen, Jilke, Olsen, & Tummers, 2017).
Participants in my survey experiment were randomly assigned to a control group or to a treatment group, in which subjects read one of four statements regarding public school teachers. The four statements vary along two dimensions: (1) the actor making the statement, and (2) the tone of the statement made by the actor. The actor making the statement was defined as either ‘elected officials’ or local ‘citizens.’ The tone of the statement was either ‘praise’ or ‘bashing.’ Each treatment group read statements with information that was untrue and made up by the author. Table 3 below details the study’s experimental conditions.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Tone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Praise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Officials</td>
<td>Blame</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The experiment uses a 2×2 factorial design with a control group, resulting in 4 treatment groups plus one control group, for a total of 5 groups. Subjects were randomly assigned to a treatment group or to the control group.

As illustrated in table 3 above, my study contained a total of five experimental groups: 4 treatment groups and one control group. All subjects—both those assigned to one of the treatment groups and those assigned to the control group—began by reading the study information sheet which detailed information regarding eligibility guidelines, the purpose of the study, and procedures for the study. After reading the study information sheet, subjects in the control group proceeded directly to answering questions regarding their opinions towards public school teachers. Subjects in the treatment groups, by contrast, read one of four statements about public school teachers, and then proceeded to answer questions regarding their opinions towards public school teachers. After answering these questions, subjects in the treatment groups received information which detailed the intent of the study and revealed that the statements that
respondents read were untrue and made up by the author. Figure 3 below illustrates the process for both the treatment groups and the control group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read the study information sheet → Read one of 4 statements about public school teachers → Answer questions regarding public school teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read the study information sheet → Answer questions regarding public school teachers → Study reveal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four statements that were randomly assigned to the treatment groups can be found in Appendix A. Each of the four statements began by claiming that “A research team made up of professors from three Ivy League universities recently fielded surveys asking Americans what they have heard (1) ‘citizens in their community’ or (2) ‘elected officials’ say about public school teachers.” The statement went on to say that “Their results show that Americans heard mostly (1) ‘negative’ or (2) ‘positive’ comments about public school teachers from (1) ‘citizens in their community’ or (2) ‘elected officials,’” depending on whether respondents were assigned to the “citizens” or “elected officials” treatment and whether they were assigned to a “bashing” or “praise” condition. The last two sentences of the statements reads as follows “Many respondents reported hearing comments suggesting that public school teachers are (1) ‘lazy, incompetent, unaccountable, and self-serving’ or (2) ‘hardworking, competent, held accountable,
and selfless.’ The results from this study will be published in a forthcoming issue of the American Education Research Journal (AERJ).”

The benefit of this research design is that it refers to elected officials and citizens in a general sense, not to specific elected officials or to specific citizens—given that doing so would make it impossible to discern whether the findings are specific to the particular citizens or elected officials mentioned in the contrived statement. Furthermore, using highly general language about the citizens, elected officials, and Ivy League universities mentioned in the statement makes it more difficult for respondents to determine that the statement that was provided to them is untrue. Another benefit of this research design is that it could easily be applied to other public professions given that there is nothing in the statements that is specific to public school teachers other than the phrase “public school teachers.”

**Dependent Variables**

The entire survey instrument for this study can be found in Appendix B. Five dependent variables were assessed in this study. I measured the first dependent variable, support for merit pay, with the following survey item: “Do you favor or oppose basing the salaries of teachers around the nation, in part, on their students’ academic progress on state tests?” The response options were based on a five-point scale from (1) completely oppose to (5) completely favor.

I measured the second dependent variable, support for raising teachers’ salaries, with the following survey item: “Do you think that salaries for public school teachers in the United States should increase, decrease, or stay about the same?” The response options were based on a five-point scale from (1) greatly decrease to (5) greatly increase.

I measured the third dependent variable, support for teacher tenure, with the following survey item: “Teachers with tenure cannot be dismissed unless a school district follows detailed procedures. Some say that tenure protects teachers from being fired for arbitrary
reasons. Others say that it makes it too difficult to replace ineffective teachers. We want to know what you think of tenure. Do you favor or oppose offering tenure to public school teachers across the country?” The response options were based on a five-point scale from (1) completely oppose to (5) completely favor.

I measured the fourth dependent variable, the likelihood that respondents would recommend a career as a public school teacher to a close friend or family member, with the following survey item: “What are the chances that you would recommend a career as a PUBLIC school teacher to a close family member? You may choose any number from 0 to 100.” Respondents were allowed to choose any number between one and one hundred through sliding a bar to register their answer.

I measured the fifth dependent variable, perceived prestige, using three survey items that read as follows: (1) “In general, others respect public school teachers,” (2) “Generally, public school teachers have a good overall image,” and (3) “Generally, people in this country think highly of public school teachers.” The response options were based on a seven-point scale from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree. The three survey-items demonstrated high internal consistency with a Cronbach’s alpha of α=.95.

Data

I recruited 660 U.S. residents aged 18 and older to participate in the survey experiment, from Amazon.com’s Mechanical Turk, or MTurk as it is commonly known. Recruiting respondents from MTurk for participation in survey experiments is quite common in public administration scholarship (Stritch, Pedersen, & Taggart, 2017), and in the social sciences more broadly (Paolacci & Chandler, 2014), and represents an improvement over college samples which are significantly less diverse than the MTurk pool. Moreover, scholars have found that MTurk workers “appear to be truthful when providing self-report information” and as attentive
when answering questions as respondents from other online samples (Paolacci & Chandler, 2014, p. 186).

Descriptive statistics of my sample can be found in table 4 below. My sample is not representative of the U.S. population, however, representative samples are only necessary when estimating “descriptive population parameters,” not “causal effects,” which is my intention here (Marvel, 2014, p. 717). Nonetheless, my sample is diverse in regards to every demographic category except for race. Lack of racial diversity, unfortunately, is typical in experimental research given that Blacks and Hispanics are underrepresented in online samples (Berinsky, Huber, & Lenz, 2012). Most crucial is that my sample demonstrates diversity of party identification, gender, and parental status, given that I expect the experimental effects to differ within these subgroups.

Prior research has found that women and Democrats are generally more supportive of teachers and public education than are men and Republicans (Berkman & Plutzer, 2005; Peterson et al., 2014). Consequently, I expect women and Democrats to be more receptive to praise statements about teachers and less receptive to bashing statements about teachers than men and Republicans. I also expect the reverse to be true: I anticipate that men and Republicans will be more receptive to bashing statements about teachers and less receptive to praise statements about teachers than women and Democrats.

Regarding gender, my sample is even, with 50 percent of the sample being men and 50 percent being women. Party identification is even as well, with approximately 44 percent of respondents identifying as Democrats, 44 percent identifying as Republicans, and 12 percent identifying with neither party. Lastly, approximately 59 percent of the sample has children under the age of 18, and 41 percent does not.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Party ID</strong></td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Ideology</strong></td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate, middle of the road</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homeowner</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent or Guardian of children under the age of 18</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 or older</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>High School graduate or less</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some college, but no degree (yet)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-year college degree</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-year college degree or more</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Income Range</strong></td>
<td>Under $10k</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10k to $39,999</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$40 to $69,999</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$70k to $99,999</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race / Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial, Some other race, ethnicity, or origin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

I ran an ANOVA model and employed an independent samples t-test in which I compared the control group mean to the treatment group mean for all five independent variables and all four treatment conditions. Figure 4 below displays the results from the question “Do you favor or oppose basing the salaries of teachers around the nation, in part, on their students' academic progress on state tests?” The mean response regarding how much each group favors merit pay for public school teachers is as follows: for the control group a mean of 2.54, for the bashing treatment from citizens a mean of 2.55, for the bashing treatment from elected officials a mean of 2.43, for the praise treatment from citizens a mean of 2.67, and for the praise treatment for elected officials a mean of 2.64.

The group that received a bashing treatment from citizens displayed higher mean support for merit pay than the control group, whereas the group that received a bashing treatment from elected officials displayed lower mean support than the control group. Neither bashing treatment had a statistically significant effect on support for merit pay. Both praise treatment groups displayed higher mean support for merit pay than the control group. However, neither praise treatment had a statistically significant effect on support for merit pay.
Figure 5 below displays the results from the question “Do you think that salaries for public school teachers in the United States should increase, decrease, or stay about the same?” The mean response regarding how much each group favors a salary increase for public school teachers is as follows: for the control group a mean of 4.03, for the bashing treatment from citizens a mean of 3.98, for the bashing treatment from elected officials a mean of 3.93, for the praise treatment from citizens a mean of 3.97, and for the praise treatment from elected officials a mean of 3.99. Both bashing treatment groups displayed lower mean support for a salary increase than the control group, however, neither bashing treatment had a statistically significant effect on support for a salary increase. Both praise treatment groups actually displayed lower mean support for a salary increase than the control group, however, neither praise treatment had a statistically significant effect on support for a salary increase.
Figure 5

![Graph showing Favor a Salary Increase](image)

Note: The control group is the comparison category for all significance tests.  
*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Figure 6 below displays the results from the question “Teachers with tenure cannot be dismissed unless a school district follows detailed procedures. Some say that tenure protects teachers from being fired for arbitrary reasons. Others say that it makes it too difficult to replace ineffective teachers. We want to know what you think of tenure. Do you favor or oppose offering tenure to public school teachers across the country?” The mean response regarding how much each group favors tenure is as follows: for the control group a mean of 2.83, for the bashing treatment from citizens a mean of 2.51, for the bashing treatment from elected officials a mean of 2.77, for the praise treatment from citizens a mean of 2.83, and for the praise treatment from elected officials a mean of 2.71.

Both bashing treatment groups displayed lower mean support for tenure than the control group, however, only the bashing treatment from citizens reached statistical significance (p < .01). Neither praise treatment increased support for tenure. The praise treatment from citizens displayed the same mean support for tenure as the control group, and the praise treatment from
elected officials actually displayed lower mean support for tenure than the control group.

Neither praise treatment had a statistically significant effect on support for tenure.

**Figure 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favor Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bashing From Citizens</td>
<td>2.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bashing From Elected Officials</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise From Citizens</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise From Elected Officials</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The control group is the comparison category for all significance tests.
*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Figure 7 below displays the results from the question “What are the chances that you would recommend a career as a PUBLIC school teacher to a close family member? You may choose any number from 0 to 100.” The mean response regarding the likelihood that each group would recommend a career as a public school teacher is as follows: for the control group a 47% chance, for the bashing treatment from citizens a 38% chance, for the bashing treatment from elected officials a 46% chance, for the praise treatment from citizens a 51% chance, and for the praise treatment from elected officials a 47% chance. Both bashing treatments displayed a lower mean chance that respondents would recommend a career as a public school teacher than the control group, however, only the bashing treatment from citizens reached statistical significance (p < .01). The group that received a praise treatment from citizens displayed a higher mean chance that respondents would recommend a career as a public school teacher than the control
The group that received a praise treatment from elected officials displayed the same mean chance that respondents would recommend a career as a public school teacher as the control group. Neither praise treatment had a statistically significant effect on the chances that respondents would recommend a career as a public school teacher.

**Figure 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Chances of Recommending A Career As A Public School Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bashing From Citizens</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bashing From Elected Officials</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise From Citizens</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise From Elected Officials</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The control group is the comparison category for all significance tests.
*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Figure 8 below displays the results from the following three questions that measure respondents’ perceived prestige of being a public school teacher: (1) “In general, others respect public school teachers;” (2) “Generally, public school teachers have a good overall image,” and (3) “Generally, people in this country think highly of public school teachers.” The mean response regarding the perceived prestige of being a public school teacher for each group is as follows: for the control group 0.02, for the bashing treatment from citizens -0.86, for the bashing treatment from elected officials -0.45, for the praise treatment from citizens 0.72, and for the praise treatment from elected officials 0.57.
Both bashing treatments displayed lower mean values regarding the perceived prestige of being a public school teacher than the control group, and both bashing treatments had a statistically significant effect on respondents’ perceived prestige (p < .001). Both praise treatments displayed higher mean value regarding the perceived prestige of being a public school teacher than the control group, however, neither praise treatment had a statistically significant effect on respondents’ perceived prestige.

### Figure 8

![Perceived Prestige of Being a Public School Teacher](image)

Note: The control group is the comparison category for all significance tests.  
*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table 5 below displays the mean responses and effect sizes for all four treatment groups and all five dependent variables. The praise treatments did not have a statistically significant effect on subjects’ responses to any of the five dependent variables. Conversely, bashing from citizens had a statistically significant effect on three outcomes: support for tenure, the likelihood that respondents would recommend a career as a public school teacher, and respondents perceived prestige of a career as a public school teacher. Bashing from citizens lowered mean responses for all three of the aforementioned dependent variables relative to the control group.
Bashing from elected officials had a statically significant effect on one outcome: respondents’ perceived prestige of a career as a public school teacher. Bashing from elected officials lowered respondents’ perceived prestige of a career as a public school teacher relative to the control group.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group means (Difference in Means Test)</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Bashing Citizens</th>
<th>Bashing Elected Officials</th>
<th>Praise Citizens</th>
<th>Praise Elected Officials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor Merit Pay</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favor Salary Increase</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favor Tenure</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.51** (d=.29)</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend Career</td>
<td>46.68</td>
<td>37.63** (d=.31)</td>
<td>46.28</td>
<td>51.18</td>
<td>47.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Prestige</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-.86*** (d=.98)</td>
<td>-.45*** (d=.54)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The control group is the comparison category for all significance tests. N = 231 Republicans, 278 Democrats. *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

Conclusion

This experiment confirms the idea that bureaucrat-bashing, in this case the bashing of public school teachers has consequences. Bureaucrat-bashing from citizens reduces support for tenure, the likelihood that respondents’ would recommend a career as a public school teacher, and respondents’ perceived prestige of a career as a public school teacher. Bureaucrat-bashing from elected officials reduces respondents’ perceived prestige of a career as a public school teacher. These findings suggest that bureaucrat-bashing may undermine efforts to recruitment and retain to workers in the public sector. Specifically bashing compromises efforts to recruit and retain public school teachers, given that encouraging others to join the teaching profession, and the profession’s perceived prestige, are important motivators.

It is also important to note that bureaucrat-bashing from citizens had a statistically significant effect on more of the dependent variables than did bureaucrat-bashing from elected
officials. As was mentioned in the literature review, Americans are more trusting of the ‘American people’ in the aggregate than they are of ‘politicians.’ The finding that bureaucrat-bashing from citizens has a statistically significant effect on more of the dependent variables than bureaucrat-bashing from elected officials supports source credibility theory.

Neither praise treatment had a statistically significant effect on any of the dependent variables in the study, which suggests the presence of negativity bias—that negative information weighs more heavily on the brain than positive information or neutral information (Ito, Larsen, Smith, & Cacioppo, 1998). My findings here suggest that negativity bias may be distorting the value of public service, specifically the work of public school teachers.

Given that it may be difficult to reduce bureaucrat-bashing, there are several steps that public employees can take to make positive information about their performance more persuasive, so as to counteract negativity bias and enhance support for work in the public sector. First, it is important for public employees to tell stories about successful performance, and not simply to report performance statistics. Research by Olsen (2017) has found that individuals are better able to recall performance information in the form of personalized stories and experiences than in the form of statistics. Second, it is important for public employees to publicize positive performance information, particularly from non-governmental agencies, given that individuals are more doubtful of good performance reported by government agencies themselves than by independent agencies (James & Van Ryzin, 2017). Lastly, it is important for public employees to report comparative performance information, not just reflexive performance information (i.e. year over year) given that research has found that comparative performance information weighs more heavily on individuals judgements of performance than reflexive performance information (Charbonneau & Van Ryzin, 2015).
This survey experiment is not without limitations. First, like most survey experiments, this was a one-shot experiment. Consequently, it is unclear how long the treatment effects will endure. Nonetheless, finding that the bashing of teachers does affect citizens’ attitudes, no matter for how long, is novel and represents a significant contribution in and of itself.

Second, this experiment, as with all experiments, may generate some concerns about external validity. In other words, does this experiment reflect how individuals experience bureaucrat-bashing and bureaucrat praise in real life? I contend that at its core it does. This experiment contains the two core elements of bureaucrat-bashing and bureaucrat praise: (1) an actor making a statement, and (2) a statement that challenges or praises a bureaucrat’s work ethic, accountability, motives, and/or competence. Every instance of bureaucrat-bashing or bureaucrat praise, in real life, contains these two core elements. Thus, this design accurately reflects how people experience bureaucrat-bashing and bureaucrat praise.

Lastly, the statistical power for some of the treatment groups was quite low, far less than the recommended power of .80. Please see Appendix C for a detailed power analysis for all of the experimental conditions. Given that there is no prior literature that quantitatively examines the impact of bureaucrat-bashing, it was extremely difficult, if not impossible, to estimate the proper sample size for each experimental condition prior to embarking on this study. For some of the experimental conditions I can achieve the proper power (.80 or higher) by adding a few hundred more subjects to my study, whereas some of the other experimental conditions require several thousand more respondents to achieve the proper power size.
Chapter 6: The Effects of Bureaucrat Bashing On the Morale of Public Employees

In this essay I assess whether two different types of bashing—bashing of public school teachers by citizens, and by elected officials—affects the morale of public school teachers along the following five dimensions: (1) career commitment; (2) intrinsic motivation; (3) the likelihood that public school teachers would recommend a career as a public school teacher to a close friend or family member; (4) job satisfaction; and (5) job stress. Additionally, I test whether both types of bashing affect teachers’ assessment of the perceived prestige of their own profession.

Hypotheses and Foundational Theories

Given the scant literature, it is unclear whether bureaucrat-bashing affects the morale of public school teachers. Similar to the previous empirical chapter, I examine two competing hypotheses. First, I hypothesize that bureaucrat-bashing does not affect the morale of public school teachers, and I provide theories from the literature to substantiate this claim. Second, I hypothesize that bureaucrat-bashing does affect the morale of public school teachers and I substantiate this claim with theory.

Reasons Bureaucrat-Bashing May Not Affect Employee Morale

Bureaucrat-bashing might not affect the morale of public school teachers for five main reasons. Three of these reasons: (1) the resistance axiom—the idea that “people tend to resist arguments that are inconsistent with their political predispositions” (Zaller, 1992, p. 44); (2) the inertial resistance axiom—the idea that “even if some new considerations…are internalized, their effects will be swamped out by the effects of previously formed considerations” (Zaller, 1992, p. 121); (3) and source credibility theory—the notion that an individual’s willingness to accept a message is dependent in part upon the perceived credibility of the source, are all outlined in the previous chapter, and so, I only briefly note them here.
The two additional arguments are largely subsets of the resistance axiom, meaning that they help explain why individuals—in this case public employees—resist information that is inconsistent with their ideological predispositions. The first theory comes from the work of Daniel Katz, who in his article, “The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes,” argues that the attitudes that individuals maintain can serve a function for the individual (Katz, 1960). Katz lists four functions that our attitudes can serve, and among the four is the ego-defensive function: we may maintain attitudes “to help protect [ourselves] from unflattering truths about [ourselves]” (Glynn, Herbst, Lindeman, O'Keefe, & Shapiro, 2015, p. 145). Therefore, public school teachers may resist negative information about themselves and their work in an effort to protect their ego or self-image. If public school teachers do not change their attitudes about themselves and their work in response to bureaucrat-bashing, then by definition bureaucrat-bashing does not affect their morale.

The second reason that bureaucrat-bashing may not affect teachers’ morale stems from work by Norman Cameron, who in his book, The Psychology of Behavior Disorders, argues that individuals sometimes attribute negative attitudes and behaviors to others when they themselves exhibit those negative attitudes and behaviors (Cameron, 1947). Cameron termed this behavior disowning projection (Cameron, 1947). Public school teachers may resist internalizing messages that they are performing poorly, by attributing the poor performance to other teachers. By blaming other teachers, public school teachers are able to protect their ego and self-image, as well as their sense of morale about their work.

**Reasons Bureaucrat-Bashing May Affect Employee Morale**

Conversely, there is reason to posit that the bureaucrat-bashing of public school teachers does reduce their morale. I hypothesize that the bashing of public school teachers by citizens and by elected officials undermines their perceived prestige, which in turn undermines their
morale. As Carmeli (2005b) notes, “individuals are motivated to maintain and enhance their self-esteem and self-worth” (p. 447). As the perceived prestige of working as a public school teachers increases or decreases, employees’ attachment to the profession subsequently increases or decreases as they try to protect their self-image. Moreover, as demonstrated in the previous chapter, the perceived prestige of public school teachers is variable, which suggests that their morale might vary along with it.

Previous studies have found statistically significant correlations between employees’ perceived prestige of their employer and their affective commitment (Carmeli, 2005a, 2005b; Carmeli & Freund, 2009; Fuller, Hester, Barnett, & Relyea, 2006; Ojedokun, Idemudia, & Desouza, 2015), job satisfaction (Carmeli, 2005a; Carmeli & Freund, 2009), turnover intention (Carmeli & Freund, 2009), and withdrawal cognitions (Fuller et al., 2006). Therefore, there appears to be a strong link between perceived prestige and employee morale.

**Research Design**

I conducted a survey experiment to test the effects of bashing on public school teachers’ morale. I chose to examine only the effects of bashing, not both bashing and praise, because the cost of acquiring the appropriate sample size to examine both phenomena was prohibitive. Furthermore, given the robust findings on negativity bias (Ito et al., 1998), I hypothesized that bashing would have a stronger effect on teacher morale than praise.

Participants in my survey experiment were randomly assigned to a control group or to a treatment group in which subjects read one of two statements regarding public school teachers. The two statements vary along one dimension: the actor making the statement. The actor was defined as either ‘elected officials’ or local ‘citizens.’ The treatment group read a statement with information that was untrue and made up by the author. Table 6 below details the study’s experimental conditions.
As illustrated in table 6 above, my study contained a total of three experimental groups: 2 treatment groups and one control group. All subjects—both those assigned to the treatment group and those assigned to the control group—began by reading the study information sheet which detailed information regarding eligibility guidelines, the purpose of the study, and procedures for the study. After reading the study information sheet, subjects in the control group proceeded directly to answering questions regarding their morale. Subjects in the treatment groups, by contrast, read one of two statements about public school teachers, and then proceeded to answer questions regarding their morale. After answering these questions, subjects in the treatment groups received information which detailed the intent of the study and revealed that the statements that respondents read were untrue and made up by the author. Figure 9 below illustrates the process for both the treatment groups and the control group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Actor Tone</th>
<th>Tone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Blame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The experiment uses a 2×1 factorial design with a control group, resulting in 2 treatment groups plus one control group, for a total of 3 groups. Subjects were randomly assigned to a treatment group or to the control group.
The two statements that were randomly assigned to the treatment groups can be found in Appendix C. Each of the two statements began by claiming that “A research team made up of professors from three Ivy League universities recently fielded surveys asking Americans what they have heard (1) ‘citizens in their community’ or (2) ‘elected officials’ say about public school teachers,” depending on whether the respondent was assigned to the “citizens” or “elected officials” treatment. The statement went on to say that “Their results show that Americans heard mostly ‘negative’ comments about public school teachers from (1) ‘citizens in their community’ or (2) ‘elected officials.’” The last two sentences of the statements read, “Many respondents reported hearing comments suggesting that public school teachers are lazy, incompetent, unaccountable, and self-serving. The results from this study will be published in a forthcoming issue of the American Education Research Journal (AERJ).”
Dependent Variables

The entire survey instrument for this study can be found in Appendix D. I assessed six dependent variables in this study. The first dependent variable, career commitment, I measured with the following survey item: “How long do you plan to work as a PUBLIC school teacher? Please mark only one box.” Respondents were allowed to choose one of eight response options: (1) “As long as I am able,” (2) “Until I am eligible for retirement benefits from this job,” (3) “Until I am eligible for retirement benefits from a previous job,” (4) “Until I am eligible for Social Security benefits,” (5) “Until a specific life event occurs (e.g., parenthood, marriage) (please specify),” (6) “Until a more desirable job opportunity comes along,” (7) “Definitely plan to leave as soon as I can,” or (8) “Undecided at this time.” In the analysis below, I recoded the responses from this question into a dummy variable with one indicating those who plan to work as public school teacher as long as they are able to and zero indicating those who chose any one of the other seven response options.

I measured the second dependent variable, intrinsic motivation, with three survey items that read as follows: (1) “I would still do this work, even if I received less pay,” (2) “I find that I also want to work in my free time,” and (3) “I get my motivation from the work itself, and not from the reward for it.” The response options were based on a seven-point scale, from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree. The three survey-items demonstrated low internal consistency with a Cronbach’s alpha of $\alpha=.54$. Given the low internal consistency among the three survey items, I evaluated them as separate dependent variables in the analysis below, rather than as a single construct.

I measured the third dependent variable, the likelihood that respondents would recommend a career as a public school teacher to a close friend or family member, with the
following survey item: “What are the chances that you would recommend a career as a PUBLIC school teacher to a close family member? Please slide the bar to register your answer. You may choose any number from 0 to 100.” Respondents were allowed to choose any number between one and one hundred through sliding a bar to register their answer.

I measured the fourth dependent variable, perceived prestige, with two survey items that read as follows: (1) “Generally, public school teachers have a good overall image,” and (2) “Generally, people in this country think highly of public school teachers.” The response options were based on a seven-point scale from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree. The two survey-items demonstrated high internal consistency with a Cronbach’s alpha of α=.84.

I measured the fifth dependent variable, job satisfaction, using two survey items that read as follows: (1) “All in all, I am satisfied with my job,” and (2) “In general, I don't like my job.” The response options were based on a seven-point scale from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree. The three survey-items demonstrated high internal consistency with a Cronbach’s alpha of α=.84.

I measured the sixth dependent variable, job stress, using the following survey item, “Do you find your job as a public school teacher stressful? For each of the following words and phrases please select ‘no’ if the item does not describe your job, select ‘undecided’ if you are undecided, and select ‘yes’ if you agree that the item describes your job.” Four phrases were presented to respondents: “pressured,” “calm,” “many things stressful,” and “pushed.” The four items demonstrated high internal consistency with a Cronbach’s alpha of α=.81.

Data

I recruited 380 U.S. public school teachers who work in early childhood, elementary or secondary-level education in a full-time or part-time capacity. After a detailed analysis of the data, I discovered that four of the respondents work as private school teachers. Consequently, I
removed them from the analysis leaving a total of 376 respondents. I recruited the respondents from the site TurkPrime.com. Although TurkPrime is a relatively new data acquisition platform, launched in 2015, more than 1,000 labs and researchers worldwide have used TurkPrime, and more than 500,000,000 research questions have been answered through the site. TurkPrime allows researchers to acquire niche samples, such as a sample of public school teachers, for participation in research or market studies. Niche samples are difficult to acquire through most data acquisition sites such as MTurk, given that such sites do not allow researchers to select respondents based on highly specific demographic characteristics (Gleibs, 2016).

Descriptive statistics of my sample can be found in Table 7 below. My sample is not representative of U.S. public school teachers, however, representative samples are only necessary when estimating “descriptive population parameters,” not “causal effects,” which is my intention here (Marvel, 2014, p. 717).

Nonetheless, my sample closely approximates the demographics of public school teachers in the United States. 81 percent of respondents in my sample are female, in comparison to 73 percent among public school teachers nationally (Peterson et al., 2014). 77 percent are white, in comparison with 79 percent nationally (Peterson et al., 2014). 89 percent of my sample have a college degree or higher, compared to 86 percent nationally (Peterson et al., 2014). And 36 percent of the respondents in my sample are Republicans, 49 percent Democrats, compared to 31 percent and 39 percent respectively among public school teachers nationally (Peterson et al., 2014).

12 TurkPrime.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Descriptive Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Party ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Ideology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate, middle of the road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g. part-time, teacher aide, substitute, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Charter School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Magnet School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, but no degree (yet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-year college degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree or Higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Household Income Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10k</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40 to $69,999</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70k to $99,999</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $100k</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race / Ethnicity

| Ethnicity                                                      | Count |
|                                                               |       |
| White                                                          | 77    |
| Black                                                          | 11    |
| Asian                                                          | 2     |
| Multiracial, Some other race, ethnicity, or origin             | 3     |
| Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin                            | 5     |

### Results

I ran an ANOVA model and employed an independent samples t-test, in which I compared the control group mean to the treatment group mean for all six independent variables and both treatment conditions. Figure 10 below displays the results from the following question: “How long do you plan to work as a PUBLIC school teacher? Please mark only one box.” As mentioned earlier, I recoded the responses from this question into a dummy variable with one indicating those who plan to work as public school teacher as long as they are able to, and zero indicating those who chose any other response option. The mean response for each group regarding this measure of career commitment was: for the control group .63, for the bashing treatment from citizens .60, and for the bashing treatment from elected officials .60.

Both treatment groups displayed lower mean support than the control group for the idea of working as a public school teacher for as long as they are able. However, neither bashing treatment had a statistically significant effect on teachers’ mean support for staying in the profession.
Figure 10

Note: The control group is the comparison category for all significance tests.
*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Figure 11 below displays the results from the following question: “I would still do this work, even if I received less pay.” The mean response for each group regarding this measure of intrinsic motivation was: for the control group 4.01, for the bashing treatment from citizens 4.19, and for the bashing treatment from elected officials 4.16.

Both treatment groups displayed higher mean support than the control group for the idea of remaining in teaching, even if they received less pay. However, neither bashing treatment had a statistically significant effect on teachers’ mean support for the idea of remaining in teaching, even if they received less pay.
Figure 11

“I would still do this work, even if I received less pay”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Bashing From Citizens</th>
<th>Bashing From Elected Officials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The control group is the comparison category for all significance tests. *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Figure 12 below displays the results from the following question: “I find that I also want to work in my free time.” The mean response for each group regarding this measure of intrinsic motivation was: for the control group 3.99, for the bashing treatment from citizens 4.31, and for the bashing treatment from elected officials 4.15.

Both treatment groups displayed higher mean support than the control group for the idea of also wanting to work in one’s free time. However, neither bashing treatment had a statistically significant effect on teachers’ mean support for the idea of wanting to work in one’s free time.
Figure 12

"I find that I also want to work in my free time"

Note: The control group is the comparison category for all significance tests.
*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Figure 13 below displays the results from the following question: “I get my motivation from the work itself, and not from the reward for it.” The mean response for each group regarding this measure of intrinsic motivation was: for the control group 5.20, for the bashing treatment from citizens 5.01, and for the bashing treatment from elected officials 5.29.

The group that received a bashing treatment from citizens displayed lower mean support than the control group for the idea of getting motivation from the work itself, and not from the reward for it. Conversely, the group that received a bashing treatment from elected officials displayed higher mean support than the control group for the idea of getting motivation from the work itself. Neither bashing treatment, however, had a statistically significant effect on teachers’ mean support for the idea of getting motivation from the work itself versus from the reward.
Figure 13

"I get my motivation from the work itself, and not from the reward for it"

Note: The control group is the comparison category for all significance tests.
*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Figure 14 below displays the results from the question: “What are the chances that you would recommend a career as a PUBLIC school teacher to a close family member? You may choose any number from 0 to 100.” The mean response regarding the likelihood that each group would recommend a career as a public school teacher was: for the control group a 64% chance, for the bashing treatment from citizens a 66% chance, and for the bashing treatment from elected officials a 62% chance.

The group that received a bashing treatment from citizens displayed a higher mean chance that teachers would recommend a career as a public school teacher than the control group. Conversely, the group that received a bashing treatment from elected officials displayed a lower mean chance that teachers would recommend a career as a public school teacher than the control group. Neither treatment had a statistically significant effect on the chances that teachers would recommend a career as a public school teacher.
Figure 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Bashing From Citizens</th>
<th>Bashing From Elected Officials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The control group is the comparison category for all significance tests.
*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Figure 15 below displays the results from the two questions that measure respondents’ perceived prestige of being a public school teacher: (1) “Generally, public school teachers have a good overall image,” and (2) “Generally, people in this country think highly of public school teachers.” The mean response regarding the perceived prestige of being a public school teacher for each group was: for the control group 0.21, for the bashing treatment from citizens -0.01, and for the bashing treatment from elected officials -0.20.

Both bashing treatments displayed lower mean values regarding the perceived prestige of being a public school teacher than the control group, and both bashing treatments had a statistically significant effect on respondents’ perceived prestige. The citizen bashing treatment had a statistically significant effect at the p<.01 level and the elected officials bashing treatment had a statistically significant effect at the p<.001 level.
Figure 15

Perceived Prestige of Being a Public School Teacher

Control Bashing From Citizens Bashing From Elected Officials
25 0.20 0.15 0.10 0.05 0.00 0.05 0.10 0.15 0.20
-0.25 -0.20 -0.15 -0.10 -0.05 0.00 0.05 0.10 0.15 0.20

Note: The control group is the comparison category for all significance tests.
*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Figure 16 below displays the results from the two questions that measure respondents’
job satisfaction: (1) “All in all, I am satisfied with my job,” and (2) “In general, I don't like my
job.” The mean response for each group regarding this measure of job satisfaction is as follows:
for the control group -.05, for the bashing treatment from citizens .02, and for the bashing
treatment from elected officials .03. Both treatment groups displayed higher mean job
satisfaction than the control group. However, neither bashing treatment had a statistically
significant effect on mean job satisfaction.
Figure 16

![Job Satisfaction Graph](Image)

Note: The control group is the comparison category for all significance tests.
*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Figure 17 below displays the results from the question that measures respondents’ job stress: “Do you find your job as a public school teacher stressful? For each of the following words and phrases please select "no" if the item does not describe your job, select "undecided" if you are undecided, and select "yes" if you agree that the item describes your job.” Four phrases were presented to respondents: “pressured,” “calm,” “many things stressful,” and “pushed.”

The mean response for each group regarding this measure of job stress is as follows: for the control group -.02, for the bashing treatment from citizens .01, and for the bashing treatment from elected officials .02. Both treatment groups displayed higher mean job stress than the control group. However, neither bashing treatment had a statistically significant effect on mean job stress.
Table 8 below displays the mean responses and effect sizes for both bashing treatment groups and all eight dependent variables. Bashing from citizens and from elected officials had a statistically significant effect only on respondents’ perceived prestige of a career as a public school teacher: both types reduced respondents’ perception of the prestige of a career as a public school teacher, relative to the control group. Neither bashing from citizens nor from elected officials had a statistically significant effect on the other seven dependent variables.
Conclusion

Contrary to prior research (Garrett et al., 2006; Jahan & Shahan, 2012), this study does not find that bureaucrat-bashing—in this case the bashing of public school teachers—affects the morale of employees. There are a number of possible explanations for why my findings conflict with past studies. First, my study presents a stricter test of causality, given that the other two studies employed qualitative designs. These qualitative studies asked individuals how bureaucrat-bashing affects them, which is likely to engender an attribution bias, and dramatically enhance the likelihood of the individuals identifying a link between changes in their attitudes and behavior and their experiences with bureaucrat-bashing.

Second, my study examines the effects of a single bashing treatment on the morale of public employees, whereas past studies sought to examine the effects of bashing across a much

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8</th>
<th>Group means (Difference in Means Test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Profession</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would still do this work, even if I received less pay.</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that I also want to work in my free time.</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get my motivation from the work itself, and not from the reward for it.</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend Career</td>
<td>63.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Prestige</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The control group is the comparison category for all significance tests. *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.
longer time period. It may be the case that single bashing treatments do not affect the morale of public employees, whereas much longer, more sustained bashing does.

Third, the stimuli in my study were different from the stimuli examined in prior studies. Garrett et al. (2006) for example, examined the effects of bashing from presidential campaigns, and Jahan and Shahan (2012) took a much more liberal approach by exploring bureaucrat-bashing from all segments of society, including bashing from academics. As discussed above, my study focused on the effects of bashing from only ‘elected officials’ and ‘local citizens.’ It may be the case that bashing from heads of state, such as the President, has the most impact on the morale of public employees and/or it may be that bureaucrat-bashing must come from multiple segments of society in order to affect public employees’ morale.

Lastly, the subjects of my research were different from the subjects examined in prior studies. I studied the effects of bashing on public school teachers, whereas past studies examined federal employees. It may be the case that public school teachers have higher levels of public service motivation and/or a stronger sense of mission than federal employees, which might prevent bashing from affecting their morale.

In future research, I hope to examine the effects of more sustained bashing, versus single instances of bashing, and to tease out the effects on employees with high and low levels of public service motivation. I suspect that more sustained bashing will have a stronger effect on employee morale than single instances, and that effect will be more intense for employees with low levels of public service motivation than employees with higher levels.

However, in this study I did find that the bashing of public school teachers undermines teachers’ assessment of the prestige of their profession. This result suggests that public school
teachers internalize bashing messages, though those messages only affect their assessment of the prestige of teaching and not their morale.

That bureaucrat-bashing affects perceived prestige but not morale was unexpected, given that other studies have found statistically significant correlations between employees’ assessment of the perceived prestige of the organization for which they work and their morale (Carmeli, 2005a, 2005b; Carmeli & Freund, 2009; Fuller et al., 2006; Ojedokun et al., 2015).

As with the experiment in the previous chapter, this survey experiment is not without limitations. Given that these three limitations were mentioned in the previous experiment, I only briefly mention them here: first, this experiment was a one shot experiment, and future research should examine the effects of more sustained bashing; second, this experiment, as with all experiments, may generate some concerns about external validity; and lastly, the statistical power for some of the treatment groups was quite low, far less than the recommended power of .80. Please see Appendix F for a detailed power analysis for all of the experimental conditions.

Still, this chapter greatly contributes to the literature on bureaucrat-bashing, given that it challenges the idea that single instances of bureaucrat-bashing affect the morale of public employees.
Chapter 7: Conclusion

Introduction

Practitioners and good government groups have made serious claims about the dangers of bureaucrat-bashing. The Report for the National Commission of Public Service contends that bureaucrat-bashing has undermined the pride that once came with public service writing, “years of campaign “bureaucrat bashing” by candidates for elective office, reinforced by too many instances of ethical lapse, have eroded the sense of pride that once came with government service” (Volcker, 1990, p.12). In a report entitled “In the Public We Trust,” the Partnership for Public Service contends that bureaucrat-bashing undermines support for government writing, “Broad public support for our federal government has been lacking for decades. Despite occasional improvements in public attitudes, high-profile failures and the steady drumbeat of bureaucrat bashing…have limited any significant, long-term improvements (In The Public We Trust: Renewing the Connection between the Federal Government and the Public, 2008, pg. 2).”

Academics have also warned of the dangers of bureaucrat-bashing. Academics, particularly public administration scholars, have posited that bureaucrat-bashing undermines Americans’ support for public programs (Barth, 2010; Garrett et al., 2006; Haque, 1998), their interest in a career in public service (Baldwin, 1990; Garrett et al., 2006; Ingraham & Peters, 1988; Mann, 2006), and their support for work benefits for public employees (Roberts, 2012). Furthermore, scholars have also hypothesized that bureaucrat-bashing weakens public employees’ job satisfaction (Chen & Bozeman, 2014; Garrett et al., 2006; Ting, 1997; Volcker, 1990), intrinsic motivation (Chen & Bozeman, 2014; Jahan & Shahan, 2012), and commitment to public service (Baldwin, 1990; Ingraham & Peters, 1988; Yang & Pandey, 2009).

Despite these claims, no empirical studies have quantified the effects of bureaucrat-bashing on citizens’ attitudes towards public employees, nor on the morale of public employees.
The paucity of empirical research on this topic results from scholars’ struggle to define and measure bureaucrat-bashing.

This dissertation addressed this research gap by clearly defining bureaucrat-bashing and measuring its effects on citizens and public employees. This dissertation also identified the factors that influence whether members of congress frame public employees in a positive or negative light, as a means to better understand which government workers and which government agencies are most at risk of losing public support and when.

Findings

In chapter three, the first empirical chapter, I identified the conditions under which the term ‘bureaucrat/s’ is used in the Congressional Record versus the terms ‘public employee/s,’ ‘government employee/s,’ or ‘civil servant/s. The purpose of this analysis was to identify the factors that influence whether members of congress frame public employees in a positive or negative light (i.e. as public employee/s,’ ‘government employee/s,’ or ‘civil servant/s vs. bureaucrat/s).

The dataset used in this study consists of every congressional speech in the House and Senate Congressional Record from 1995 to 2015 that contain at least one of the following four key words within the title or body of the speech: 1) ‘bureaucrat/s,’ 2) ‘government worker/s,’ 3) ‘civil servant/s,’ or 4) ‘public employee/s.’ Given that the dependent variable is binary—with one indicating that the term ‘bureaucrat/s’ was used in the title or body of a congressional speech and not any of the other three terms, and zero indicating that the term ‘civil servant/s,’ ‘public employee/s,’ and/or ‘government worker/s’ was used in the title or body of a congressional speech and not the term ‘bureaucrat/s’—I employed a logit model.

Results from the logistic analysis demonstrates that congressional speeches that include the terms ‘welfare,’ ‘environment,’ ‘health care,’ ‘education,’ ‘regulation,’ or ‘taxes’ in the title
of the speech have a higher likelihood of having the term ‘bureaucrat/s’ in the title or body of the speech than congressional speeches that do not include those terms in the title. Furthermore, proceedings that take place in the House have a higher likelihood of evoking the term ‘bureaucrat’ in the title or body of congressional speeches than do congressional speeches stemming from the Senate.

Ceremonial proceedings such as tributes, remembrances, memorials, and congratulatory ceremonies have a lower likelihood of having the term ‘bureaucrat/s’ in the title or body of congressional speeches as do congressional speeches that include the terms ‘defense’ or ‘social security’ in the title of the speech relative to speeches that do not contain those terms. Usage of the term ‘bureaucrat/s’ is correlated with public opinion, the term is evoked less when support for government programs is increasing.

In chapter five, the second empirical chapter, I conducted a survey experiment to test both the effects of bashing and the effects of praise on citizens’ attitudes towards public school teachers. I chose to examine the effects of both bashing and praise on citizens’ attitudes, not solely bashing, because both phenomena exist in the ‘real world,’ and thus understanding both types of responses allows for a richer and more precise analysis.

I assessed whether two different types of bashing—bashing of public school teachers by citizens and by elected officials—affects citizens’ attitudes regarding the following five outcomes: (1) support for merit pay for public school teachers, (2) support for a salary increase for public school teachers, (3) support for teacher tenure, (4) the likelihood that citizens’ would recommend a career as a public school teacher to a close friend or family member, and (5) the perceived prestige of public school teachers. I chose these five issues because they are central to debates regarding public education.
I ran an ANOVA model and employed an independent samples t-test in which I compared the control group mean to the treatment group mean for all five independent variables and all four treatment conditions. The praise treatments did not have a statistically significant effect on subjects’ responses to any of the five dependent variables. Conversely, bashing from citizens had a statistically significant effect on three outcomes: support for tenure, the likelihood that respondents would recommend a career as a public school teacher, and respondents perceived prestige of a career as a public school teacher. Bashing from citizens lowered mean responses for all three of the aforementioned dependent variables relative to the control group.

Bashing from elected officials had a statistically significant effect on one outcome: respondents’ perceived prestige of a career as a public school teacher. Bashing from elected officials lowered respondents’ perceived prestige of a career as a public school teacher relative to the control group.

In chapter six, the third empirical chapter, I assessed whether two different types of bashing—bashing of public school teachers by citizens, and by elected officials—affects the morale of public school teachers along the following five dimensions: (1) career commitment; (2) intrinsic motivation; (3) the likelihood that public school teachers would recommend a career as a public school teacher to a close friend or family member; (4) job satisfaction; and (5) job stress. Additionally, I tested whether both types of bashing affect teachers’ assessment of the perceived prestige of their own profession.

I chose to examine only the effects of bashing, not both bashing and praise, because the cost of acquiring the appropriate sample size to examine both phenomena was prohibitive. Furthermore, given the robust findings on negativity bias (Ito et al., 1998), I hypothesized that bashing would have a stronger effect on teacher morale than praise.
I conducted a survey experiment to test the effects of bashing on public school teachers’ morale. I ran an ANOVA model and employed an independent samples t-test, in which I compared the control group mean to the treatment group mean for all six independent variables and both treatment conditions.

Bashing from citizens and from elected officials had a statistically significant effect only on respondents’ perceived prestige of a career as a public school teacher: both types reduced respondents’ perception of the prestige of a career as a public school teacher, relative to the control group. Neither bashing from citizens nor from elected officials had a statistically significant effect on the other seven dependent variables.

**Theoretical Implications**

The findings from this dissertation support and challenge key theories and hypotheses within the disciplines of public administration and political science. Additionally, the conclusions presented here point to new theories and hypotheses that are in need of additional testing. Findings from chapter three, for example, support the following hypotheses: (1) elected officials are responsive to public opinion; (2) the House is less civil in its deliberations than the Senate; (3) elected officials act according to logics of appropriateness; and (4) distributive policies are less conflictual than redistributive and regulative policies.

Results from chapter three also suggest that Republican members of congress may be less critical of public employees when they are in charge of the House or Senate than when they are not in charge of those institutions. I hypothesize that this is due to the fact that Republican members of congress feel more responsible for the actions of public employees when they are in charge of the House or Senate then when they are not in charge of those institutions. Consequently, if Republicans were to criticize public employees when they are in charge of the
House or Senate it would be tantamount to criticizing themselves. Additional research is needed to provide a more robust test of this hypothesis.

Findings from chapter five, support the hypothesis that bureaucrat-bashing undermines support for public employees. This finding lends greater credence to micro-performance theory which posits that support for government institutions and government employees is dependent in part upon the performance of government institutions and government employees. Given that bureaucrat-bashing signals negative information about the performance of government employees it makes sense that the public reduces support for government employees as a result of the bashing.

Findings from chapter five also lend credence to source credibility theory which posits that the persuasiveness of a message is dependent in part upon the credibility of the source. Bureaucrat-bashing from citizens had a statistically significant effect on more of the dependent variables than did bureaucrat-bashing from elected officials which, in light of source credibility theory, makes sense. Results from public opinion polls demonstrate that the American public is more trusting of the ‘American people’ than they are of ‘politicians’ ("Americans' Trust in Political Leaders, Public at New Lows," 2016).

Lastly, findings from chapter five also provide some tentative support for negativity bias. Negativity bias posits that negative information weighs more heavily on the brain than positive information or neutral information (Ito et al., 1998). Bureaucrat praise from neither citizens nor elected officials had a statistically significant effect on any of the dependent variables, which in light of negativity bias, makes sense.

Results from chapter six found that while bureaucrat-bashing from citizens and from elected officials undermined the perceived prestige of teaching in public schools, it did not,
however, undermine the morale of public school teachers. This findings contradicts results from other studies which have found a link between the perceived prestige of an individual’s employer and/or their profession and their morale (Carmeli, 2005a, 2005b; Carmeli & Freund, 2009; Fuller et al., 2006; Ojedokun et al., 2015). Therefore, additional theorizing and testing is necessary to better understand if and potentially how bureaucrat-bashing affects the morale of public employees.

**Practical Implications**

The results from this dissertation suggest that bureaucrat-bashing threatens the quality of public school teachers given that it reduces public support for things that teachers care about namely professional prestige and tenure. Furthermore, bureaucrat-bashing also decreases the chances that individuals would recommend a career in teaching which is a concerning finding given that a large of pool of teachers is necessary for educating nearly fifty million American children.

Leaders in the public sector can take several actions to minimize the effects of bashing on support for public employees. Government communication officials’ should consider increasing their interaction with the media, enhancing cross department support for communication, and providing an adequate budget for communication given that Liu et al. (2012) found that each of these actions are positively correlated with positive news coverage.

Public employees should also consider telling stories about successful performance, and not simply reporting performance statistics given that individuals are better able to recall performance information in the form of personalized stories than in the form of statistics (Olsen, 2017).

Government workers and government agencies should be sure to publicize positive performance information, particularly from non-governmental agencies, given that individuals
are more doubtful of good performance reported by government agencies themselves than by independent agencies (James & Van Ryzin, 2017).

Lastly, public employees should consider reporting comparative performance information, not just reflexive performance information (i.e. year over year) given that research has found that comparative performance information weighs more heavily on individuals judgements of performance than reflexive performance information (Charbonneau & Van Ryzin, 2015).

**Future Research**

This dissertation underscores several new avenues for future research. For each of the three empirical chapters I recommend three lines of additional research. Regarding chapter two on the framing of public employees by members of congress I recommend the following avenues for additional research: (1) Scholars should examine whether framing public employees as ‘bureaucrats’ rather than ‘public employee/s,’ ‘government employee/s,’ or ‘civil servant/s’ affects the attitudes of citizens and the morale of public employees as suggested in chapter three; (2) Scholars should trace the framing of public employees within the congressional record back further than 1995 to assess if and potentially how historical events have influenced the way public employees are framed; and (3) Given that I combined congressional speeches from the House and from the Senate into a single analysis it would be interesting to perform separate analyses for the House and the Senate to examine whether the same dynamics influence framing in both chambers.

Regarding chapter five on the effects of bureaucrat-bashing on citizens’ attitudes I recommend the following avenues for additional research: (1) Scholars should examine whether different dimensions of bashing (e.g. regarding work ethic, competence, etc.) affect the attitudes of citizens differently; (2) Scholars should examine whether bashing from certain elected
officials (e.g. the president or the governor) have a greater effect on citizens attitudes than others;

(3) Scholars should examine whether bureaucrat-bashing affects citizens attitudes differently when the bashing is directed at professions that are more closely associated with bureaucratic behavior such as IRS agents.

Lastly, regarding chapter six on the effects of bureaucrat-bashing on the morale of public employees I recommend the following avenues for additional research: (1) Scholars should employ a research design that examines bureaucrat-bashing over a longer period given that the results of this dissertation suggest that single instances of bashing do no effect the morale of public employees; (2) Scholars should employ large samples that are capable of assessing whether bureaucrat-bashing has differential effects on the morale of new public employees versus those with significant tenure; (3) Scholars should employ research designs that are capable of identifying the process by which bureaucrat-bashing affects the morale of public employees and not simply employ research designs that test whether or not bureaucrat-bashing affects the morale of public employees.
Appendix A: Vignettes for Chapter 5

Citizen Bashing Statement
A research team made up of professors from three Ivy League universities recently fielded surveys asking Americans what they have heard citizens in their community say about public school teachers. Their results show that Americans heard mostly negative comments about public school teachers from citizens in their community. Many respondents reported hearing comments suggesting that public school teachers are lazy, incompetent, unaccountable, and self-serving. The results from this study will be published in a forthcoming issue of the American Education Research Journal (AERJ).

Citizen Praise Statement
A research team made up of professors from three Ivy League universities recently fielded surveys asking Americans what they have heard citizens in their community say about public school teachers. Their results show that Americans heard mostly positive comments about public school teachers from citizens in their community. Many respondents reported hearing comments suggesting that public school teachers are hardworking, competent, held accountable, and selfless. The results from this study will be published in a forthcoming issue of the American Education Research Journal (AERJ).
**Elected Officials Praise Statement**

A research team made up of professors from three Ivy League universities recently fielded surveys asking Americans what they have heard elected officials say about public school teachers. Their results show that Americans heard mostly positive comments about public school teachers from elected officials. Many respondents reported hearing comments suggesting that public school teachers are hardworking, competent, held accountable, and selfless. The results from this study will be published in a forthcoming issue of the American Education Research Journal (AERJ).

**Elected Officials Bashing Statement**

A research team made up of professors from three Ivy League universities recently fielded surveys asking Americans what they have heard elected officials say about public school teachers. Their results show that Americans heard mostly negative comments about public school teachers from elected officials. Many respondents reported hearing comments suggesting that public school teachers are lazy, incompetent, unaccountable, and self-serving. The results from this study will be published in a forthcoming issue of the American Education Research Journal (AERJ).
You are invited to participate in a research study that examines attitudes towards public school teachers and teacher related policies. I ask that you read this form and ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

You must be eligible to participate in the study. This research is for residents of the United States over the age of 18; if you are not a resident of the United States and/or under the age of 18, please do not complete this survey.

The study is being conducted by Gordon Abner, a doctoral candidate in public policy in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs and the Department of Political Science at Indiana University-Bloomington. Professor James L. Perry in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs is providing oversight for the study.

**STUDY PURPOSE**

The purpose of this study is to examine attitudes towards public school teachers and teacher related policies.

**PROCEDURES FOR THE STUDY**

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

To check whether you are eligible to take the survey, you will be asked two quick screening questions at the beginning of the survey which will take less than a minute to answer. Those eligible will be directed to the survey. Those who are not eligible will not receive a payment.

If you are eligible to participate in the study, you will complete a short survey which includes a short article about research that has examined discourse about public school teachers, you will answer questions about your attitudes towards public school teachers and teacher related policies, and lastly you will answer some basic demographic questions.

The total time to participate in the study should not exceed 15 minutes.
CONFIDENTIALITY

If you are eligible to participate in the study and choose to do so, your name will not be linked to your survey responses at any time. I do not collect your name in the survey and therefore not even the researcher will know who provided which sets of responses.

Please note that the data you provide may be collected and used by Amazon as per its privacy agreement.

Organizations that may inspect and/or copy your responses for quality assurance and data analysis include groups such as the study investigator and his/her research associates, the Indiana University Institutional Review Board or its designees, and (as allowed by law) state or federal agencies, specifically the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP).

PAYMENT

You will receive payment a $1.00 payment for taking part in this study if you are eligible to participate in and complete the study. Eligibility will be determined by two quick screening questions at the beginning of the study as mentioned above and you will not receive payment if you are not eligible to participate in the study.

Additionally, you need to complete the study. This means that you need to complete the required questions in order to receive a confirmation code to enter into the HIT to receive payment. If you do not wish to complete the required questions, then I am not able to accept your response and you will not receive payment for participating in the study.

CONTACTS FOR QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS

For questions about the study, contact the researcher, Gordon Abner, at (***) ***-**** or goabner@indiana.edu.

For questions about your rights as a research participant or to discuss problems, complaints or concerns about a research study, or to obtain information, or offer input, contact the IU Human Subjects Office at (812) 856-4242 or (800) 696-2949.

VOLUNTARY NATURE OF STUDY

Taking part in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to take part or may leave the study at any time. Leaving the study will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled. Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your current or future relations with the School of Public and Environmental Affairs, the Department of Political Science or Indiana University-Bloomington.
Q1 I understand and wish to participate.
  ○ Yes
  ○ No

Q2 What is your age group?
  ○ 17 and under
  ○ 18-21
  ○ 22-25
  ○ 26-29
  ○ 30-39
  ○ 40-49
  ○ 50-59
  ○ 60 or older

Q3 Have you taken this survey before? Please note: The researcher will verify whether participants have taken the survey more than once. Those who have taken the survey more than once will NOT receive a payment.
  ○ Yes
  ○ No
  ○ Don't Know / Unsure

Q4 Recent research on decision making shows that choices are affected by context. Differences in how people feel, their previous knowledge and experience, and their environment can affect their choices. To help us understand how people make decisions, we are interested in information about you. Specifically, we are interested in whether you actually take the time to read directions; if not, some results may not tell us very much about decision-making in the real world. To show that you have read the instructions, please ignore the question below about how you are feeling and instead select only the none of the above option as your answer. Please select all of the words that describe how you are currently feeling.
  ○ Interested
  ○ Distressed
  ○ Excited
  ○ Upset
  ○ Strong
  ○ Guilty
  ○ Scared
  ○ Hostile
  ○ Enthusiastic
  ○ Proud
  ○ Irritable
  ○ Alert
  ○ Ashamed
  ○ Inspired
  ○ Nervous
  ○ Determined
  ○ Attentive
Q5 Please select Yes if you commit to providing quality answers for this survey.
   o No
   o Maybe
   o Yes

Q6 Please read the following carefully.

A research team made up of professors from three Ivy League universities recently fielded surveys asking Americans what they have heard citizens in their community say about public school teachers. Their results show that Americans heard mostly negative comments about public school teachers from citizens in their community. Many respondents reported hearing comments suggesting that public school teachers are lazy, incompetent, unaccountable, and self-serving.

The results from this study will be published in a forthcoming issue of the American Education Research Journal (AERJ).

Q7 Please read the following carefully.

A research team made up of professors from three Ivy League universities recently fielded surveys asking Americans what they have heard citizens in their community say about public school teachers. Their results show that Americans heard mostly positive comments about public school teachers from citizens in their community. Many respondents reported hearing comments suggesting that public school teachers are hardworking, competent, held accountable, and selfless.

The results from this study will be published in a forthcoming issue of the American Education Research Journal (AERJ).

Q8 Please read the following carefully.

A research team made up of professors from three Ivy League universities recently fielded surveys asking Americans what they have heard elected officials say about public school teachers. Their results show that Americans heard mostly negative comments about public school teachers from elected officials. Many respondents reported hearing comments suggesting that public school teachers are lazy, incompetent, unaccountable, and self-serving.

The results from this study will be published in a forthcoming issue of the American Education Research Journal (AERJ).

Q9 Please read the following carefully.
A research team made up of professors from three Ivy League universities recently fielded surveys asking Americans what they have heard elected officials say about public school teachers. Their results show that Americans heard mostly positive comments about public school teachers from elected officials. Many respondents reported hearing comments suggesting that public school teachers are hardworking, competent, held accountable, and selfless.

The results from this study will be published in a forthcoming issue of the American Education Research Journal (AERJ).

The next set of items ask you about how others view public school teachers. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

Q10 In general, others respect public school teachers.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Somewhat disagree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Somewhat agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree

Q11 Generally, public school teachers have a good overall image.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Somewhat disagree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Somewhat agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree

Q12 Generally, sometimes people are not paying attention. Please mark somewhat agree for this question.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Somewhat disagree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Somewhat agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree
Q13 Generally, people in this country think highly of public school teachers.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Somewhat disagree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Somewhat agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree

Q14 Thinking about the last few questions you just answered regarding how others view teachers, please list a few people, organizations or ideas that came to mind as you were answering those questions. You do not need to provide an in-depth response. Just a few words or a short sentence is sufficient.

Q15 What are the chances that you would recommend a career as a PUBLIC school teacher to a close family member? Please slide the bar to register your answer. You may choose any number from 0 to 100.
   ______ % Chance

Q16 Thinking about the question you just answered, please list a few people, organizations or ideas that came to mind as you were answering the question. You do not need to provide an in-depth response. Just a few words or a short sentence is sufficient.

Q17 Some people think taxes should go up other people think taxes should go down, and yet other people think taxes should remain the same. For this question please mark approve somewhat.
   - Disapprove strongly
   - Disapprove somewhat
   - Neither approve nor disapprove
   - Approve somewhat
   - Approve strongly

Q18 Do you think that salaries for public school teachers in the United States should increase, decrease, or stay about the same?
   - Greatly decrease
   - Decrease
   - Stay about the same
   - Increase
   - Greatly increase
Q19 Teachers with tenure cannot be dismissed unless a school district follows detailed procedures. Some say that tenure protects teachers from being fired for arbitrary reasons. Others say that it makes it too difficult to replace ineffective teachers. We want to know what you think of tenure. Do you favor or oppose offering tenure to public school teachers across the country?
   o Completely oppose
   o Somewhat oppose
   o Neither favor nor oppose
   o Somewhat favor
   o Completely favor

Q20 Do you favor or oppose basing the salaries of teachers around the nation, in part, on their students' academic progress on state tests?
   o Completely oppose
   o Somewhat oppose
   o Neither favor nor oppose
   o Somewhat favor
   o Completely favor

Q21 Thinking about the last few questions you just answered about teachers' salaries, tenure, and merit pay, please list a few people, organizations or ideas that came to mind as you were answering those questions. You do not need to provide an in-depth response. Just a few words or a short sentence is sufficient.

Q22 Thinking about the research results you read earlier, would you say that comments made about public school teachers from citizens in the United States are:
   o All Negative
   o Mostly Negative
   o Evenly positive and negative
   o Mostly positive
   o All positive

Q23 Thinking about the research results you read earlier, would you say that comments made about public school teachers from citizens in the United States are:
   o All Negative
   o Mostly Negative
   o Evenly positive and negative
   o Mostly positive
   o All positive
Q24 Thinking about the research results you read earlier, would you say that comments made about public school teachers from elected officials in the United States are:
- All Negative
- Mostly Negative
- Evenly positive and negative
- Mostly positive
- All positive

Q25 Thinking about the research results you read earlier, would you say that comments made about public school teachers from elected officials in the United States are:
- All Negative
- Mostly Negative
- Evenly positive and negative
- Mostly positive
- All positive

The next set of items asks for basic demographic information about you.

Q26 Are you male or female?
- Male
- Female

Q27 Which of the categories below best describe you? Select all boxes that apply. Note you may select more than one group.
- White
- Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
- Black/African-American
- Asian
- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Middle Eastern or North African
- Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Some other race, ethnicity, or origin

Q28 What is the highest degree or level of education you have completed?
- No high school degree
- High school graduate
- Some college, but no degree (yet)
- 2-year college degree
- 4-year college degree
- Master's degree
- Doctoral/Professional degree

Q29 Are you the parent or guardian of any children under the age of 18?
- No
- Yes
Q30 Do you/does your family own your home, pay rent, or what?
   o Own home
   o Pay rent
   o Other, please specify ________________

Q31 Approximately what is your annual household income range?
   o Less than $10,000
   o $10,000 - $19,999
   o $20,000 - $29,999
   o $30,000 - $39,999
   o $40,000 - $49,999
   o $50,000 - $59,999
   o $60,000 - $69,999
   o $70,000 - $79,999
   o $80,000 - $89,999
   o $90,000 - $99,999
   o $100,000 - $149,999
   o More than $150,000

The last set of items asks you about your work status and your political views.

Q32 Which of the following best describes your current employment status?
   o Working full time now
   o Working part time now
   o Temporarily laid off
   o Unemployed
   o Retired
   o Permanently disabled
   o Taking care of home or family
   o Student
   o Other

Q33 Have you ever worked as an early childhood, elementary or secondary-level teacher?
   o No
   o Yes

Q34 Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?
   o Republican
   o Independent
   o Not sure
   o Other
   o Democrat
Q35 Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?
   o Strong Republican
   o Not Very Strong Republican

Q36 Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?
   o Strong Democrat
   o Not Very Strong Democrat

Q37 Do you think of yourself as a closer to the Democratic or the Republican Party?
   o The Democratic Party
   o The Republican Party
   o Neither
   o Not Sure

Q38 We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. When it comes to politics, do you usually think of yourself as extremely liberal, liberal, slightly liberal, moderate or middle of the road, slightly conservative, extremely conservative, or haven't you thought much about this?
   o Extremely Liberal
   o Liberal
   o Slightly Liberal
   o Moderate, middle of the road
   o Slightly conservative
   o Conservative
   o Extremely conservative
   o Don't Know, haven't thought much about it

Q39 You are almost done! Before you are finished, please be aware that the information you were provided in the report about what citizens or elected officials are saying about public school teachers was created by the researcher. Therefore, this information does not reflect a real research study, and thus, will not appear in the American Education Research Journal (AERJ). The purpose of this study was to assess whether teacher bashing or negative discourse about public school teachers affects attitudes towards public school teachers and teacher related policies. For accurate information about attitudes towards public school teachers please visit the National Center for Education Statistics online: https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2010/2010004/findings_10.asp Feel free to contact the researcher responsible for this study, Gordon Abner, at (***)***-**** or goabner@indiana.edu if you have any questions or concerns. Lastly, please refrain from discussing the particulars of this study with other workers in the Mechanical Turk community until after the study closes. This research is part of Gordon's dissertation and he needs the experiment to run smoothly so he can collect his data and finish his dissertation.
## Appendix C: Power Analysis for Chapter 5

### Power Analysis - Experiment #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bashing Citizens</th>
<th>Bashing Elected Officials</th>
<th>Praise Citizens</th>
<th>Praise Elected Officials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommend Career</strong></td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Image</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favor Merit Pay</strong></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favor Salary Increase</strong></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favor Tenure</strong></td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sample Size Needed To Detect 80% Power - Experiment #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bashing Citizens</th>
<th>Bashing Elected Officials</th>
<th>Praise Citizens</th>
<th>Praise Elected Officials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommend Career</strong></td>
<td>326</td>
<td>176,606</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>120,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Image</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favor Merit Pay</strong></td>
<td>498,938</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>2,882</td>
<td>4,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favor Salary Increase</strong></td>
<td>7,076</td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td>5,266</td>
<td>11,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favor Tenure</strong></td>
<td>380</td>
<td>11,262</td>
<td>9,677,646</td>
<td>2,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Vignettes for Chapter 6

Citizen Bashing Statement
A research team made up of professors from three Ivy League universities recently fielded surveys asking Americans what they have heard citizens in their community say about public school teachers. Their results show that Americans heard mostly negative comments about public school teachers from citizens in their community. Many respondents reported hearing comments suggesting that public school teachers are lazy, incompetent, unaccountable, and self-serving. The results from this study will be published in a forthcoming issue of the American Education Research Journal (AERJ).

Elected Officials Bashing Statement
A research team made up of professors from three Ivy League universities recently fielded surveys asking Americans what they have heard elected officials say about public school teachers. Their results show that Americans heard mostly negative comments about public school teachers from elected officials. Many respondents reported hearing comments suggesting that public school teachers are lazy, incompetent, unaccountable, and self-serving. The results from this study will be published in a forthcoming issue of the American Education Research Journal (AERJ).
You are invited to participate in a research study that examines attitudes towards teaching in public schools. I ask that you read this form and ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

You must be eligible to participate in the study. This research is for residents of the United States over the age of 18 and who currently work as public school teachers; if you are not a resident of the United States, and/or do not currently work as a public school teacher, and/or under the age of 18, please do not complete this survey.

The study is being conducted by Gordon Abner, a doctoral candidate in public policy in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs and the Department of Political Science at Indiana University-Bloomington. Professor James L. Perry in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs is providing oversight for the study.

**STUDY PURPOSE**

The purpose of this study is to examine attitudes towards teaching in public schools.

**PROCEDURES FOR THE STUDY**

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

To check whether you are eligible to take the survey, you will be asked four quick screening questions at the beginning of the survey which will take less than two minutes to answer. Those eligible will be directed to the survey. Those who are not eligible will not receive a payment.

If you are eligible to participate in the study, you will complete a short survey which includes a short article about research that has examined discourse about public school teachers, you will answer questions about your attitudes towards teaching in public schools, and lastly you will answer some basic demographic questions.

The total time to participate in the study should not exceed 20 minutes.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**

If you are eligible to participate in the study and choose to do so, your name will not be linked to
your survey responses at any time. I do not collect your name in the survey and therefore not even the researcher will know who provided which sets of responses.

Organizations that may inspect and/or copy your responses for quality assurance and data analysis include groups such as the study investigator and his/her research associates, the Indiana University Institutional Review Board or its designees, and (as allowed by law) state or federal agencies, specifically the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP).

**PAYMENT**

You will receive payment from TurkPrime for taking part in this study if you are eligible to participate in and complete the study. Eligibility will be determined by four quick screening questions at the beginning of the study as mentioned above and you will not receive payment if you are not eligible to participate in the study.

Additionally, you need to complete the study. This means that you need to complete the required questions in order to receive a confirmation code to enter into the HIT to receive payment. If you do not wish to complete the required questions, then I am not able to accept your response and you will not receive payment for participating in the study.

**CONTACTS FOR QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS**

For questions about the study, contact the researcher, Gordon Abner, at (***)***.**** or goabner@indiana.edu.

For questions about your rights as a research participant or to discuss problems, complaints or concerns about a research study, or to obtain information, or offer input, contact the IU Human Subjects Office at (812) 856-4242 or (800) 696-2949.

**VOLUNTARY NATURE OF STUDY**

Taking part in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to take part or may leave the study at any time. Leaving the study will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled. Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your current or future relations with the School of Public and Environmental Affairs, the Department of Political Science or Indiana University-Bloomington.

Q1 I understand and wish to participate.
   - No
   - Yes
Q2 Have you taken this survey before? Please note: The researcher will verify whether participants have taken the survey more than once. Those who have taken the survey more than once will NOT receive a payment.
   o Yes
   o No
   o Don't Know / Unsure

Q3 What is your age group?
   o 17 and under
   o 18-21
   o 22-25
   o 26-29
   o 30-39
   o 40-49
   o 50-59
   o 60 or older

Q4 Do your currently work as an early childhood, elementary or secondary-level teacher?
   o No
   o Yes

Q5 Do you teach in a public school, public charter school, public magnet school, or a private school?
   o Public School
   o Public Charter School
   o Public Magnet School
   o Private School
   o Other, please specify ____________________
Q6 Recent research on decision making shows that choices are affected by context. Differences in how people feel, their previous knowledge and experience, and their environment can affect their choices. To help us understand how people make decisions, we are interested in information about you. Specifically, we are interested in whether you actually take the time to read directions; if not, some results may not tell us very much about decision-making in the real world. To show that you have read the instructions, please ignore the question below about how you are feeling and instead select only the none of the above option as your answer. Please select all of the words that describe how you are currently feeling.

- Interested
- Distressed
- Excited
- Upset
- Strong
- Guilty
- Scared
- Hostile
- Enthusiastic
- Proud
- Irritable
- Alert
- Ashamed
- Inspired
- Nervous
- Determined
- Attentive
- none of the above

Q7 Please select Yes if you commit to reading each question carefully.

- No
- Maybe
- Yes
Q8 Please read the following carefully. A research team made up of professors from three Ivy League universities recently fielded surveys asking Americans what they have heard citizens in their community say about public school teachers. Their results show that Americans heard mostly negative comments about public school teachers from citizens in their community. Many respondents reported hearing comments suggesting that public school teachers are lazy, incompetent, unaccountable, and self-serving.

The results from this study will be published in a forthcoming issue of the American Education Research Journal (AERJ).

Q9 Please read the following carefully. A research team made up of professors from three Ivy League universities recently fielded surveys asking Americans what they have heard citizens in their community say about public school teachers. Their results show that Americans heard mostly positive comments about public school teachers from citizens in their community. Many respondents reported hearing comments suggesting that public school teachers are hardworking, competent, held accountable, and selfless.

The results from this study will be published in a forthcoming issue of the American Education Research Journal (AERJ).

Q10 Please read the following carefully. A research team made up of professors from three Ivy League universities recently fielded surveys asking Americans what they have heard elected officials say about public school teachers. Their results show that Americans heard mostly negative comments about public school teachers from elected officials. Many respondents reported hearing comments suggesting that public school teachers are lazy, incompetent, unaccountable, and self-serving.

The results from this study will be published in a forthcoming issue of the American Education Research Journal (AERJ).

Q11 Please read the following carefully. A research team made up of professors from three Ivy League universities recently fielded surveys asking Americans what they have heard elected officials say about public school teachers. Their results show that Americans heard mostly positive comments about public school teachers from elected officials. Many respondents reported hearing comments suggesting that public school teachers are hardworking, competent, held accountable, and selfless.

The results from this study will be published in a forthcoming issue of the American Education Research Journal (AERJ).

Q12 Please advance to the next page.
Q13 How long do you plan to work as a PUBLIC school teacher? Please mark only one box.
   o As long as I am able
   o Until I am eligible for retirement benefits from this job
   o Until I am eligible for retirement benefits from a previous job
   o Until I am eligible for Social Security benefits
   o Until a specific life event occurs (e.g., parenthood, marriage). Please specify.
      ____________________
   o Until a more desirable job opportunity comes along
   o Definitely plan to leave as soon as I can
   o Undecided at this time

Q14 Thinking about the question you just answered, please list a few people, organizations or ideas that came to mind as you were answering the question. You do not need to provide an in-depth response. Just a few words or a short sentence is sufficient.

Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements regarding your current job as a public school teacher.

Q15 I would still do this work, even if I received less pay.
   o Strongly disagree
   o Disagree
   o Somewhat disagree
   o Neither agree nor disagree
   o Somewhat agree
   o Agree
   o Strongly agree

Q16 I find that I also want to work in my free time.
   o Strongly disagree
   o Disagree
   o Somewhat disagree
   o Neither agree nor disagree
   o Somewhat agree
   o Agree
   o Strongly agree

Q17 I get my motivation from the work itself, and not from the reward for it.
   o Strongly disagree
   o Disagree
   o Somewhat disagree
   o Neither agree nor disagree
   o Somewhat agree
   o Agree
   o Strongly agree
Q18 Thinking about the last few questions you just answered about your current job please list a few people, organizations or ideas that came to mind as you were answering those questions. You do not need to provide an in-depth response. Just a few words or a short sentence is sufficient.

Q19 When a big news story breaks people often go online to get up-to-the-minute details on what is going on. We want to know which websites people trust to get this information. We also want to know if people are paying attention to the question. To show that you’ve read this much, please ignore the question and select FoxNews.com and Huffington Post as your two answers. When there is a big news story, which is the one news website you would visit first? (Please only choose one)

- New York Times website
- Huffington Post
- Washington Post website
- CNN.com
- FoxNews.com
- MSNBC.com
- The Drudge Report
- Google News
- ABC News website
- CBS News website
- NBC News website
- Yahoo! News
- The Associated Press (AP) website
- Reuters website
- National Public Radio (NPR) website
- USA Today website
- New York Post Online
- None of these websites

Q20 What are the chances that you would recommend a career as a PUBLIC school teacher to a close family member? Please slide the bar to register your answer. You may choose any number from 0 to 100.

______ % Chance
The next set of items ask you about how others view public school teachers. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

Q21 Generally, public school teachers have a good overall image.
   o Strongly disagree
   o Disagree
   o Somewhat disagree
   o Neither agree nor disagree
   o Somewhat agree
   o Agree
   o Strongly agree

Q22 Generally, people in this country think highly of public school teachers.
   o Strongly disagree
   o Disagree
   o Somewhat disagree
   o Neither agree nor disagree
   o Somewhat agree
   o Agree
   o Strongly agree

Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements regarding your current job as a public school teacher.

Q23 All in all, I am satisfied with my job.
   o Strongly disagree
   o Disagree
   o Somewhat disagree
   o Neither agree nor disagree
   o Somewhat agree
   o Agree
   o Strongly agree

Q24 In general, I don't like my job.
   o Strongly disagree
   o Disagree
   o Somewhat disagree
   o Neither agree nor disagree
   o Somewhat agree
   o Agree
   o Strongly agree

Q25 Thinking about the last few questions you just answered about your current job please list a few people, organizations or ideas that came to mind as you were answering those questions. You do not need to provide an in-depth response. Just a few words or a short sentence is sufficient.
Q26 Do you find your job as a public school teacher stressful? For each of the following words and phrases please select "no" if the item does not describe your job, select "undecided" if you are undecided, and select "yes" if you agree that the item describes your job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pressured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many things stressful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q27 Thinking about the question you just answered above, please list a few people, organizations or ideas that came to mind as you were answering the question. You do not need to provide an in-depth response. Just a few words or a short sentence is sufficient.

Q28 Which of the following adjectives were used to describe public school teachers in the video that you viewed earlier?
   - Young
   - Lazy
   - Female
   - Liberal
   - Idealistic
   - Hardworking

Q29 Which of the following adjectives were used to describe public school teachers in the video that you viewed earlier?
   - Young
   - Lazy
   - Female
   - Liberal
   - Idealistic
   - Hardworking

Q30 Which of the following adjectives were used to describe public school teachers in the video that you viewed earlier?
   - Young
   - Lazy
   - Female
   - Liberal
   - Idealistic
   - Hardworking
Q31 Which of the following adjectives were used to describe public school teachers in the video that you viewed earlier?
   o Young
   o Lazy
   o Female
   o Liberal
   o Idealistic
   o Hardworking

The following questions deal with the nature of your job, when answering them please refer to your current teaching position.

Q32 How would you classify your current teaching position?
   o Regular full-time teacher
   o Regular part-time teacher
   o Itinerant teacher
   o Long-term substitute (i.e., your assignment requires that you fill the role of a regular teacher on a long-term basis, but you are still considered a substitute)
   o Short-term substitute
   o Student teacher, please explain role
   o Teacher aide
   o Other, please specify

Q33 Excluding time spent on maternity/paternity leave or sabbatical, how many school years have you worked as an early childhood, elementary or secondary-level teacher in public, public charter, public magnet, or private schools?

Q34 Are you a member of a teachers’ union or an employee association similar to a union?
   o No
   o Yes

Q35 Does your school, district, or school system offer tenure?
   o No
   o Yes

Q36 Are you tenured at your current school?
   o No
   o Yes
The next set of items asks for basic demographic information about you.

Q37 Are you male or female?
    o Male
    o Female

Q38 Which of the categories below best describe you? Select all boxes that apply. Note you may select more than one group.
    o White
    o Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
    o Black/African-American
    o Asian
    o American Indian/Alaskan Native
    o Middle Eastern or North African
    o Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
    o Some other race, ethnicity, or origin

Q39 What is the highest degree or level of education you have completed?
    o No high school degree
    o High school graduate
    o Some college, but no degree (yet)
    o 2-year college degree
    o 4-year college degree
    o Master's degree
    o Doctoral/Professional degree

Q40 Approximately what is your annual household income range?
    o Less than $10,000
    o $10,000 - $19,999
    o $20,000 - $29,999
    o $30,000 - $39,999
    o $40,000 - $49,999
    o $50,000 - $59,999
    o $60,000 - $69,999
    o $70,000 - $79,999
    o $80,000 - $89,999
    o $90,000 - $99,999
    o $100,000 - $149,999
    o More than $150,000
The last set of items asks you about your political views.

Q41 Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?
   - Republican
   - Independent
   - Not sure
   - Other
   - Democrat

Q42 Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?
   - Strong Republican
   - Not Very Strong Republican

Q43 Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?
   - Strong Democrat
   - Not Very Strong Democrat

Q44 Do you think of yourself as a closer to the Democratic or the Republican Party?
   - The Democratic Party
   - The Republican Party
   - Neither
   - Not Sure

Q45 We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. When it comes to politics, do you usually think of yourself as extremely liberal, liberal, slightly liberal, moderate or middle of the road, slightly conservative, extremely conservative, or haven't you thought much about this?
   - Extremely Liberal
   - Liberal
   - Slightly Liberal
   - Moderate, middle of the road
   - Slightly conservative
   - Conservative
   - Extremely conservative
   - Don't Know, haven't thought much about it
Q46 You are almost done! Before you are finished, please be aware that the information you were provided in the report about what citizens or elected officials are saying about public school teachers was created by the researcher. Therefore, this information does not reflect a real research study, and thus, will not appear in the American Education Research Journal (AERJ). The purpose of this study was to assess whether teacher bashing or negative discourse about public school teachers affects attitudes towards public school teachers and teacher related policies. For accurate information about attitudes towards public school teachers please visit the National Center for Education Statistics online: https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2010/2010004/findings_10.asp Feel free to contact the researcher responsible for this study, Gordon Abner, at (***)***-**** or goabner@indiana.edu if you have any questions or concerns. Lastly, please refrain from discussing the particulars of this study with other workers in the Mechanical Turk community until after the study closes. This research is part of Gordon's dissertation and he needs the experiment to run smoothly so he can collect his data and finish his dissertation.
### Appendix F: Power Analysis for Chapter 6

#### Power Analysis - Experiment #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bashing Citizens</th>
<th>Bashing Elected Officials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Profession</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would still do this work, even if I received less pay.</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that I also want to work in my free time.</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get my motivation from the work itself, and not from the reward for it.</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend Career</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Prestige</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sample Size Needed To Detect 80% Power - Experiment #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bashing Citizens</th>
<th>Bashing Elected Officials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Profession</td>
<td>9,534</td>
<td>9,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would still do this work, even if I received less pay.</td>
<td>3,322</td>
<td>4,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that I also want to work in my free time.</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>4,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get my motivation from the work itself, and not from the reward for it.</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>8,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend Career</td>
<td>8,082</td>
<td>11,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Prestige</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>5,706</td>
<td>5,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>27,704</td>
<td>20,786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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