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Abstract

This study involved music teachers in six large urban districts in the United States. Job satisfaction was studied as it relates to teacher attrition from high poverty urban schools. Data on teacher characteristics, school characteristics and teacher attitudes and opinions were collected to determine common factors among experienced teachers in high-poverty urban schools. Regression analysis was used to determine predictive factors for music teacher job satisfaction, as well as the teacher's attrition or retention decisions in a high-poverty urban school setting.

The confidential questionnaire included teacher demographic items and Likert-style items to gauge teacher attitudes and opinions. School demographic data were collected from NCES databanks.

The majority of music teachers were white and from middle-class backgrounds. Novices were more likely to teach on a stage or in a multi-purpose room rather than a designated music room. Experienced teachers generally scored higher on measures of attitudes and opinions of their jobs than did their Novice counterparts.

Eighty-four percent of the teachers planned to stay in their present position for the following year, although 51.7% indicated that they would stay in their current positions during the next five years.

Results of linear regression found that high scores from teachers on job satisfaction were predicted by high scores on opinion and perceptions student quality, by a greater commitment to the teaching profession, and by a greater commitment to the philosophy of Social Justice.

Binary logistic regression found that a teacher’s immediate plans to leave a position were could be predicted based on their opinions and perceptions of the music teaching profession, and calculation of a Phi coefficient found a relationship between future plans and the teacher’s race. Many reasons were given by teachers for leaving their positions, including poor salary, student discipline issues, lack of job security, inadequate time with students, overcrowded classes, poor facilities and security, too much time spent on testing, and lack of administrative support.

Teachers’ intention to remain in their positions for the next five years were best predicted by teacher job satisfaction, teacher’s perception of labor issues, and the teacher’s race.
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Preface

Music teacher job satisfaction is important to me because I loved my job. I taught for eight years in two urban, high-poverty schools in High Point, North Carolina, a middle and a high school. The majority of my students were African-American and living in the housing projects that surrounded the school. I loved my kids, and I loved making music with them. When I took on the position, there were more broken instruments in the storage room than functioning ones, the music library was completely disorganized, and after having had six orchestra directors in the six preceding years, the program was tiny.

In the eight years that I taught at these schools, three chorus teachers came and went, and eventually the chorus program was so small that no chorus teacher was hired to teach the tiny classes of students who remained interested in singing in the schools but who were active in the local church choirs. The middle school band program went through three teachers as well, as did the high school band program. At the end of the eighth year I was by far the most senior member of either school’s music department. I was left wondering why so many teachers left while I stayed with these students that I loved.

There was, by my eighth year, a constant police presence in the school, security cameras in all of the common areas, and a rapid escalation of gang violence in the building. What had happened that drove the downward spiral of quality and teacher attrition at my schools? What caused me to feel so burned out doing a job that I ostensibly loved? Why did I last eight years in this job that the previous six orchestra directors only held for one? At the end of my eighth year, I left public school teaching to
pursue a new career path in higher education, beginning with working towards a Ph.D. in
music education with a cognate in the sociology of schools, poverty and race. After three
years of coursework, and three years of self-examination, the best answer I have is that I
lasted because I loved my job, and they possibly didn’t love it as much as I did. I stayed
at the job until I realized that I would be happier doing something else, which precipitated
my shift to higher education to be a teacher educator.

All of this leads me to the main purposes of this study, to find out what kinds of
music teachers stay in high-poverty urban schools. What job attributes or opinions
regarding teaching or their workplace enable them to stay? This dissertation is my
attempt to find some better answers.
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Music and arts education are important to the education of the children of American society. With the passage of Goals 2000 legislation, the arts were named as a core academic subject, "as important to education as English, mathematics, history, civics and government, geography, science and foreign language" (MENC: The National Association for Music Education, 2007, p. 131). Shortly after the passage of this law, bringing the arts to the forefront of American public school education, a second education reform act was passed. This law, entitled No Child Left Behind (NCLB), was intended to bring all children up to a high standard of educational achievement regardless of the child's background. In announcing the education reform act, then President George W. Bush stated that it was necessary because "too many of our neediest children are being left behind" (United States Department of Education, 2004a, para. 1). The cornerstones of the law were accountability, choice and flexibility.

The perhaps unintended consequence of the accountability called for with this law was an increased focus on testing of science, reading and math and the decrease in focus on other, untested subjects. The law called for sanctions on schools and school systems whose scores failed to rise, thus, untested subjects received less funding, less time in the school day, and were sometimes cut entirely. Because urban high-poverty schools have had the most difficulty in meeting standards, they have been most often penalized. Kozol (2005) noted that
In some of the [high-poverty urban schools] art and music are excluded from the organized curriculum, not solely because of budget cutbacks that have decimated art and music programs... but also, again, because these subjects are not tested by the state examinations... [These] largely marginalized activities [are] nothing like the programs of rich cultural exposure that are prized and celebrated in the schools that serve the children of the privileged. (p. 119)

The relatively recent push for students of all backgrounds to achieve parity on standardized tests of English, science and math has led to drastic cuts in funding for, and student participation in arts programs in inner city schools, but not in the suburbs (Kozol, 2005). Docker (2010) found that of the nearly 400 Pennsylvania high schools contacted in data collection, four small, academically focused high schools in Philadelphia were the only ones with no music programs at all. The size of these four schools could be seen as analogous to small rural schools, each with substantial music programs (Docker, 2010).

It would appear that laws regarding testing and standards, established to ensure that all students can reach a given standard in some subjects may ensure that there are two systems of education in America. There is a system of education in place for middle and upper-class suburban students, which is rich in cultural arts and electives (Kozol, 2005). There is also a system of education serving high-poverty urban students, focused on drilling the basics so that student achievement, measured solely through standardized tests of math, science, social studies and reading can best be advanced. Tyack (2003) notes that if, in New York City Schools, 77 percent of students fail to meet proficiency standards, then it is a ludicrous goal to think that 100 percent of students could score at proficient levels without the best possible teachers, smaller classes, buildings to be proud
of, advanced academic courses as well as remedial ones, social and health services, stimulating after school programs and a rich curriculum. These are the very qualities that are seen in schools serving the wealthy suburbs surrounding New York City. Tyack further notes:

So long as school resources continue to reflect the gross inequalities of wealth and income in this country, major achievement gaps will persist between the prosperous and the poor, and too many students will continue to be, now as in the past, ‘thoroughly trained in failure’ (Tyack, 2003, p. 126).

When schools focus solely on teaching to the standardized tests of reading, math, science and social studies, time spent on other subjects must be cut. Cuts to time and resources for music classes may lead to teacher attrition, as those who care most about a subject-the teachers- may not feel appreciated or effective.

This may be one of several possible reasons why the attrition rate of teachers in high-poverty urban schools is higher than in schools in other urbanicities and serving students from other income brackets. The focus of this research is on the music teachers of high-poverty urban schools. Retaining highly qualified music teachers is vital, for with the loss of these teachers the school loses not just the money spent on recruiting and staff development, but also a leader, a conductor, an organizer, a performer as well as a listener, a cultural knowledge bearer and so much more (Jorgensen, 2008) that is vital to the cultural activities of a school and the community surrounding it.

**Public Education in High-Poverty Urban Areas**

All teachers in high-poverty urban schools (those situated in densely populated areas with high percentages of students at or below the poverty level) face numerous
difficulties in the course of fulfilling their duties in their chosen careers. Often the difficulties faced by teachers in urban high-poverty schools are not echoed in the careers of teachers whose schools are situated in other urbanicity categories, or teachers whose students are from middle to high socio-economic status (SES) backgrounds.

The schools’ physical structures are frequently crumbling, overcrowded and lack sufficient resources for the pupils (Kozol, 1991, 2005; Noguera, 2003; Rothstein, 2004). The loss of industrial jobs in the cities (e.g. the decimation of the steel industry in Pittsburgh and Bethlehem, PA in the 1970’s, or Detroit's automotive industry in the 1980's) have, according to Mitra, Movit and Frick (2008) lowered the tax base of urban areas across the country. Without industrial jobs and without a viable middle class supported by those jobs, cities are transformed from "Institutional to Jobless Ghettoes" (Wilson, 1996, p.3). Cities are transformed from working areas with support systems in place for the people and their families who work and live in them to areas of social and physical deterioration. With the loss of business and industry, support structures and tax structures necessary for schools disappear (Wilson, 1996). This has led to lower funding for the schools in urban areas as compared to the suburbs, which affects not just facilities and supplies for the students, but salaries and support for teachers and administrators (Hochschild & Scovronick, 2003).

Poverty impacts schools in a number of ways, but its impact on urban schools may be unique in scope among American schools. The direct impact is felt in the relatively lower salaries for urban teachers as compared to their suburban counterparts, and is also felt through the lack of money for resources, both facilities and supplies for teaching. As previously mentioned, the federal government has worked to address
unequal educational outcomes through No Child Left Behind legislation, a renewal and expansion of the Elementary and Secondary Schools Act (ESEA) of 1967. The ESEA has included since its inception Title-I legislation. Title-I legislation was designed to help high-poverty school systems make up for the wide discrepancies in per-student funding that exists between wealthy and poor school systems. Hochschild and Scovronick (2003) note that although per pupil expenditures are lower in urban areas than in suburban areas, their cost is actually higher due to the increased cost of maintaining older buildings.

Poverty and school urbanicity also indirectly impact the cost of education in urban schools, as the school’s population include higher percentages of children with health-related disabilities, and a greater need for English language instruction due to the influx of immigrants to the cities. Money from the federal government to supplement urban districts' budgets, in the form of Title-I funding paid directly to high-poverty schools regardless of urbanicity makes up for some of these additional costs. High-poverty in these cases is defined in the law as those schools with at least 30 percent of students living at or below the poverty level. However, due to the higher cost of facility upkeep and the higher percentage of students with major health problems than in suburban or rural schools with wealthier student populations, the per-pupil spending on regular education programs in high-poverty urban schools "remains substantially lower than such spending in surrounding suburbs" (Hochschild & Scovronick, 2003, p. 63).

NCLB requires that all students regardless of background meet achievement standards on state tests of reading and math. Low test scores of students who have grown
up in high-poverty urban schools have been widely documented. * The response of state
departments of education, in conjunction with the federal government to the low test
score problem in urban schools has in some extreme cases been the takeover or
sanctioning of schools, or in the case of Philadelphia, entire school systems (Useem,
Christman & Boyd, 2006). One course of action employed in state takeovers of
underperforming schools has been the firing of the entire teaching staff, regardless of an
individual teacher's effectiveness, devotion to their students or community ties. To date,
there have not been incentives for outstanding teachers to come to work in under-
performing schools, nor bonuses for exemplary teachers in these schools that are not tied
to standardized test scores.

Teachers do indeed make a difference in the lives of their students, and teacher
quality, commitment to students, and commitment to the profession matters. “The heart
of our educational system is the instructional interaction between a teacher and the
students” (Gardner, 2006, p.1). Ensuring that high-poverty urban schools can not only
recruit, but also retain high quality teachers would seem to be an urgent education policy
priority.

* In music education literature, please see Kinney, 2008. For a historical
overview of the matter, see Nyaggah & Gethaiga, 2005. For an overview of the Black-
For policy recommendations dealing with the class-based or race based achievement gap
see Hochschild & Scovronick (2003) or Smith, 2005.
Funding and facilities issues in high-poverty urban schools are coupled with other issues that, while not unique to urban areas are perhaps more prevalent there, e.g. higher rates of incarceration, poverty, single parent households and drug abuse (Wilson, 1996). Inequalities that exist in the quality and funding of the public school systems among urban, rural and suburban schools, and among teachers serving high-poverty, middle class and rich neighborhoods threatens the very concept of the American Dream, that through education and hard work, anyone can succeed (Hochschild & Scovronick, 2003).

**Teacher Recruitment in Urban School Systems**

Teacher shortages are documented by the U.S. Department of Education and the Department of Labor statistics. The 2010 Teacher Shortage Area report (TSA) listed the existence of teacher shortages in each of the fifty states and the territories (Miller, 2010). Teacher shortages were most often found in cities and rural areas (e.g. Illinois only reported teacher shortages in Chicago schools, while in Arizona, the majority of shortages were in schools on reservations). Shortages were also listed by subject area, with nineteen states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reporting music teacher shortages. One challenge to solving the teacher shortage problem is the preparation of sufficient numbers of teachers in teacher training programs. Additional challenges include the recruitment of teachers willing to work in urban schools and the subsequent retention of those teachers.

 Numerous sources have reported that high-poverty urban schools have both smaller applicant pools and higher teacher turnover rates than low-poverty suburban schools and high and low-poverty rural schools (Ingersoll, 2002; Liu & Myer, 2005; Watlington, Shockley, Guglielmino & Felsher 2010). A frequently cited study by Boyd,
Lankford, Loeb and Wyckoff (2005) indicated that while there is a glut of teachers graduating from teacher preparation programs, few are willing to work in high-poverty urban schools. Instead the findings of the study suggested that new teachers would prefer schools in close geographic proximity to, and similar to those from which they themselves matriculated. Recent graduates of teacher training programs were found to prefer to substitute teach in suburban schools in hopes of landing full-time employment in those districts rather than teach full-time in urban schools.

Preferences by teacher candidates for teaching positions in close proximity to their home district leads to a recruitment problem for urban schools districts. This problem comes about because the majority of graduates from teacher training programs come from middle-class suburban backgrounds (Boyd et al., 2005; Nieto, 2003). Recruitment of urban students into teacher preparation programs could be a long-term solution to the problem of the smaller pool of teacher candidates for jobs in urban school systems. Nieto also notes that cultural congruency between teachers and their students may help with educational outcomes.

Stopgap measures have attempted to make up for teacher shortages in hard-to-staff schools by filling vacancies in rural and urban schools through programs such as Teach for America (TFA) and alternative certification, with mixed results. Students who study under TFA teachers have higher test scores than those in classrooms with long-term substitutes, but not as high as those students in classrooms staffed by experienced, certified teachers (Heilig & Jez, 2010). Teachers in the TFA programs also have been shown to have an eighty percent attrition rate after the first two years, with a cost approaching $70,000 to replace the teachers (Heilig & Jez, 2010). This cost can be
compared to the estimate of $15,000-$26,000 reported by the City of Chicago to replace teachers through traditional channels (Watlington et al., 2010). That only 16.6% of TFA teachers remain in their teaching positions past the initial two-year commitment (Heilig & Jez, 2010) further illustrates Ingersoll’s (2002) point that the main problem regarding the teacher shortage in the United States is not the lack of teachers graduating from teacher training programs, nor the lack of interest in teaching, but rather the high levels of attrition from the teaching profession.

No Child Left Behind legislation dictates that all classrooms must be headed by highly-qualified teachers (United States Department of Education, 2004b). This can be viewed not just as an obvious solution to helping students succeed, but also as a problem for schools and school districts with large teacher shortages. High-poverty urban schools may have the most difficulty satisfying this provision because their classrooms are more often headed by long-term substitutes, (Kozol, 2005) teachers with provisional licenses, or teachers who are assigned subjects outside of their specialty areas (Neild, Useem, & Farley, 2005). The recruitment and hiring of highly qualified teachers becomes an expensive and almost futile exercise if those teachers cannot be retained in their positions.

**Retention of Teachers in High-Poverty Urban Schools**

Retention of teachers is a problem for districts and administrators who must constantly hire and provide staff development for new teachers. Teacher retention has been identified as a concern for administrators for whom the identification, recruitment, hiring and training of teachers represents significant investments of time and capital (Shakrani, 2008; Watlington et al., 2010). The thousands of dollars needed to recruit and
train new teachers can be seen as a wasted investment if those teachers cannot be retained in the positions for which they are hired. In addition to these monetary costs is the loss of the teacher and their intangible cultural and intellectual capital necessary for guiding the students of the school (Watlington et al., 2010). With smaller applicant pools and higher turnover rates, coupled with the high cost of replacing teachers, it becomes imperative for hard to staff high-poverty urban schools to keep their teachers once they are hired.

Studies have frequently linked teacher turnover and retention to teacher job satisfaction (Culver, Wolfle & Cross, 1990; Perie & Baker, 1997; Ingersoll, 2002). These studies have indicated that teachers who are happy and satisfied seem to be less likely to leave their positions. According to Gardner (2006) teacher job satisfaction is related to a number of internal and external factors. These include teacher opinions and perceptions of teaching and the workplace, such as the perception of adequacy of salary, perception of support from administrators, job attributes such as level taught (elementary middle or high school) or type of classes taught (general music, band orchestra or chorus). Varying levels of teacher job satisfaction and attrition rates have also been found to be associated with teacher attributes such as age, sex, race, years of experience and level of education.

Teacher attrition rates are generally higher in high-poverty urban schools than in schools within other urbanicities and serving students of middle and high SES backgrounds (Ingersoll, 2002; Plecki, Elfers, Loeb, Zahir & Knapp, 2005; Useem & Nield, 2001). Teacher attrition in general may be driven in part by level of job dissatisfaction (Culver et al., 1990; Gardner, 2006; Perie & Baker, 1997). It has not yet been thoroughly examined in the research literature whether teacher job dissatisfaction is a greater problem in high-poverty urban schools than in other schools, or whether job
dissatisfaction is the primary cause of the higher rates of attrition that have been observed in high-poverty urban schools. Three questions become prescient based on this analysis:

Is job dissatisfaction in high-poverty urban schools the major factor leading to higher levels of attrition in high-poverty urban schools than in other types of schools? If so, then what are the leading sources of job dissatisfaction in high-poverty urban schools? Finally, are there teacher characteristics, similar to those enumerated by Gardner (2006) that may be linked to job dissatisfaction or attrition in high-poverty urban schools?

**Music Teacher Attrition as a Special Case**

Music teachers in all school settings may present a special case in the study of job satisfaction or attrition. The previously mentioned TSA report indicated that music teacher shortages were noted in nineteen states for the 2010-2011 school year (Miller, 2010). Keeping music teachers in the profession longer and in the schools where they are initially hired may help to address the music teacher shortage issue. Two studies found higher attrition rates for music and arts teachers than rates for other subjects (Leukens, Lyter & Fox, 2004; Theobald & Michael, 2001;), while three other studies indicated that overall attrition rates for music and arts teachers were similar to other subject areas (Gardner, 2006; Hancock, 2009; Scheib, 2006), although Scheib found that rates of movement between schools were higher. While a possibly higher attrition rate and/or rate of movement do not in any way prove that music teachers are more dissatisfied than other teachers of other subject areas it may be at least one indication that music teachers may be a special case in need of further study. That other researchers have not found these same results, instead finding that attrition rates for music teachers are similar to teachers of other subject areas does not negate the need for further research into this
matter, but rather affirms it. One reason that this is so is that only articles from general education literature, rather than music education research literature, have found differences between attrition rates for music and arts teachers and teachers of other subject areas and it may be that the combining of music and arts into a single subject area is a confounding factor in the studies. Further research is warranted in this area however.

Several reasons are found in the literature as to why music teachers may be less satisfied or have higher rates of attrition, one of which is isolation (Lipscomb & Sindberg, 2005). There are often fewer music teachers per building than math, science or English teachers (Frierson-Campbell, 2004). Music teachers may feel that professional development activities directed at raising test scores in reading and math, wherein participation by the whole staff is mandated, are irrelevant in their classroom situation. Music teacher may also feel that teachers of math, science and reading may view music as an opportunity for planning time rather than a legitimate discipline in itself (Doyle, 2010). Feelings of professional isolation may be exacerbated in urban schools where the number of music teachers in proportion to the overall student population may be lower than in suburban or rural schools (Dockser, 2010).

The dual identities of music teachers as performers and teachers may also lead to job dissatisfaction or attrition from the music teaching profession. Music teachers are most typically prepared for the profession in schools of music. To become certified music teachers, they must first have gained sufficient skill in traditional western classical music either on an instrument or vocally. Conservatory-style training through private lessons, participation in music ensembles and through the study of music history and theory cements the musical identity of the future music educators as performer (Scheib, 2006).
Research has suggested that when music teachers neglect this performer identity, dissatisfaction with their job, and perhaps their career may follow (Russell, 2009).

Music courses, music department budgets and personnel may be cut in high-poverty urban schools that are struggling to meet AYP goals, which may lead to increased turnover rates in these schools. Frequent teacher turnover may be linked to diminishing class sizes in music programs (Witt, 2003), and low numbers in these performance classes may be interpreted by administrators as a lack of interest in the subject by a school’s pupils. As an example of this, I can cite my own experience teaching in High Point, where three chorus teachers were hired, and then left the school within my first four years. At the end of the fourth year, no replacement was hired because the choir had diminished to less than a dozen members.

It is important to examine the structures in place that support experienced music educators in high-poverty urban schools, as they have demonstrated a commitment to their school, the community, and the students they serve. Just as important is to examine experienced teachers' opinions and attitudes that have shaped their intentions to stay in positions in high-poverty urban schools.

**Experienced Teachers and Novice Teachers**

There are a number of reasons why experience matters in the teaching profession. These include the effects on student achievement, effects on overall school faculty through mentorship and the development of faculty leadership roles as department heads, and committee chairs. There are additional reasons why experience matters for music teachers particularly. Like coaches or other art teachers, but unlike teachers of math, science, social studies or English, who typically have a student for only a single year,
music teachers have the opportunity to develop and sustain relationships with students and students' parents across a number of years. In the process of teaching groups of students for many years, reputation of the program builds, along with the teacher's reputation. Unlike math, science, social studies or English, music in the secondary grades is less likely to be a required subject, so for music teachers, the concept of "building the program" becomes important.

Music teacher attrition rates are an area of concern due to the roles music teachers have in shaping, guiding and sustaining programs across several years, what music teachers call, “building the program.” Anecdotal evidence and personal experience has suggested that stability in the teaching staff of a music program (given high quality teachers) fosters trust, confidence and support from the parents and students of a school. A growing reputation of an ensemble or director may enhance recruitment efforts and the number of students enrolled in ensemble classes may grow. Often instrumental music programs have only one entry point, e.g. all beginning classes are offered only in sixth grade. Thus, in order to sustain a high school instrumental program it is important to control the number of students who leave the program, as there are often no later entry points.

Research has suggested that the times when most students drop out of music classes are at school level changes; e.g. between middle and high school, or when there is a change in the teacher of the program (Witt, 2003). If continuous turnover of teachers leads to a diminishing rather than increasing size of ensemble music classes, positions may be eventually cut because staffing allotments are predicated by class enrollment numbers. In my teaching position in a high-poverty urban school, three chorus teachers
were hired then left their positions within three years. In that time, the number of students enrolled in the chorus dropped to only eight students, and after the departure of the third chorus teacher, the class was disbanded entirely and no replacement was hired. In the same period of time, my senior orchestra quintupled in size, while my middle school orchestra quadrupled, so despite cuts to other music programs at the school, the orchestra thrived.

As previously noted, many teachers in urban schools necessarily come from suburban middle class backgrounds, and urban schools may be an unfamiliar environment to them. Many novice urban teachers benefit from time and experience. A second-year urban teacher, quoted in Guin (2004) remarked

My first year here I did not really understand how to teach here. It was so different from teaching in a north-end school (a school with few minorities, few low-SES students, few students who were English Language Learners). The population was so different. I really feel it takes you a year to teach at a new location. As a second year teacher I can feel how last year impacted my feeling of comfort and understanding of how the school works. If you are always faced with new teachers you will always have a school on the edge. (p.15)

Knowledge of the community is built along with a mutual respect. Experienced teachers are not necessarily the panacea to urban schools' student achievement woes. Novice teachers also serve an important role- bringing new ideas, fresh perspectives, energy and excitement into the school (Huang & Moon, 2009; Muñoz & Chang 2007). It should be noted though that too many novice teachers tend to overextend a school's resources for necessary support for the novice teachers.
The schools that are least organized to hire and support new teachers are often located in low-income communities, where there are the greatest concentrations of new teachers. When these schools are unable to support new teachers, they also fail the students who most depend on public education for their future.

(Johnson, 2004, p. 249)

Years of experience can represent a demonstrated commitment to a school, the students, or the community (Nieto, 2003). Years of experience, can be seen as a measurable proxy for commitment to the school and the school system, and is rewarded by the school system in the form of step pay increases. Pay increases are also often tied to graduate degree attainment, which might be seen as a proxy for commitment to the profession.

**Music Teacher Job Satisfaction as a Social Phenomenon**

Music teacher job satisfaction is not only whether a teacher simply likes his/her job. Gardner (2006) posits that music teacher job and career satisfaction is a "complex social phenomenon ... influenced by a variety of different factors" (Gardner, 2006, p. 188). Gardner concluded that:

There exists substantial evidence that the more positive music teachers' opinions of the workplace are, and the more professionally satisfied they feel, the more likely it is that they will continue in their teaching positions. (p. 197)

Although some attrition from the teaching field is rightfully celebrated due to retirement, of concern for the purposes of this project is attrition of novice teachers working in high-poverty urban schools that may be preventable.
Examples of types of factors that may influence teacher job satisfaction include teachers’ opinions and perception of the teaching profession and their workplace, teachers’ personal attributes and the attributes associated with their teaching position. Teachers’ opinions and perceptions of the teaching profession and of their workplace influence them in shaping an overall feeling of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction which may influence their decision to stay in a teaching position, or even within the teaching profession, or the intention to leave the position or the profession. Teachers’ opinions and perceptions of teaching or the workplace are influenced by numerous factors. These include their perception of support of themselves, their students and their music program from administrators (Gardner, 2006; Russell 2009), a teacher’s opinion of student characteristics relating to quality and discipline issues (Russell, 2009) and perceptions of labor market forces (Hansen, Lien, Cavalluzzo & Wenger, 2004; Nelson, 2006).

A number of teacher attributes and job attributes have also been found to be associated with either higher or lower levels of job satisfaction. Job attribute factors relating to music teacher job satisfaction are those factors from the working environment, including physical environmental factors and persons in the environment who interact with the teacher to influence his/her job satisfaction. These include but are not limited to level of the school (elementary, middle or high), percentage of African American students, percentage of White students, type of room, instructional duties including the number of non-music courses taught, and whether teachers are itinerant (Gardner, 2006). An additional job attribute factor explored in education literature, but not in music education literature that may be relevant to music teachers’ job dissatisfaction in high-
poverty urban schools is the physical condition of the buildings and classrooms (Buckley, Schneider & Shang, 2005).

Teacher attributes have been seen in the research literature to be associated with either higher or lower levels of music teacher job satisfaction. Some of these teacher attribute factors are physical in nature, while others are understood in a social context. Philosophical viewpoint such as a commitment to the profession (Russell, 2009) or a commitment to social justice (Doyle, 2010) may also be considered to be a teacher attribute. Commitment to the profession may strengthen a teacher’s resolve to continue teaching music, as a part of a person’s occupational identity, whereas a commitment to social justice may strengthen a teacher’s resolve to continue teaching because of the positive impact of music education on educational outcomes on students in high-poverty urban schools. Teacher attributes associated with higher or lower levels of teacher job satisfaction or higher or lower attrition rates include sex and age (Gardner, 2006). Socially constructed characteristics of race and ethnicity (Culver et al., 1990) and a teacher's SES while growing up (Doyle, 2010) have also been found to be associated with differing levels of teacher job satisfaction.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to find out what kinds of teachers are most satisfied in high-poverty urban schools, what differences may exist between those teachers who intend to stay in their present positions and those who intend to leave. Numerous factors (teacher attribute factors, job attribute factors, and factors relating to teacher opinion and perception of teaching or the workplace) were examined regarding their relative strength in predicting three dependent variables (teacher job satisfaction, planned attrition or
retention decisions for the following year and intended attrition or retention- the projected attrition or retention decisions of the teachers for the next five years). This study utilized a questionnaire as well as outside data sources to collect information regarding teacher attributes, job attributes, and to survey the opinions and perceptions of music teachers in high-poverty urban schools regarding their present teaching position and the music education profession in general. Results of the study may lend credence to or refute the supposition that music teacher job satisfaction leads to the retention of teachers or that job dissatisfaction leads to teacher attrition.

Research Questions

1. What factors (teacher attributes, job attributes, and opinions or perceptions regarding teaching or their workplace) distinguish experienced teachers in high-poverty urban schools from novice teachers?

2. Among experienced teachers on the one hand, and novice teachers on the other, what factors distinguish stayers from leavers?

3. Which factors are most predictive of overall music teacher job satisfaction in high-poverty urban school settings?

4. Which factors, including teacher job satisfaction, are most predictive of a music teacher's intention to leave or stay in a high-poverty urban school setting?

Methodological Paradigm

This quantitative research project relied on generalizing numeric data on variables in the affective domain from a random sample to a larger population of music teachers in high-poverty urban schools. In the present study, music teacher job satisfaction was examined through survey methodology via a questionnaire with Likert-style items. The
questionnaire is divided into several sections, each section corresponding to factors that have been shown in previous literature to affect job satisfaction or be associated with higher or lower attrition rates. Scores from sections of the questionnaire served to quantify teachers' opinions and attitudes about aspects of their jobs.

Information regarding the schools in which teachers are employed (percentage of students at or below the poverty level, percentage of minority and White students) was gathered from National Center for Education Statistics databases. Regression analysis was employed to determine which factors are most predictive of overall music teacher job satisfaction and of the teacher's plans or intention to stay in or leave their current position in a high-poverty urban school.

**Definition of terms**

*Urban Schools*—Urban schools as defined for this study were limited to schools in large metropolitan school districts. A “Metropolitan” school district is defined by the U.S. Census bureau as a school district situated in a principal city of a Metropolitan Core Based Statistical Area with the city having a population greater than or equal to 250,000 (see Table 1). This is the largest designation for urban areas defined by the census bureau. Six school districts were chosen for this study, each with at least 500,000 inhabitants, and each is among the top 50 largest cities in the United States.
Table 1

*U.S. Census Bureau Metrocentric Locale Codes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Large City (CBSA), A principal city of a Metropolitan Core Based Statistical Area with the city having a population greater than or equal to 250,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mid-Size City A principal city of a Metropolitan CBSA, with the city having a population less than 250,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Urban Fringe Large City Any incorporated place, Census-designated place, or non-place territory within a Metropolitan CBSA of a Large City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City Any incorporated place, Census-designated place, or non-place territory within a CBSA of a Mid-Size City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Large Town An incorporated place or Census-designated place with a population greater than or equal to 25,000 and located outside a Metropolitan CBSA or inside a Micropolitan CBSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Small Town An incorporated place or Census-designated place with a population less than 25,000 and located outside a Metropolitan CBSA or inside a Micropolitan CBSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rural Any incorporated place, Census-designated place, or non-place outside CBSA territory not within a Micropolitan CBSA and defined as rural by the Census Bureau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rural Any incorporated place, Census-designated place, or non-place inside CBSA territory within a Metropolitan CBSA and defined as rural by the Census Bureau.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*High Poverty*- High-poverty status of the schools was determined using the federal government criteria. Title-I of the 1967 Elementary and Secondary Schools Act (ESEA) set the threshold for the designation of high-poverty status at 30% of enrolled students living at or below the poverty level. These schools then received compensatory funding from the federal government. These schools have since been called Title-I schools after this legislation. Percentage of students receiving free or reduced price
lunches at a school was used as a proxy for determining the percent of students at or below the poverty level.

Music Teacher- For the purposes of this study Music Teachers were those teachers whose position was at least one half music courses, e.g. band, choir, general music, orchestra, guitar or keyboard instruction in the public schools.

Experienced Urban Teachers- Experienced urban teachers were those with at least five years of teaching experience, and at least five years in a high-poverty urban school setting. Five years has been used as a baseline for previous research using years of experience as a variable to differentiate between novice and experienced teachers (New York City Investigative Division, 2004; Siebert, 2008; Gardner, 2006; Theobald & Michael, 2001). Five years in an urban school setting particularly is important as a benchmark for showing a level of commitment to urban schools. After five years in high-poverty urban schools, it is expected that these teachers may have unique perspectives that set them apart from teachers who have not had sustained assignments in high-poverty urban schools. Because it was expected that due to higher teacher turnover in high-poverty urban schools, if this benchmark were to be set at ten years instead of five, there may have been a paucity of responses that would fit the criteria. Novice urban teachers were defined those with fewer than five years in urban schools.

Attrition- The term attrition is generally only applied to teachers who have left their positions voluntarily as the result of leaving the profession (leavers), moving to another school inside or outside of the district (movers), shifting to another job in the education profession such as administration or teaching in higher education (shifters) or retirement (retirees).
Retention - The term retention, or retained applies to teachers who have either planned to stay at their present position for the following year, or who intend to stay in their present position during the following five years.

Limitations of the Study

This study was not designed to determine quality differences between experienced and novice teachers, but only compared them regarding their feelings about their jobs that may affect future attrition or retention decisions. Attrition or retention data for this study was based on participants’ prediction of future career paths and does not measure actual attrition or turnover. Greater accuracy in predicting plans for the following year was attempted through administration of the questionnaire during the final few weeks of the school year (late May until early June). Although less accuracy can be attributed to participants stated intention to stay in or leave a position within the next five years, stated intention to leave a position has been correlated with actual attrition in a previous study (Vandenberg & Barnes-Nelson, 1999). Fresko, Kfir and Nasser (1977) found that increased teacher job satisfaction led to a greater commitment to their job and to the profession. They surmised that job satisfaction may then be a reaction to the present, which acts to influence plans in the future, whereas immediate plans for attrition or retention are more influenced by immediate circumstances (e.g. when one turns 70, retirement is inevitable, or a plan to leave one job is made when another job becomes available, or a plan to leave the profession is precipitated by a new baby).

This study is not comparing teachers from various urbanicities to find differences, nor to find differences between teachers in high-poverty and low-poverty schools. It has been previously noted that high-poverty urban schools have higher levels of attrition and
smaller pools of candidates to fill positions. This study was an attempt to find the reasons why teachers stay in or leave these positions, and to determine teacher and school characteristics that lead to retention of teachers. The ultimate purpose is to use the results of this study to help policy makers and administrators to increase jobs satisfaction with the hope that this would lead to the retention of highly qualified music teachers in high-poverty urban schools. Thus, other schools in other urbanicity categories with students from more affluent areas will be neglected in the data collection for this study. Data collected can be generalized only to teachers in similar circumstances, and not to all music teachers in all settings nor to teachers of other subjects.

It is also recognized that to truly measure variables within the affective domain relies on approximations and estimations, and that measurement of opinions and attitudes is necessarily less reliable than measurement of physical structures.

**Summary**

High-poverty urban schools have time and again been shown to have higher attrition rates and smaller pools of candidates to fill vacant positions (Boyd et al., 2005; Ingersoll, 2002; Johnson, 2004; Plecki et al., 2005; Useem & Nield, 2001). This may be due to structures inherent in urban areas and the schools serving them. Some studies have shown that music and arts teachers have higher rates of attrition than teachers of other subjects (Theobald & Michael, 2001; Leukens et al. 2004). One factor thought to lead to attrition within schools is teacher job dissatisfaction. The combination of these three statements results in the research focus of this dissertation. It is the purpose of this study to assess factors that predict job satisfaction and the attrition or retention decisions of music teachers in high-poverty urban schools. Just as important is identifying
commonalities among experienced teachers in terms of teacher attributes, job attributes and teachers opinions and perceptions of teaching and the workplace to determine what support structures, attitudes and teacher characteristics have enabled those experienced teachers to remain in the schools when so many of their colleagues have left.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

This study examined job satisfaction of novice and experienced music teachers in high-poverty urban schools. Teacher job satisfaction has been found to be a factor in predicting teacher's plans or intentions to leave their position or the teaching profession (Culver, Wolfle & Cross, 1990; Gardner, 2006; Perie & Baker, 1997). Music and arts teachers may have higher attrition rates than teachers of other subjects (Theobald & Michael, 2001; Leukens et al. 2004). Other studies have found similar attrition rates with other subject areas (Gardner, 2006; Hancock, 2009; Scheib, 2006) although Scheib notes greater movement among schools for music teachers as opposed to other subject areas. Urban schools serving high-poverty areas have been shown to have higher levels of attrition and turnover than schools in other urbanicities and those serving middle-class or high-SES areas (Boyd et al., 2005; Ingersoll, 2002; Johnson, 2004; Plecki et al., 2005; Useem & Nield, 2001). One main focus of this study was an attempt to find similarities among experienced urban teachers and similarities between experienced urban teachers and novice teachers who intend to stay in their current teaching positions.

Four research questions guided this study:

1. What factors (teacher attributes, job attributes, and opinions or perceptions regarding teaching or their workplace) distinguish experienced teachers in high-poverty urban schools from novice teachers?

2. Among experienced teachers on the one hand, and novice teachers on the other, what factors distinguish stayers from leavers?
3. Which factors are most predictive of overall music teacher job satisfaction in high-poverty urban school settings?

4. Which factors, including teacher job satisfaction, are most predictive of a music teacher's intention to leave or stay in a high-poverty urban school setting?

No Child Left Behind legislation mandates that all classroom teachers must be “highly qualified” (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). Recruiting, and then keeping high quality teachers in positions within high-poverty urban schools must rely in part on the urban school system’s ability to first attract highly qualified teachers to fill vacancies and then to retain those teachers in their positions. The works of authors such as Jonathan Kozol (Savage Inequalities in 1991, and more recently, Shame of the Nation: The Restoration of Apartheid Schooling in America in 2005) and David Tyack (The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education, in 1974, and more recently, Seeking Common Ground: Public Schools in a Diverse Society in 2003) have focused, and then refocused attention of their readers on the difficulties faced by urban teachers, administrators and students. The purpose of this chapter is to describe what is known in the research literature about high-poverty urban schools, and those teachers who staff them. Much of the research literature reviewed focuses on attrition and retention of teachers in those schools, with special focus on those teachers who have stayed in their positions and within the profession long enough to be considered “experienced teachers.” Finally, what is found in the research literature regarding music teachers, especially those in urban schools, and why might they be a special case of interest.
Patterns of Teacher Attrition and Movement

The United States Department of Education in 2010 listed teacher shortage areas in all 50 states (Miller, 2010). Ingersoll (2002) argues that the root cause of teacher shortages is not a shortage of teachers graduating from teacher preparation programs, but high teacher turnover rates. While high-attrition rates for retirees is to be expected, of concern are the high attrition rates for novice teachers, 39% of whom leave the profession within their first five years (ibid.). Several studies have shown rates of teacher attrition to be higher within urban schools than in suburban or rural schools (Boyd et al., 2005; Ingersoll, 2002; Johnson, 2004; Useem & Nield, 2001), including a study by the New York City Council Investigative Division (2004) which estimated attrition rates of first year teachers of 18%, as compared to the national average of 10%. Other studies have found that demographic characteristics of schools- those with high concentrations of low-SES students, or those with high percentages of African American or Latino students, i.e. characteristics common in urban schools, rather than the urbanicity of the school to be the most prescient factor explaining variation in teacher attrition rates (Plecki et al., 2005; Useem & Neild, 2001). The following studies are representative of the patterns of attrition within the overall teaching profession.

Ingersoll (2002) investigated teacher attrition and retention as the root cause of the teacher shortages in the United States. Teacher shortages became an issue of national importance due to the passage of No Child Left Behind legislation, which required that all teachers be “highly qualified.” The researcher investigated the question of whether organizational characteristics and conditions in schools were driving teacher attrition. Ingersoll undertook a large-scale statistical analysis of the results of the Schools and
Staffing Survey (SASS) and Teacher Follow-up Survey (TFS) conducted by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). Data analyzed in this study were derived from surveys administered by the NCES during 1987-88, 1990-1991, 1993-94 and 1999-2000 school years. The SASS was administered by the National Center for Educational Statistics to 55,000 randomly selected teachers and 12,000 administrators from all 50 states. One year later, the TFS was sent to a sub-sample of those teachers who had participated in the SASS, regardless of whether or not they remained in their positions from the year before.

Analysis of the results of the TFS indicate that 39% of teachers left their positions after just 5 years in the teaching profession. Ingersoll found that teacher attrition rates were shown to vary based on school characteristics. Within public schools, 16.4% of teachers in high poverty schools had left their jobs in the year between the administration of the SASS and the TFS, as compared to 9% of teachers in low poverty schools. Teachers in urban schools were statistically more likely to leave than teachers in suburban or rural schools (14% as compared to 13% and 11% respectively).

The report by Useem and Neild (2001) examined the substantial challenges of teacher staffing in the Philadelphia school district, where despite dropping student enrollment, teacher demand was very high due to high teacher attrition rates. Findings of the report are based on a data set provided by the Philadelphia school district, which included years of experience of the teachers at each of the schools in the district and student demographic information at those schools. The study also included results of surveys conducted by the district of new and experienced teachers, as well as a survey of teachers who declined employment in the district.
One important finding of the study was that the highest turnover rates and the least experienced teachers were most commonly found in Philadelphia's high-poverty schools. The researchers found that in Philadelphia schools as a whole, staff turnovers were higher than the national average, applications were down from previous years, and emergency certification was required for greater percentages of teachers than in previous years in order to fill areas of teacher hiring shortfalls. The researchers found several barriers to attracting teachers, including low salaries as compared to the surrounding suburbs, stringent state certification requirements, and competition for graduating teachers from suburban districts. Middle schools were found to have higher turnover rates than high schools or elementary schools. Schools with high percentages of low SES students had the greatest percentage of non-certified teachers. High-poverty schools also had the highest turnover rates among Philadelphia schools, such that 46% of teachers in the highest poverty schools in Philadelphia began teaching at their school within the past two years. Findings of the study suggested that Philadelphia's teachers were more likely to stay in schools whose principals have strong interpersonal and organizational skills, and who respect the teachers' skills and personal lives.

Condron and Roscigno (2003) examined school budgets looking for spending patterns and achievement differences between low and high-poverty schools in the Columbus Ohio school district, working on the assumption that such patterns may influence student achievement. Independent variables for the study were the school building’s physical condition, spending on physical structures and maintenance for the school, demographic composition of the student body. Researchers investigated the relative influence of the variables on standardized testing scores of the students attending
those schools. Additionally, they looked for patterns of spending on physical structures of the school related to the racial and social class makeup of the student body. A multiple regression analysis of factors influencing school level funding of elementary schools in Columbus Public School District revealed inequality within the district corresponding to racial and class composition of the schools. The researchers found that fewer local dollars were allocated to high-poverty schools, weakening the effects of compensatory Title-I money from the federal government. Further, the most highly credentialed teachers, with the greater number of years of experience were concentrated in high-SES, majority White schools with higher per-pupil expenditures. That these teachers had, on average, more experience indicated that schools in which high-SES, majority White student populations had lower rates of attrition. The researchers speculated that these schools may be more attractive to teachers because of real or perceived differences in the quality of the school, or more tangible classroom resources such as computers, books and teacher's aides.

The public school district of the city of Philadelphia commissioned a study authored by Neild, Useem and Farley (2005) to help to address the perceived problems of recruiting and retaining teachers in the district. Philadelphia had hired over 1,400 new teachers prior to the 2004-2005 school year, despite declining enrollment. The teacher shortage problem within the district was found to lie not in an insufficient number of qualified applicants, but rather in the retention of teachers, and in ensuring that the teachers who continue in the Philadelphia schools were fully qualified. The researchers utilized a mixed-methods approach utilizing survey data, (the district’s New Teacher Survey n=454 respondents) eight focus groups (n=58), and individual interviews (n=20).
Focus group members and interviewees were sampled from those teachers who had responded to the New Teacher Survey. Similar to the findings of Condron and Roscigno (2003), new and novice teachers were concentrated in the highest poverty schools (high-poverty schools within this study were defined as those with at least 90% of attending students at or below the poverty level).

Reasons teachers stated for choosing to teach in Philadelphia included high availability of jobs, good benefits packages, the desire to teach urban students, and that applicants were from Philadelphia originally. School and class climate were the main challenges to the district’s retention efforts, according to the teachers. Additionally, many teachers felt unprepared to teach special education classes. The enforcement of No Child Left Behind legislation requiring all teachers to be highly qualified further drives already high turnover rates as many teachers hired to fill emergency vacancies without full credentials are laid off at the end of the school year. Finally, labor market forces and the willingness to move to what may have been perceived by these teachers as better schools drove some portion of the attrition rate. Many of the teachers who left Philadelphia schools were not leaving the profession, but were instead moving to schools elsewhere where they believed they would find a more satisfying teaching position.

A report prepared for the Washington State Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession (Plecki et al., 2005) examined teacher retention and mobility within the state. Four hundred teachers from twenty districts were administered a “fast response” survey instrument comprised of a combination of Likert-type and open-ended questions during the 2003-2004 school year. Teachers were selected for the study through stratified random sampling to include representation from all subject areas, from rural, urban and
suburban, and low and high-poverty schools. The twenty districts from which the sample was drawn represent 14,286 teachers, or nearly 30% of the state’s teacher workforce. High levels of teacher job satisfaction were found to be related to a.) the presence of supportive colleagues, b.) a collaborative work environment and c.) support from an administrator. Reasons given for job dissatisfaction most often related to a.) overall workload, b.) frustration with state education reform policies, c.) class size, and d.) inadequate instructional time. Teacher retention rates varied with school characteristics. Specifically, teacher retention was found to be negatively correlated with a.) the percentage of students at the poverty level, b.) the percentage of students who performed poorly on state tests of math and science, and c.) the percentage of African-American students at the school.

Johnson (2004) conducted a qualitative study of 50 new teachers in Massachusetts, and the 50 teachers they were replacing to determine reasons why some teachers stay in their positions and why some leave the profession or change positions within the teaching profession. Eleven of the participants moved between teaching positions during the study, and all eleven were found to have migrated to schools with more wealthy student populations. Johnson determined that those schools with the lowest levels of teacher attrition, either from moving or leaving the profession, were those with better support mechanisms in place for new teachers. New teachers who felt supported in their positions stated that they had "good curricula, sufficient supplies and supportive colleagues" (Johnson, 2004, p. 256). Schools that were less likely to provide these types of support were those schools that had high levels of attrition and were also likely to be high-poverty urban schools.
The evidence from these studies has suggested that high-poverty urban schools in general have higher levels of attrition than other types of schools. Attracting highly qualified teachers may not be enough to overcome teacher shortages in high-poverty urban schools if such teachers cannot be retained. The next sections of this chapter address the matters of what characteristics of high-poverty urban schools contribute to high teacher attrition rates, and what teacher attributes may contribute to the teacher's willingness to stay in high-poverty urban schools.

**Characteristics of Urban Schools that Drive Attrition Rates**

Several researchers have attempted to ascertain ways in which high-poverty urban schools differ from suburban or rural schools serving students from higher SES backgrounds and how these differences in the schools lead to different rates of teacher attrition. Funding issues due to schools being situated in high-poverty neighborhoods in urban areas relate directly to lower teacher salaries, older school buildings that are poorly maintained and the lesser availability of necessary supplies than in suburban or rural schools serving students from higher SES backgrounds. Indirectly related are issues such as administrative support and classroom discipline issues that may be tied to larger issues of public safety in urban areas. Another difference between high-poverty urban schools and suburban or rural schools serving students from the same or higher SES backgrounds is a far greater emphasis in high-poverty urban schools on preparation for high-stakes standardized tests, due to historically lower scores on standardized tests documented extensively elsewhere in books and articles on environmental causes of the black-white achievement gap (e.g. Jencks and Phillips, 1998; Paige and Witty, 2010; Rothstein, 2004). Generally, the authors of research studies highlighting the problems faced in
high-poverty urban schools (e.g. low teachers' salaries, classroom discipline or teaching to the test) do not argue that these problems are unique to high-poverty urban schools, only that these problems may be more prevalent in high-poverty urban schools.

Results of the analysis of SASS and TFS data by Ingersoll in the previously mentioned 2002 study indicated the generally high rates of teacher attrition were often linked to teacher job dissatisfaction. Shakrani (2005) found that of the approximately 275,000 teachers who left teaching in the previous year (8.5% of the total workforce, nationally) 30 percent retired, while 57% left due to issues under the broad heading of job dissatisfaction. The other 13% left due to personal issue; commonly family issues. In the previously mentioned Ingersoll (2002) study, job dissatisfaction was also given as the most common reason for teacher attrition. Gardner as well, in his dissertation (2006) found that music teachers commonly leave due to factors related to job dissatisfaction (teacher attributes, job attributes, teacher opinions and perceptions of teaching and the workplace), rather than reasons such as firings, retirements or district layoffs due to budget cuts. The term attrition is generally only applied to teachers who have left their positions voluntarily as the result of leaving the profession, moving to another school, shifting to another job in the education profession such as administration or teaching in higher education or retirement.

The most common reasons for attrition (Ingersoll, 2002) included poor salary (46% of teachers), lack of administration support (34%), student discipline problems (23%), poor student motivation (22%), and lack of faculty influence in school decision-making regarding student discipline (15%). Other, less common reasons included unsafe environment (7%), inadequate time (9%), large class sizes (9%), intrusions on teaching
(8%), lack of room for advancement (9%) and lack of community support (9%).

Ingersoll did not however directly link these issues with teacher retention in urban schools, however, as mentioned previously, he did find that attrition rates in urban schools and in high poverty schools were higher than suburban or rural schools serving students from higher SES backgrounds.

In a study of teacher retention and attrition in New York City Schools, the Council Investigative Division (New York City Council Investigative Division, 2004) investigators and staff members conducted phone interviews with 2,781 randomly chosen teachers in the Spring of 2004. The impetus of the study were various reports on New York City Schools attrition rates for new hires showing a first-year attrition rate of 18% as compared to a national average attrition rate of first year teachers of 10%. Interview questions pertained to teachers’ opinions regarding the teaching environment, their plans to leave the school system, and their likely reasons for leaving. For the purposes of the study, teachers were divided into three categories based on experience: new teachers (1-5 years of experience), mid-career teachers (6-24), and eligible retirees (25+). All three categories reported low salary as compared to surrounding suburbs and school safety and discipline issues as the top two reasons for leaving jobs in the New York City school system. The third most common reason differed for each experience level, with new teachers reporting dissatisfaction with availability of instructional supplies and materials, mid-career teachers reporting dissatisfaction with amount of planning and preparation provided, and eligible retirees reporting dissatisfaction with the lack of flexibility in teaching approach. It should be noted that New York City Schools are not strictly homogeneous in terms of percentage of minorities and percentage of students at or below
the poverty level (Kozol, 2005) and that this research report did not disaggregate data based on these factors.

Liu and Meyer (2005) examined teacher responses from the SASS and the TFS to examine the question of which aspects of their jobs teachers were least satisfied. The researchers used 35 questions from the SASS and TFS surveys, grouped into five aspects of teaching, student discipline, school climate, professional support, compensation and work conditions. Hierarchical linear modeling was used to then discover with which aspects of their jobs teachers were least satisfied. Results from the analysis affirmed the findings of the New York City Council Investigative Division, although now with nationally representative data sets, showing teacher dissatisfaction was primarily linked to income and benefits, followed by student discipline problems. Though private school teachers reported lower salaries than public school teachers, they tended to be more satisfied with their jobs than their public school counterparts, which the researchers theorized was due to fewer discipline problems in the private schools, as they could be more selective in their admissions and had more control over expulsions. Minority teachers were also found to be less satisfied than White teachers with student discipline and with their salary. The researchers posited that this difference in satisfaction due to salary and student discipline issues may be because minority teachers are more often found in urban schools with high percentages of minority students. "It is not surprising", the researchers state, "that inner city schools rife with student discipline problems experience high teacher turnover" (Liu & Meyer, 2005, p. 998).

Hanson, Lien, Cavalluzzo & Wenger (2004) analyzed teacher retention rates within a large urban school district in relation to the Annualized Cost of Leaving-
formula developed by the military to assess differences in compensation levels for workers in an industry compared to what workers in other jobs in the same labor market might earn with identical credentials. The researchers drew data from the personnel records of 6,429 secondary level teachers in the district who were in the first ten salary steps (less than 20 years' experience). Results of the analysis showed that while salary matters to the teachers, the effects of increasing pay on teacher retention are small, such that for each one percent raise in pay, teacher retention rates are increased by only .7 percent. No substantial link was found between teacher retention and school demographic conditions (percentage of minority students, nor percentage of students at or below the poverty level). Although teachers in schools with high-minority/high-poverty student populations were found to be more likely to leave the district, their decisions to leave could be traced to "other factors" (not specified) p. 41, and not found to be directly related to the demographic mix of the student body. Finally, in contrast to the findings of similar studies, the data suggested that district wide retention rates for large urban districts may not vary from the national average. The researchers conjectured that this finding, that this urban district's attrition rate may not vary from the national average, may be due to the variety of teaching situations possible in a large urban district, such that although teachers may not leave the district, they are moving within the district at higher rates than is possible within smaller districts. This finding may be different than what is found due to the researcher's access to the complete personnel records of each of the study participants, allowing for tracking of teachers careers across a ten-year time frame. Thus, if teachers left high-poverty schools for low-poverty schools within the district, they were not counted in attrition numbers.
Buckley, Schneider and Shang (2005) examined the relationships between school facility quality and condition and the retention of teachers who work in those buildings. The aspects examined in detail are air quality, thermal comfort, classroom lighting, amount of natural daylight and soundproofing in public schools in urban district of Washington DC, which contains a mixture of high-poverty and low-poverty schools. Two thirds of teachers surveyed for the study reported poor air quality, 20 percent reported poor lighting, 20 percent also could not see out of a window in their classroom. Almost 70 percent reported that the classrooms and hallways were "so noisy that it affects their ability to teach" (p.1113). Teachers were asked whether they would remain at their present assignment in the following school year, and what incentives might entice them to stay in their present position. The effect of facility upgrades on teacher retention was found to be equal to or greater than the effect of pay increases on teacher retention, even when controlling for factors such as teacher age and years of service.

In another study of building and maintenance issues in Washington DC schools, Wooley and Winkler (2007) examined expenditures on school construction and improvement in relation to the individual school's urbanicity, percentage of students on free or reduced lunch, and percentage of minority students. The researchers found that those school buildings whose student population included at least 40 % of students on free and reduced lunch fell below the regional average on construction and improvement expenditures. Construction spending was also below average in schools attended primarily by minority students (schools where less than 15 percent of the student population were White) and for schools where African-Americans formed the dominant minority group. Schools with a racially diverse or majority White student population
garnered the greatest level of funding for construction and maintenance. Outlay for construction was highest in the outer and far suburbs of the city, and lowest in the inner core and inner suburbs of the city, a pattern that reflected the need for school construction in the rapidly growing suburbs, but which neglected the maintenance needs of the school buildings in the inner city.

Diamond and Spillane (2004) used interview data from teachers in four Chicago elementary schools, two high-performing elementary schools, and two probationary elementary schools to examine those schools' responses to high-stakes accountability policies that were implemented following the passage of NCLB legislation. School culture was examined in terms of rigidness of gate-keeping (restrictions on providing information to outsiders by school personnel) and amount of time and stress put on standardized test preparation and teaching to the test. Analysis of interview transcriptions with stake-holders including teachers, administrators, community members and volunteers at the schools revealed that although standardized testing may be responsible for academic improvements as measured by test scores in the schools, the high performing schools, they may also be responsible for creating a divide between high and low performing schools. Those high-performing schools, typically with higher percentage of White and middle-income students, may benefit more from accountability policies which include incentives such as praise for student scores, and the posting of gain scores. This may be seen in contrast with low performing schools who receive not incentives, but sanctions leading to low morale, stress, and the marginalization of the teachers and students in those schools.
Though there are, of course, high-poverty schools in suburban and rural areas, housing segregation and White-flight led to the concentration of African-Americans and other minorities in the cities with few job opportunities. This in turn led to the budgetary constraints that have plagued city schools. Again, it should be stated that on the whole researchers are not stating that it is urbanicity that is to blame for high attrition and lower teacher job satisfaction, but rather that factors which have been associated with high attrition and lowered teacher job satisfaction are more prevalent in urban areas than elsewhere. The present study may be warranted in part because there is seemingly little consensus regarding the relative import of these factors on teacher job satisfaction.

Teacher Attributes Associated with Persistence in Urban School Settings

It is possible that teachers who demonstrate persistence in their teaching positions have consistent characteristics that may contribute to their positive retention rates. Having noted the higher levels of attrition and lower teacher job satisfaction ratings among urban teachers, some researchers have examined not working conditions, but rather the characteristics or attributes of the teachers themselves which may be associated with staying in, leaving, or moving between urban schools. These attributes may be demographic characteristics such as race, sex, or age, or they may be related to the teacher's life experiences—SES while growing up, years of experience in the teaching profession, or the attainment of a Masters degree. Another type of teacher attribute is a personal philosophy or belief, such as a belief in social justice, or a commitment to the teaching profession. An example of this line of research is the finding by Hanson, Lien, Cavalluzzo & Wenger (2004) that showed that new teachers (fewer than five years of experience) and those teachers holding Masters degrees were most at risk of attrition.
The general purpose of the following studies is to attempt to identify characteristics of those teachers who stay in, leave, or move between urban schools. These characteristics may be as easily measured as sex, age, years of experience, hometown or graduate degree attainment, but may also be more nebulous characteristics such as a teacher’s race, their having a sense of social justice or a feeling of being prepared to teach in urban schools. These teacher characteristics are often measured in conjunction with urban school characteristics, so there is some limited, unavoidable crossover with other sections of this literature review.

Theobald and Michael (2001) conducted a five-year longitudinal study of 1,000 teachers in five mid-western states to investigate teacher retention and turnover. The researchers attempted to construct a profile of teachers in the categories of stayers, leavers and movers. Independent categorical variables were sex of teacher, ethnicity (minority or White), age upon entry into the teaching field (over or under 30), subject taught, and whether they taught in an urban setting. Results of the study found urbanicity of the school to which they were assigned (urban or non-urban) to be a significant predictor of attrition. Fifty percent of all teachers left their positions by their fifth year. Those who made it past five years in their school were labeled "stayers.” Factors associated with high levels of attrition were a secondary school teaching assignment, urban placement and graduate degree attainment. Arts teachers had higher levels of attrition than other teaching areas. Though minority teachers did not leave at faster rates than non-minority teachers, they were found to be more likely to be movers; changing jobs within their first five years, but remaining in the education field.
Effects of teachers’ own educational experience.

Also in 2005, Boyd et al. examined teachers’ preferences for positions in urban districts based on the proximity of the school system to the teachers’ hometowns, and the similarity of the teaching environment to the school (elementary or secondary) which they themselves attended. Data were collected on every teacher hired in New York State between 1998-2002, and included teachers’ hometowns, matriculating college or university, and city in which they were employed upon attaining a teaching license. Teachers tended to take teaching jobs close to their hometowns, or in school systems similar to the ones in which they grew up. Available jobs in urban areas were found to out-number teachers graduating from accredited teachers colleges who had attended primary or secondary school in urban areas. This discrepancy was stated as one reason for perennial teacher shortages in urban areas. The researchers believed that the idea of "The Draw of Home" (from the title of the article) may help to explain the relatively high numbers of teachers who begin their careers in urban schools but may move to suburban or rural areas once there is an opening in a more desirable position, which may be more akin to the schools which they attended or closer to their hometown.

Similarly, Nieto (2003) determined that one of the main problems driving teacher attrition in urban schools was a cultural incongruity between the teachers and the students they teach. The qualitative data for Nieto’s study was garnered from interviews, journaling and focus group discussions of an inquiry group of veteran teachers drawn from urban school settings,

Our public urban schools are increasingly filled by students whose lives and experiences are vastly different from those of their teachers, who are
overwhelmingly White, middle class, and monolingual English-speakers. Most know little, either from direct experience or training about the diversity of their students. If this is the case, they may become frustrated and impatient, longing for an idealized past that never was, when all children were easy to teach and looked like them. (Nieto, 2003, p. 125)

Nieto along with the members of the inquiry group argue that it is with time, caring, experience and through reflection that teachers can overcome cultural incongruency with their students.

**Urban teacher preparation programs.**

In a study exploring factors contributing to the retention of teachers in high-poverty urban schools, Freedman and Appleman (2009) engaged in a five-year longitudinal mixed methods research project in which they followed the career trajectories of 26 teachers who began in the UC Berkeley Multicultural Urban Secondary English Credential and MA Program, which works to certify teachers specifically to teach and work in high-poverty urban schools. The first year of the program includes methods courses as well as coursework designed to instill in graduates a theoretical framework for teaching emphasizing social justice and cross-cultural understanding. The second year is devoted to two semesters of student teaching and the MA thesis. Factors that were found to contribute to this population staying in the profession include a.) a sense of mission, reinforced in the teacher ed program, b.) a disposition for hard work and persistence, c.) substantive preparation for working in high poverty urban schools, d.) training in becoming a teacher researcher, e.) the opportunity to change schools but still
Olsen and Anderson’s 2007 qualitative study investigated relationships among the reasons for entry, preparation experiences, workplace conditions, and future career plans of 15 early-career teachers in urban Los Angeles schools. Each teacher had been part of the Center X program at UCLA, a Masters program aimed at helping to prepare successful urban teachers. The authors examined reasons given by the sampled teachers for remaining in, shifting from, or considering departure from the urban schools in which they taught.

The authors' analyses highlight the need to reconceptualize teacher retention to acknowledge and support the development of deep, varied and successful careers in urban education. The most common reason given for entering the profession was to help the students, more specifically, to help students who, like themselves, were minorities. These new teachers perceived that low-income students in difficult situations could be helped by caring teachers from similar backgrounds. Often novice teachers shifted within the teaching profession, not leaving it entirely, but pursuing different positions in urban teaching such as administration literacy intervention specialist or else moving to careers in university teacher education programs. Reasons given by these shifting teachers included because the felt they were stagnating, or they wanted to make a bigger impact. Others wished to pursue advanced degrees while some teachers left the profession entirely due to family pressures, low salary, time-related stresses or due to teaching conditions at their schools. Reports of dissatisfaction regarding workplace conditions were frequently linked to administrative pressures, such as pressure from principals to stay in urban ed. and f.) ongoing support from cohort members as well as other support networks.
raise test scores.

The authors speculated that these urban teachers may remain in urban education if they can adopt multiple education roles inside and outside the classroom. Findings also pointed to the need for urban teachers to receive professional support throughout their careers, rather than solely at the beginning of their teaching careers.

Research findings in studies of demographic characteristics of teachers in relation to risk of attrition high-poverty, high-minority urban school are often contradictory with regard to previous studies, or else have been inconclusive, although Boyd et al. (2005) regarding the desire of teachers to work in schools that are similar to, and in close geographic proximity with those from which they matriculated is frequently cited in explanations of high attrition in urban schools. More important perhaps, are feelings of being well prepared for teaching in urban settings, the feeling of being supported by one's teaching colleagues, administrators and the community of professors at a teacher’s undergraduate or graduate degree granting institution, and the feeling that one’s work is in line with a sense of mission or social justice.

**Characteristics of Experienced and Novice Teachers**

One of the more easily measured characteristics of teachers mentioned in the previous section is years of experience. As it is also mentioned in the very title of this study, it is prudent to explore some of the extant research to determine why this is a variable of particular interest. One reason for an interest in measures of experience may be in the lower rates at which experienced teachers leave the profession or change schools, as compared to the rate at which new teachers leave or change schools as noted previously in Hansen, Lien, Cavalluzzo & Wenger (2004). Years of teaching at a school
may be an indication that the experienced teachers are relatively satisfied with their teaching position. Also of interest is the effect of a teacher's years of experience on their students and the overall school climate.

**Attrition rates and experience.**

The Teach for America (TFA) program encourages young college graduates from selective universities to devote at least two years of their lives to teaching in disadvantaged schools. The unfortunate downside is that the two-year commitment virtually ensuring a revolving door for teachers, with an attrition rate after the second year of at least 80%, coupled with a cost of $70,000 to the school system for recruitment and training of the teacher (Heilig & Jez, 2010). The researchers conducted a meta-analysis of research relevant to the TFA program, finding that first year TFA teachers were less effective in increasing student achievement in reading, but as effective for math scores of their students than more traditionally trained teachers in the school. These differences were less pronounced with each year of experience gained by the TFA teachers, however very few remained in the schools for more than three years, and the researchers speculated that the more effective teachers with greater self-efficacy were more likely to remain.

The aforementioned study conducted by the New York City Council Investigative Division (2004) noted that reasons for leaving a position may change over the course of one’s career, from beginning teachers’ concern with materials and facilities to mid-career teachers’ concern with adequate planning time, to retirement age teachers’ concerns with lack of flexibility with teaching approach. A second finding regarding the various experience levels from this report was that members of each cohort were found to leave
at different rates. Beginning teachers and retirement age teachers tended to be more likely to leave the profession or to leave their positions in New York City Schools for other more attractive positions than were mid-career teachers. Of the 2781 randomly selected teachers, 25% of first year teachers reported that they would not return the following year, and an additional 30% of new teachers (1-5 years experience) reported that it was likely that they would leave within three years. Of the experienced teachers, 26% reported that it was likely that they would leave in the next three years. Of retirement age teachers (25+ years of experience) over 70% reported that they would likely leave within the next two years.

This pattern of high attrition for beginning teachers, lower attrition for experienced teachers, and then high again for retirement aged teachers is referred to as the u-shaped curve. Similar professional attrition curves are found in virtually all professions. Luekens et al. (2004) reported on this trend in the education profession using nationally representative sampling. In their report of attrition rates based on data from the SASS and TFS, rates were high for novice teachers (defined here as ten or fewer years of teaching), whereas experienced teachers rates of movement and of leaving the profession were significantly lower until they reached retirement age, when attrition rates rose again. Within the first three years, 13.3% of teachers moved between school positions, and 8.5% left the profession entirely. Between their fourth and ninth years, 10.2% moved, while 6.5% left the profession. Following the first ten years the percentages of movers and leavers both drop, to 6.6% moving and 6.5% leaving until the 25 year threshold is reached when attrition rises again to 11.2% leaving the profession each year.
Impact of attrition.

In a study published in 2004, Guin utilized a mixed methods approach to address the question of which schools in a large urban district experienced the highest teacher turnover, and how the turnover rates affected the experienced teachers in the schools.

Descriptive data was obtained from 97 schools in a district divided along racial and class lines. Teacher turnover rates for each school were analyzed in relation to the percentage of students on free or reduced lunch, percentage of minority students, percentage of English Language learners, and percentage of students achieving at grade level on state tests of reading and mathematics. Teacher attrition rates were found to have a weak positive correlation with the percentage of minority students and with the percentage of students on free or reduced lunch, and was negatively correlated with the percentage of students achieving at grade level on end of grade testing.

Analysis of qualitative data from interviews with teachers and administrators in the schools revealed a number of trends regarding impact of high attrition on the experienced teachers in low-performing, high-poverty, high-minority schools in the district. Experienced teachers felt that the high turnover rates within their schools resulted in disruptions to their own teaching. This may have been because new teachers relied heavily on experienced teachers to help with discipline issues in their classrooms and with routine tasks. Administrators and experienced teachers in schools with high attrition rates complained that staff development activities were, by necessity, redundant so that new teachers could be trained to take their place in the team atmosphere of the school, but this became increasingly frustrating as new teachers often left the following year. Experienced teachers also felt that collaboration was difficult when they had to learn to
work with new teachers each year. It was noted in one low-performing, high-poverty school that attrition had slowed considerably since the hire of a new principal, who was seen as being supportive of the teachers and involved in the school community.

Teachers in low-attrition schools (often low-poverty schools with few minorities) reinforced the difficulties stated by the other teacher by talking of how a stable core of teachers positively impacted their work in terms of teaching consistency and instructional quality, high quality collaboration and targeted professional development.

**Experience and student achievement.**

Muñoz and Chang (2008) studied the teacher attributes of years of experience, graduate degree attainment and race as they influenced student achievement through a comparison of class gain scores in standardized tests of reading in an urban school district during the 2005-2006 school year. Participants included 58 teachers and their 1,487 students. Students were tested at three points during the school year. None of the three teacher characteristics were found to be associated with significant gain scores in tests of reading with time between tests found to be the only significant influencing factor associated with gains in reading scores.

In a study of teachers in high poverty schools in mid-western districts, Huang and Moon (2009) examined various teacher attributes including years of experience, graduate degree attainment and licensing status and their associations with student achievement as measured by scores on second grade reading tests. The researchers utilized hierarchical linear modeling to analyze data from 1,544 students and 153 teachers from 53 schools. Teacher experience was measured both as years in the teaching profession and years as a second grade teacher. Results indicated that the number of years of experience as a
second grade teacher was a significant predictor of student achievement, although total years of teaching experience in the profession was not. Neither graduate degree attainment nor licensure status was found to be significant predictors of student achievement.

That more experienced teachers are at lower risk of attrition seems established through the research literature (Leukens et al., 2004). It has not been established through the literature, however, that this means that more experienced teachers are necessarily more satisfied with their positions than their less experienced colleagues. Also less firmly established is the effect of experience on student achievement, although a meta-analysis by Wayne and Youngs (2003) of 21 studies of student achievement found that most often the results of the studies showed positive effects for experience. Meaningful generalizations were found to be impossible to make due to a number of issues confounding the variable, including years taken off for child-rearing, and whether teachers were hired during a teaching shortage or a surplus.

It may be the case that a greater effect may be found for student achievement in music with more experienced music teachers due to the process of building a music program and the effect of teacher turnover on student attrition within an instrumental or choral ensemble. A meta-analysis of research literature regarding student attrition within school music programs has shown that students leave the programs most often when there is a change in teachers, either due to teacher turnover or between levels, such as in moving from a middle school to a high school program (Witt, 2006). Although the researchers acknowledge that the study was limited in scope, using qualitative data from five schools, the Guin (2004) study points to the negative impact of high levels of
attrition on more experienced teachers, on overall school climate and on student learning.

**Studies Specific to Music and Arts Teacher Job Satisfaction and Attrition**

There are a number of studies that point to music teachers being a special case for closer examination within a study of teacher job satisfaction in urban schools. Some studies have shown that music teachers and other arts teachers have higher rates of attrition than do teachers of other subjects, although other studies have shown similar rates. Other studies have shown that while music teachers do not necessarily leave the profession at higher rates than teachers of other subjects, they are more likely to move between schools. Possible explanations for these findings have arisen from studies demonstrating that music teachers’ professional identities as both musician and teacher are unique to them in a way that set them apart from teachers of other subjects, e.g. the science teacher may not think of herself as a scientist. Finally, other studies have shown a sense of isolation unique to music teachers that literally set them apart within larger school teaching faculties, either through being in a different building, or not being thought of as a "real" teacher.

Theobald & Michael (2001) in the study referenced earlier also examined subject area taught as it relates to attrition. The researchers found that arts teachers are more likely to leave the profession than teachers of other subjects. Over 70% of arts teachers (including music and visual arts in this category) were found to either leave or change jobs within the education profession as compared with less than 60% for any other subject, including math, science or special education. These three subject areas were also relatively high, and the researchers theorized the math and science teachers were especially likely to leave the teaching profession because knowledge in their subject areas
is more easily translated into a more lucrative career in the private sector. No explanation is given by the authors as to why arts and music teachers’ attrition rate would be higher than other teaching areas.

Madsen & Hancock (2002) conducted a longitudinal study of graduates of a large university music school in south-eastern United States to determine rates of attrition and reasons for attrition among graduates with music education degrees who had gone on to teach. The researchers sent out questionnaires to 225 recent graduates in 1995, of which 137 were returned. Among the respondents there was a 17.5% attrition rate. A second questionnaire was sent out in 2001. Attrition had by this time climbed to 34.4 percent, which is lower than with Ingersoll’s findings regarding average attrition rates of all teachers the United States, which were closer to 50%. There were gender differences in attrition rates for responses from the first survey, with more women having left than men, however the second survey showed that the sex differences had evened out, and the percentage of women and men who had left the profession had leveled by 2001. The researchers also left space in the questionnaire for open-ended responses regarding attrition or retention as a music teacher. Of the responses to this section (n=112) some reasons given were family related, some support related, and some were music specific, e.g., “talents were better suited for performance…wanted something more musically interesting” (Madsen & Hancock, 2002, p.12).

Leukens et al. (2004) in the previously discussed study reported that music and arts teachers had the highest percentages of movers within any subject area category, and the fourth highest level of teachers leaving the profession. A second way in which the attrition patterns of music and arts teachers differed from other subject areas was that
69% of music teachers who were moving gave the reason of pursuing an opportunity for a better teaching assignment, in contrast to 47% of the next closest teaching specialty.

Scheib (2006) suggests that the reason music and arts teachers move between schools at higher rates than other subject areas is that music teachers pursue positions where they may be more musically fulfilled, and that this is a characteristic particular to music teachers for whom their identity as a music educator is perhaps more strongly linked to their musical preparation during pre-service university training than it is to teacher preparation, and that this may not be the case for other education subject areas who are not required to, for example, pass a math audition and take private studio math lessons as part of their math teacher training.

In his dissertation, Gardner (2006) developed a model to predict the retention, turnover, and attrition of k-12 music teachers in the United States. Data for the statistical analysis were derived from responses to the SASS and TFS. A subsample of the total responses of all teacher respondents to the SASS and TFS included 1,903 music teachers. Gardner utilized factor analysis, logistic regression and structural equation modeling to develop an analytic model to predict music teacher retention, turnover and attrition. The researcher compared music teachers to other classroom teachers on personal and professional attributes and found that music teachers were more likely to hold part-time or itinerant positions, were more likely to be male, more likely to be White, were generally younger than other teachers, more likely to have less than 10 years of experience, though 20% had more than 25 years of experience. Music teachers were also more likely to teach in secondary schools than other teachers. Though their retention rate, as reported by their school principal was similar to other teachers, self reports by the
teachers found them to be less likely to have continued in their current positions and more likely to have moved from a different teaching position, and more likely to have entered from outside of the profession than other teachers.

According to Gardner (2006), music teachers were less likely to teach in urban schools, or in schools with high percentages of non-white students than other teachers. Music teachers felt they had little influence over school-wide policies, but had substantial autonomy in their classrooms. Though some teachers left the profession due to retirements, or for family matters, many left due to job dissatisfaction. Perceived administrator support and recognition had the most prominent influence on teacher job satisfaction and retention, along with age, years of experience, level of education and control over classroom instruction. Music teacher job and career satisfaction were significantly related to the gender of the teacher, grade level taught, base salary, concerns over student attendance and students' parental support.

Hancock (2008), also working with data from the 1999-2000 SASS performed logistical regression to examine teacher demographic information and job characteristics in relation to the researcher’s perception of the teacher’s risk of attrition based on the response to a survey question on the SASS regarding how long the teacher planned to remain in the profession. Those who answered “until retirement” were considered “low risk”, and those who gave other answers were considered to be “high risk.” Based on this answer, 27 percent of music teachers were determined to be high risk for attrition. Women, secondary teachers, minorities, younger teachers (under 30) and those from schools with more discipline problems and less administrative support were found to be more at risk of attrition. Urban teachers were not found to be more at risk than other
teachers for attrition, although it was acknowledged that some characteristics that may or may not be more prevalent in schools in urban districts were found to be associated with music teacher attrition.

Russell (2009) developed and administered a String Music Educator Questionnaire to a sample of members of the American String Teachers Association (n=600) and garnered responses from 304 (51%). The questionnaire contained 44 items focusing on teacher characteristics, teacher job satisfaction and job descriptions. Based on a factor analysis, five major components were found to under-gird the concept of string teacher job satisfaction. They were professional climate, student quality, interpersonal relationships, teaching responsibilities, and external career factors. Unique to this study was a musical aspect to the teacher job satisfaction questionnaire. Findings from this section suggested that teachers who remain active as musicians are more likely to be satisfied with their teaching positions than those who view themselves as more teacher than musician. Negative correlations were also found to exist between teacher job satisfaction and percentage of minorities in the student population and between teacher job satisfaction and percentage of students with special needs.

Overall there are disparate findings regarding the risk of attrition for music teachers. Two articles (Scheib, 2006 and Russell, 2008) examined musical reasons for why music teachers might be less satisfied in their positions, and the open-ended responses by music teachers to the Madsen and Hancock (2002) questionnaire also pointed to sense of musical fulfillment being an important criteria affecting teacher job satisfaction or the attrition or retention decisions of music teachers.
Music Teaching in Urban Schools

Few research articles have been written regarding music teachers in urban schools. Frierson-Campbell (2006a) edited a two-volume compendium of practical advice for music teachers which included four chapters devoted to research on music teachers in urban schools, two of which are abstracted here. The two selected chapters discuss professional needs of urban music teachers and how the teachers cope with the limited resources available to them. The relative isolation of music teachers in urban schools is discussed, as is the finding that music teachers, perhaps more so than teachers of other subjects, may be more different from their students in terms of sheer demographics than teachers of other subjects.

Abril (2006) conducted interviews and observations of outstanding music educators in urban schools with high poverty rates (over 75% on free or reduced lunch). The intention of the study was to collect the stories of the teachers so that the stories could serve to guide beginning and struggling teachers or to inspire those who might want to teach in urban schools. They may also provide music teacher educators with ideas to better prepare their students to teach in urban schools.

Abril visited the campuses and conducted scripted interviews, which were structured to allow conversation. Interview questions centered around reasons for teaching in urban schools, obstacles and problems, and negotiated solutions to those problems. Though the teachers honestly expressed fears and frustrations, they focused more on the joy of working with children and making music. Policy recommendations include ensuring that new teachers are well matched to their school placements and that schools should provide high quality mentor experiences for new teachers. The teachers
succeeded in part by recognizing the limited available funding for their programs and applying for and receiving grants. One important trait found in all three teachers was flexibility and understanding in working with students from trying circumstances. Overall, the teachers found that teaching in high-poverty urban schools was a difficult, yet fulfilling career.

Ward-Steinman reported in 2006 on the development of a school-university partnership in music education to couple music education majors with urban schools in a partnership to create an after-school program for disadvantaged urban youths. The researcher noted that the university’s music education students differed vastly from the students they are teaching in the urban schools, the urban youths being mainly minorities from low-income households, whereas the preservice music teachers involved in this action research were mainly from middle to upper income households and were all White.

Bruenger (2010) investigated preservice music teachers’ preferences for teaching in urban schools. The researcher utilized an action research qualitative design, using a demographic questionnaire and interviews with eleven preservice teachers from a university program designated as a Hispanic Serving Institution. The researcher investigated why preservice music teachers chose to, or chose not to apply to teach in urban schools. Of the eleven preservice music teachers who participated in the study, only three chose to apply to teach in urban schools. The one of the eleven participants who chose to teach in an urban school stated that, “in an urban school the potential for impact on students’ lives is larger than in other situations.” Teachers chose not to apply to urban teaching because of perceptions of the preservice teachers that the arts were not
seen as important by urban administrators, that these schools’ music departments would have comparatively low budgets, a primary focus on testing in those schools, and the perception that performance ensembles would not be as competitive as those in other districts.

Corroborating the concerns of new teachers in New York City Schools, the availability of adequate supplies, materials and instruments has been shown to be an issue affecting urban music teachers. Frierson-Campbell (2006), in the course of designing in-service opportunities for urban music teachers in New Jersey at the William Paterson University conducted a formal needs assessment of the participating teachers (n=76). Groups of teachers were formed from the total pool of participants. These groups were then asked to create a prioritized list of professional needs based on the needs of the individual teachers.

The two most common needs presented by these groups were facilities (by eight groups) and supplies/instruments (by seven groups). Through formal post-workshop surveys, the music teachers also indicated a sense of isolation from their music-teaching colleagues. The majority of respondents (83%) had no opportunities to collaborate with other music teachers during work time, in contrast with non-music teachers who commonly have prep time and grade-level or departmental meetings during school hours for the purposes of planning or collaboration. Results of an assessment of the impact of the program indicated that 50% of the participants felt that networking and being with other music colleagues was the most valuable aspect of the professional development.

Doyle (2009) in an unpublished Masters thesis examined demographics of music teachers in Miami-Dade schools in relation to their students. The teachers’ attitudes and
job satisfaction were also examined. Consistent ethnic background and SES mismatches between elementary music teachers and their students were found, with the preponderance of teachers Caucasian (44%), although Caucasians made up only four percent of students in the Miami-Dade school system. Teachers were most commonly from suburban urbanicities (53%), and from upper middle class or higher SES backgrounds (57%), as compared with their students 84% of whom were eligible for free or reduced lunch. The most rewarding aspects of the teachers jobs were "empowering students to succeed" (reported by 51% of respondents) and "experiencing diversity and culture" (reported by 28%). The most challenging issues reported by these teachers were "inadequate materials/budget" (60%), "lack of parental involvement" (42%) and "lack of subject respect in the school" (34%).

Smith (1997) found that there were significant differences in student access to string music education between low and high-poverty school districts and between different urbanicity levels. The six MENC divisions were used for comparisons between geographic regions of the United States. Smith used data from a variety of sources including state departments of education, state music education associations and phone calls and mailings to individual districts. Data were analyzed using chi-squared analysis, Pearson Product-Moment correlations and regression analysis. Smith found that of those districts that offered string music education courses, 64% were in average socio-economic level districts, 32% in high socio-economic level districts, and the remaining four percent in low socio-economic level districts. Strings were most often found in medium sized districts, (48%) and least likely to be found in large districts (only 22%).
Findings of the Smith study (1997) were corroborated in part by Docker (2010), who examined the relationships between urbanicity and Title-I status and access to music education and string music instruction in individual Pennsylvania high schools, rather than at the district level, as in Smith (1997). Scripted telephone interviews with school administrators were completed during the 2008-9 school year to determine staffing numbers and presence of string instruction at 352 high schools. A two-way ANOVA was calculated to determine significant differences in access to music education based on in Title-I status and urbanicity, and correlation coefficients were calculated to examine relationships between access to string instruction and Title-I status, urbanicity and school population. Results of the ANOVA showed significant differences in staffing numbers based on the school’s urbanicity, but not based on Title-I status. There were found to be more music teachers per student in rural and suburban schools than urban school. Urban and suburban schools had the highest mean student populations, and were more likely to have string programs. Title-I schools were somewhat less likely than non Title-I schools to have orchestra programs. This finding may corroborate Frierson-Campbell’s (2006) finding that urban music teachers may be more professionally isolated than their suburban or rural counterparts.

**Summary**

One trend in the research literature is that high teacher job satisfaction ratings have been shown to be associated with low attrition in districts. A second trend found in many studies is that experienced teachers have a lower level of attrition than do new teachers. Although it may seem simple to think that teachers who have remained in schools must therefore be satisfied with their jobs, this link has not been explored in the research
A second area to be explored is the added impact of an urban teaching assignment on teacher job satisfaction and risk of attrition. Numerous studies have repeatedly found that teachers in urban school assignments are at a higher risk of attrition than teachers in rural or suburban schools. It is not made clear through an examination of the research literature, however, exactly what aspects of urban schools are most responsible for this increased risk of attrition, nor what characteristics of the teachers themselves might be most associated with this increased risk of attrition.

Finally, although some studies have found music teachers to be at greater risk of attrition than teachers of other subjects, it is not made clear through the literature whether aspect of their jobs affect whether music teachers are or are not satisfied and if that puts them at this greater risk. An examination of urban music teachers’ job satisfaction may be a prudent first step in helping to forge policy recommendations which may aid in finding and keeping committed, high quality teachers in high-poverty urban classrooms.
Chapter 3

Methodology

High-poverty urban schools have time and again been shown in educational literature to have higher attrition rates and smaller pools of candidates to fill vacant positions (Boyd et al., 2005; Ingersoll, 2002; Johnson, 2004; Plecki et al., 2005; Useem & Nield, 2001). Such attrition may be due to structures inherent in urban communities and the schools serving them. Some studies have shown that music and arts teachers have higher rates of attrition than teachers of other subjects (Theobald & Michael, 2001; Leukens et al. 2004). One of the factors thought to lead to attrition within the teaching profession is teacher job dissatisfaction (Gardner, 2006). The purpose of this project was to assess factors that predict job dissatisfaction or attrition among music teachers in high-poverty urban schools. A second focus of this research project is to identify commonalities among experienced urban teachers and novice teachers who intend to remain in their schools to determine what drives some teachers to remain in high-poverty urban schools while many of their colleagues leave. This question will be examined in terms of teacher attributes, such as age, gender, race, and personal philosophy, as well as through an examination of job attributes, and teachers’ opinions and perceptions of teaching and the workplace. Four research questions guide this study:

1. What factors (teacher attributes, job attributes, and opinions or perceptions regarding teaching or their workplace) distinguish experienced teachers in high-poverty urban schools from novice teachers?

2. Among experienced teachers on the one hand, and novice teachers on the other, what factors distinguish stayers from leavers?
3. Which factors are most predictive of overall music teacher job satisfaction in high-poverty urban school settings?

4. Which factors, including teacher job satisfaction, are most predictive of a music teacher's intention to leave or stay in a high-poverty urban school setting?

**Independent variables**

Independent variables are those that have been previously identified in the research literature to affect teacher job satisfaction or to influence teachers’ planned or intended attrition. As noted in Chapter 1, music teacher job satisfaction is a social phenomenon, a concept formed in the mind of the teacher that is related to attributes of themselves, attributes of their jobs, and their perceptions and opinions regarding their teaching position and the teaching profession. These three categories of variables for this study were adapted from Gardner’s 2006 dissertation. (See Table 2)
Table 2

*Independent variables and data sources*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Category</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Attributes</strong></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SES growing up</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years in urban schools</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means of Certification</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate degree attainment</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Commitment</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Attributes</strong></td>
<td>School Level</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music class type</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type mismatch</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of non-music classes</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Itinerancy status</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom type</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of students in poverty</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>NCES website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of minority students</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>NCES website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Opinions and Perceptions of the Workplace</strong></td>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental support</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colleague support</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Musical Fulfillment</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility quality</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor Market</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student quality</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher attributes.**

This broad heading includes socially constructed characteristics such as race, gender, educational attainment and SES, as well as the philosophical stance regarding social justice and teaching. Each of these variables has been shown in various articles,
books or dissertations in the mass of research literature to be related to job satisfaction or attrition from specific positions or from the teaching profession.

Gardner (2006) found that how satisfied teachers feel about their job depends on their gender, but that this was mitigated by grade level taught, such that female music teachers and those who taught elementary grades were more likely to have higher levels of job satisfaction, but because most elementary teachers are female, these may be measurements of the same phenomenon. Culver et al., (1990), also found teacher gender to be a significant predictor of teacher satisfaction. Regression analysis may help to determine whether it is grade level or teacher gender that is more associated with music teacher job satisfaction.

Some research has suggested that the teacher's SES while growing up (Boyd et al., 2005; Nieto, 2003) or their race (Culver et al, 1990; Nieto, 2003; Nunez & Fernandez, 2004) may influence their decisions to begin teaching in urban areas, and their intentions to continue teaching in high-poverty urban schools. Those perspective teachers who grew up in White, middle-class suburbs are likely to want to teach in White, middle-class suburbs. Those who accept positions in White-minority, high poverty urban schools may be more likely to leave their positions when an opportunity is presented that is more like the school from which they matriculated.

Experience is both an indication of commitment to the school and a predictor of attrition rates. The relationship between years of experience and attrition rates, for teachers and in many other professions has been shown to follow a u-shaped curve, with higher rates of attrition at the beginning of a teaching career for those who leave the profession after only a short tenure, and then a leveling off in mid career, and finally high
attrition rates again for retirees (Hansen, et al., 2004). Experience was measured two ways, as number of years teaching, and as a number of years teaching in an urban setting, in order to be able to differentiate between experienced teachers and experienced urban teachers.

A teacher's certification status as well as means of certification, or attainment of an advanced degree in music education may be an indicator of a commitment to music education on the part of the teacher. Some research has shown lower attrition rates in teachers holding advanced degrees (Gardner, 2006). Teachers who have achieved certification through Masters degree programs with an emphasis on urban teaching have also shown lower attrition rates and greater commitment to urban teaching and social justice (Quartz et al., 2008; Quartz & TEP Research Group, 2003).

A commitment to social justice has been shown in music education and in education literature to be associated with teacher retention in urban schools. (Doyle, 2010; Quartz & TEP Research Group, 2003) A "commitment to social justice" in education is a dedication on the part of the teacher to the ideal that the powerless and the marginalized in any society should have the same chances and opportunities, and that if any inequalities should exist, they should exist to benefit the least powerful and the most marginalized (Jennings, 2004). For urban teachers, a commitment to social justice is evidenced by a teacher's commitment to teach in high-poverty urban schools, choosing to teach in these schools so that they can positively impact the lives of children living in poverty.

Commitment to the teaching profession has been shown in previous music education literature to be related to overall job satisfaction (Fresko, Krir & Nasser, 1997).
The researchers posited that job satisfaction and greater self-efficacy leads to greater commitment to the profession.

Musical satisfaction, inside and outside of the public school music program also has been shown to influence overall job satisfaction. Music teachers are trained in conservatory-style settings so an artist identity is solidified through private lessons, performances with university ensembles and frequently a recital (Scheib, 2006) at the same time that a teacher identity is solidified through education coursework, practicum experiences and student teaching. Russell (2009) found that occupational identity as a musician, not just as a teacher was related to string music teacher job satisfaction. Those string teachers who saw themselves as equal part musician and teacher were most satisfied with their jobs.

**Job attributes.**

As important as the teacher's characteristics are to the question of predicting music teacher job satisfaction, perhaps as important are the characteristics of the workplace in which the teacher is employed. Some job characteristics of the have been found to be related to teacher job satisfaction or to higher or lower rates of attrition. These job characteristics include instructional duties such as the type of music classes taught, number of non-music classes taught, school level, condition and type of room in which instruction occurs, and percentage of minority students in the school population.

As previously noted, music teachers in elementary schools were shown to rate higher in measures of job satisfaction than other types of music teachers. It was not made clear whether this was a function of gender or grade level, (Gardner, 2006) but another perhaps confounding variable is the type of music classes one teaches. Russell's (2009)
article examined string music teacher job satisfaction, but it may be the case that greater or lesser job satisfaction may be related to the type of music classes taught, whether choral, general, orchestral, band or other.

In my own teaching situation in a high-poverty urban school, all teachers were required to teach one reading class per day, regardless of specialty. During another period I was assigned to relieve the teacher in charge of in-school suspension, giving him a much-needed break but forfeiting my own planning time in the bargain. Gardner (2006) indicated that only 8.4% of music teachers were required to teach outside of their main subject area. In high-poverty urban schools, where there have been more difficulties reaching AYP on end of grade testing of English, Math and Science, there may be greater need for music teachers to teach outside of their subject area, perhaps leading to overall lower job satisfaction.

Several articles in education literature have noted the positive effect of new construction and facility upkeep on teacher retention, indicating that physical surroundings make a difference in teacher job satisfaction (Buckley et al., 2005; Perie & Baker, 1997). Not yet adequately explored is whether working in purpose built music classrooms, which may include risers, acoustic treatments, practice rooms and storage for instruments has a positive effect on music teacher job satisfaction.

Research literature has suggested that a negative correlation exists between music teacher job satisfaction and percentage of minority students in the school population. In a comparison of teacher turnover rates in Washington State, it was found that higher turnover rates existed not in Title-I schools, but those with high percentages of African American students (Plecki et al., 2005).
Teacher opinions and perceptions of the workplace.

More important, perhaps than a principal's actions in instilling jobs satisfaction for their teaching staff is the teacher's perceptions of those actions. Teacher's attitudes regarding administrative, parental and colleague support are vital to the teacher's feelings of job satisfaction leading to retention. Gardner (2006) found that perceived administrative support and recognition had the greatest influence on job satisfaction and retention.

As important as salary is in a teacher's decision to remain in or leave a job, the perception of adequacy of salary and size of salary relative to others is perhaps just as important. In a study of relative salary, it was found that the greater the difference between a district's average administrative and central office personnel salary and the district's average teacher's salary, the greater the dissatisfaction of the teachers (Gritz & Theobald, 1996). Further, it was found that teachers were more likely to stay if teacher's salaries were commensurate with area non-teachers salaries.

Teachers may be more likely to stay and have higher ratings of teacher satisfaction if they believe that their facilities are adequate to the job of teaching music, and that they are adequately maintained. Newer facilities also help to foster a perception the workplace physical environment (Buckley et al., 2005; Perie & Baker, 1997; Wooley & Winkler, 2007).

Dependent Variables

Three dependent variables were examined for this project as they were affected by the independent variables. They are teacher job satisfaction, and immediate plans to stay
in or to leave their present position for the coming year, and the stated intention to remain in or leave their current teaching position within the next five years.

**Sampling**

Participants for the study were music teachers currently teaching in urban, high-poverty schools, selected through random sampling. A variety of music teachers were sought, representing various music class types (Band, choir, orchestra and general music) and different teaching levels (elementary, middle school, high school). The sampling technique was used to ensure that the results would be generalizable back to the total population of music teachers in high-poverty urban schools, as well as allowing for the disaggregating of data based on type or level.

To obtain a nationally representative sample, the National Association for Music Education (NAfME) geographic divisions were used, which divide the United States into six regions. In each of the six geographic regions, one major urban area was selected. Each of the six urban areas selected met three criteria. Firstly, each urban area was listed among the top 50 largest cities in the United States. Additionally, each urban area had a population of at least five hundred thousand. The six urban areas representing each of the six NAfME geographic regions were:

Eastern, (Philadelphia Public Schools, Philadelphia, PA. http://www.phila.k12.pa.us/),
North Central, (Chicago Public Schools, Chicago, IL. http://www.cps.edu),
Northwest, (Seattle Public Schools, Seattle, WA. http://www.seattleschools.org/),
Southern, (Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, GA. http://www.atlanta.k12.ga.us),
Southwest, (Denver Public Schools, Denver, CO. http://www.dpsk12.org/),
The specific schools from which participants were selected were chosen through random sampling (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007). The sample size for each district was chosen through consulting Algina & Olejnik’s (2003) sample size tables for regression analysis (n=31 for each group when alpha was set at .05) and then doubling this number to 62 because of an expected return rate of 50%. The district sample size of 62 was divided into the total number of schools within the district to determine which schools from the total school list provided by the district were chosen for participant invitations. As an example, the Philadelphia School District contains a total of 258 schools. Because 62 divides into 258 approximately 4 times, random sampling was achieved by selecting every fourth school on the total list of schools within the Philadelphia School District.

Once a school had been selected, the name of the school was entered into the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) school search utility (http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/schoolsearch/). This web-based utility provides the Title-I status for every school in the United States. If the school did not meet the requirement for Title-I status (at least 30% of students attending the school were at or below the federal poverty level) then the next school on the list was tried, and so on, until 62 Title-I schools from each of the six urban districts were selected.

Names of teachers came from school websites listing faculty members (commonly along with email addresses) by specialty areas. If the school website listed a music teacher but not an email address, then the school personnel were contacted by telephone and asked for the email address of the music teacher. A rotating list of music area specialties was used to select teachers for participation (band, orchestra, chorus and general music) so that teacher specialties may be taken into account in the regression
calculation. If no music teachers were employed at a selected school then a replacement was made from the next school on the district’s total school listing.

**Procedures**

On April 21, 2011, the Pennsylvania State University Office of Research Protections approved IRB application #35300, as it was determined that the study was exempt from IRB review (See Appendix B for IRB application materials). Data collection began the following day with the collection of names and addresses of participants.

The participants’ names, school names, school addresses and email addresses were entered into Microsoft Excel to create a single master list. A second Excel spreadsheet was created with one column for each of the independent and dependent variables. Each returned response was assigned an individual identification number based on the district and the order in which the response was received. Once a response was received from an individual teacher, a note was made on the master list so that they would not be contacted for unnecessary reminders.

Teachers were contacted through the U.S. mail with an initial mailing which included a recruitment letter, an informed consent form, the questionnaire and a self addressed stamped envelope (see Appendix C for content of all communications). After two weeks, teachers who had not yet responded to the initial mailing were contacted via email. The email included a link to a website URL that directed teachers to an electronic form of the questionnaire. The electronic questionnaire was hosted by SurveyMonkey.com. One week after the initial email, a second email was sent to the teachers again inviting them to visit the SurveyMonkey.com electronic questionnaire.
One week after this second email was sent the online questionnaire was closed. Although identifying information (the name of their school and school district) were gathered as part of the questionnaire (see page one of the questionnaire in Appendix A) this information was used to ensure that respondents were not counted more than once, and to aid in collection of school information from the NCES school search website. Appendix D contains the complete short-answer raw data set, but only individual identification numbers have been included so as to protect the confidentiality of the respondents.

Returned questionnaires and the master list of participants (stored on a 16 Gigabyte flash memory card) were stored in a locked metal filing cabinet.

**Questionnaire Construction**

The questionnaire used for this research project was adapted from four main sources, National Center for Educational Statistics Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), Joshua Russell’s String Music Educator Questionnaire (SMEQ) (Russell, 2009), Jennifer Doyle’s survey of urban teachers regarding social justice and music teaching (2010), and the criteria used for assessing facility adequacy were derived from Buckley, Schneider & Yang’s article (2005). The final questionnaire included a total of 59 items.

Eight questions collecting demographic information on teachers were adapted from the National Center for Educational Statistics Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS). The eight questions related to teacher attributes focused on demographic information that has been investigated in previous studies of teacher job satisfaction or attrition in urban schools. Demographic information requested included the teacher’s race and SES while growing up. One question was asked regarding initial means of certification. Teachers also provided information on their highest music education degree. Years of experience
were assessed from two questions, the total number of years teaching, and number of years teaching in urban schools.

Twenty-two questions were adapted for use in this questionnaire from Dr. Joshua Russell’s SMEQ (2009), used in his dissertation on string music teacher job satisfaction. While many of these questions were quoted verbatim, several questions were not used in this study as they were found to be irrelevant due to being string musician specific, or because they related to variables that were not found to be related to music teacher job satisfaction in the related literature. Questions from the SMEQ generally conform to eight categories related to music teacher job satisfaction: Instructional Duties (two questions used in the questionnaire for this study), Student characteristics (three questions), Teacher support (six questions on support from administrators, community members and teaching colleagues), Opinions regarding the music teaching profession (three questions), Musical fulfillment (four questions), Labor market factors (one question) and Plans for retention, attrition or migration (two questions).

Doyle’s (2010) survey of urban music teachers provided four items regarding application of the philosophy of social justice to the music teaching profession.

Eight items for the questionnaire were formulated by the researcher, but developed from categories listed by Buckley et al. (2005). These items related to adequacy of facilities and supplies and the physical structure of the classroom. These items relate to the presence of natural lighting in the classroom, air circulation, temperature and humidity controls, adequacy of supplies, and building security concerns. The remaining fifteen items on the questionnaire were developed by the researcher in consultation with his dissertation advisor, then pilot tested.
**Pilot Study**

Prior to sending out the questionnaire to the survey study participants, the survey tool was piloted. For the pilot study, fifty invitations were sent to music teachers in an urban district on the East Coast of the United States. Twenty-five invitations were sent via email, with directions to complete a 69-item questionnaire online, and twenty-five were sent via regular mailings with an enclosed questionnaire and self-addressed stamped envelope. Two weeks after the questionnaire was sent, an email reminder was sent to each participant. After a third week, the online pilot questionnaire was closed. Of those who were sent questionnaires, eleven hard copies of the survey were returned, and six questionnaires were completed online. As a result of the pilot project, the decision was made to send all surveys out as hard copies initially instead of first sending out a mass email. Additionally, the survey was shortened from six to four pages, and from 69 to 59 items to omit redundant items. Finally, an additional possible response was added for the prompt "The room in which I teach the majority of my classes is" (a portable building or trailer).

**Data Analysis**

Two types of regression analysis were used to answer the research questions. The most predictive independent variables for the continuous dependent variable “satisfaction” were calculated through the use of General Linear Regression (Question 3). The most relevant independent variables among teacher attributes, job attributes and measures of teacher opinions and perceptions of teaching and the workplace for the categorical dependent variables of attrition or retention (Question 4) were calculated through Binary logistic regression. These methods of regression were chosen through
consultation with the Statistics Consulting Center in the Department of Statistics at Penn State University.

Differences between Novice and Experienced teachers on independent variables were calculated using the Pearson Chi-Square test (Question 1) to determine the existence of statistically significant differences based on experience level teachers once they were divided into Novice or Experienced groupings, with those teachers in the Experienced grouping defined as teachers with over five years teaching in urban schools with Novice teachers defined as those with fewer than five years in urban schools.

A profile of experienced urban teachers was created using descriptive statistics calculated from teacher characteristics section of the questionnaire. Crosstabbed calculations of frequencies for each categorical independent variable allowed for comparison of Novice and Experienced stayers and leavers (Questions 1 & 2). Pearson Chi-Squared calculations were made to test the significance of differences in scores between novice or experienced teachers for each of the categorical independent variables.

For this research project, the alpha level was set a priori at $p \leq 0.05$.

Raw data were entered into Excel data files then analyzed using SPSS, the statistical software package for social sciences.
Chapter 4

Results

High-poverty urban schools have time and again been shown in educational literature to have higher rates of teacher attrition and turnover than suburban or rural schools or schools serving higher SES students, and smaller pools of candidates to fill vacant teaching positions (Boyd et al., 2005; Ingersoll, 2002; Johnson, 2004; Plecki et al., 2005; Useem & Nield, 2001). This finding of high attrition rates in high-poverty urban schools may be due to structures inherent in urban communities and the schools serving them. Some studies have shown that music and arts teachers have higher rates of attrition than is found in the general population of teachers (Theobald & Michael, 2001; Leukens et al. 2004). One identified factor that may be contributing to attrition within the teaching profession is teacher job dissatisfaction (Gardner, 2006). The purpose of the current project was to assess factors that predict job dissatisfaction and attrition among music teachers in high-poverty urban schools. A second focus of this research project was to identify similarities among experienced urban teachers and novice teachers who intend to remain in their schools to find out what drives some teachers to remain in high-poverty urban schools while so many of their colleagues do not. This question was examined in terms of teacher attributes, such as age, sex, race, and personal philosophy, as well as through an examination of job attributes, such as school level (elementary, middle or high) and job type (band, choir, general music e.g.) and the teacher’s opinions and perceptions regarding teaching or their workplace. Four research questions guide this study:
1. What factors (teacher attributes, job attributes, and opinions or perceptions regarding teaching or their workplace) distinguish experienced teachers in high-poverty urban schools from novice teachers?

2. Among experienced teachers on the one hand, and novice teachers on the other, what factors distinguish stayers from leavers?

3. Which factors are most predictive of overall music teacher job satisfaction in high-poverty urban school settings?

4. Which factors, including teacher job satisfaction, are most predictive of a music teacher's intention to leave or stay in a high-poverty urban school setting?

Information on teacher characteristics, job characteristics, and teacher's attitudes, philosophies and perceptions were gathered through a sampling of teachers in Title-I schools in six large urban districts. Descriptive statistics were calculated for each of the dependent variables so that a profile of experienced urban teachers could be developed (Question 1). Experienced and novice stayers were compared with leavers using Pearson’s Chi-Square test to find statistically significant differences between groups on continuous variables (Question 2). Linear regression was used to determine which factors were most predictive of teacher job satisfaction (Question 3). Binary logistic regression was used to find predictors of teachers' plans for the following year and for their intended attrition or retention in jobs in the next five years (Question 4).

**Mailings and Response Rate**

During the week of April 21 until the 27th, school addresses of participants in the six selected districts were compiled into an Excel file on an iMac. On April 27, 2011, invitations were sent out to the 328 identified music teachers in the six metropolitan
school districts. Between April 27 and May 19, 48 completed questionnaires were returned, for an initial response rate of 15%. Three weeks after the initial mailing, reminder emails were sent on May 20th, 21st and 22nd of 2011. Reminders were sent to 153 music teachers in the six districts. At the end of a week, the new total for responses was 68 of 323 invitations, for a total of 21% (this is R1 on Table 3).

One week after the first reminder, a second reminder was sent on May 30th. On June 6th, after being open for five weeks, the online survey was closed. Hard copies of the questionnaire continued to trickle in one at a time until the day the results were analyzed on June 24, 2011. By this point, there were 89 completed responses and response rate was 27.5% (89 of 329). Response rate varied by district, from the low of 15% for Atlanta (15 of 58) to a high of 39% for Chicago (26 of 67). See Table 3 for complete response rates for each district.
Table 3

Response rate by district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total sent</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total R</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS- No such teacher; R1- number of responses after the initial mailing, R2- Number of responses after one reminder; Total R- Total number of responses after two reminders.

Descriptive Statistics

Teacher attributes.

The questionnaire included eight items designed to glean information about some personal characteristics of the respondents that had previously been linked to teacher attrition or to teacher job satisfaction (see Appendix A). These characteristics were gender, race, SES while growing up, highest music education degree, means of certification, years of experience and years as an urban teacher.

Teachers' years of experience ranged from 1 year through 48 years, and years as an urban teacher ranged from 1 through 47. The mean number of years as a teacher was 18.19 with a standard deviation of 12.70 while the mean number of years as an urban
teacher was 14.80 with a standard deviation of 11.42. A teacher was considered a Novice urban teacher if they had five or fewer years of teaching in urban schools. Novice teachers accounted for 22 of the 89 participants, or 24.7%, while experienced urban teachers accounted for the remaining 67 or 75.3%. For the purposes of some small group comparisons based on years of teaching in urban schools, four groups were created. Novice teachers were those with one to five years in urban schools \( (n=22) \), early career teachers with 6-13 years \( (n=25) \), late career educators (14-23 years, \( n=23 \)) and eligible retirees \( (25+ \text{ years}, n=18) \)

Participants were almost equally divided in terms of gender, with 53.9% indicating they were female, and 46.1% indicating they were male. The great majority of respondents were self-identified as White (70.8%). The next most prevalent racial categories by which participants self-identified were African-American \( (n=15, \text{ or } 16.9\%) \) multi-racial \( (4) \), Hispanic \( (3) \) and Asian/Pacific Islander \( (3) \). Finally one participant identified his or her race as "other."

The majority participants stated that they grew up in a middle-class household \( (63.6\% \text{ of respondents}) \). Next most common were teachers who indicated that they grew up in an upper-middle class household \( (15.9\% \text{ of respondents}) \), followed by 11.4% who indicated growing up in a lower-middle class household. Just under seven percent of respondents reported growing up poor, and 2.3% indicated that they were "well off" growing up.

Nearly identical numbers of participants held Bachelor's degrees as their highest music education degree \( (42) \) as held Masters degrees \( (41) \). Three respondents held doctoral degrees in music education, and three held no music education degree. The clear
majority, (67 of 89 or 75.3%) were initially certified through bachelors degree programs. Of the remaining 22 who were not certified through a bachelor’s degree program, twelve were certified through Masters degree programs, and the remaining ten through alternative means of certification.

**Job attributes.**

Also examined were a number of factors associated with the participants’ teaching positions that have been found to be associated with either teacher attrition or with varying levels of job satisfaction in the research literature.

These job attribute variables included aspects of one's job- e.g. the type of music class teachers lead over the course of their day, whether they teach in a room designed for music instruction or in a less conducive teaching environment, their school level (elementary, middle or high school). Another aspect of one's teaching position are characteristics of the students taught- notably the percentage who receive free or reduced priced lunch, and the percentage of African American or White students within the student body. Student body demographic data were gathered from National Center for Educational Statistics databases (http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/schoolsearch/).

Of the respondents, the most common types of teachers were general music and band teachers, at 38.2% and 31% respectively. Orchestra and chorus teachers made up 14.6% and 10.1% of the total, and the final 4.5% taught other types of music classes not listed on the questionnaire. Examples given by participants in the “other” category included a piano teacher at a school of the arts, a music department head, and a guitar teacher. Twenty three of the 89 participants (25.8%) indicated that their ideal music teaching position would entail courses other than those which they were currently
teaching (mismatched types), an example being a teacher of band classes whose major
instrument during undergraduate coursework had been the violin, and who would prefer
to teach orchestra classes.

The questionnaire asked about the type of room in which the teachers worked, as
well as asking them to rate the adequacy of aspects of their room or necessary supplies
for teaching. The majority of the respondents indicated that they taught in a room
designed for music classes (47 of 89 participants, or 52.8%). Next most common were
music teachers using general classrooms (15%) or teaching on the stage or other multi-
purpose room (16.9% of the participants). Eleven participants responded that they moved
among several classrooms each day, and one indicated that their music room was in a
trailer or portable classroom. One teacher listed as their greatest frustration, "having to
teach on stage while physical education classes are being held in the gym."

Facilities and resources ratings were based on eight Likert-style items on the
questionnaire, asking teachers to rate the adequacy of their room's structure (natural
lighting, fresh air) materials (sheet music, books and materials) and music-specific items
that are essential to a well run music program (chairs, stands, risers, acoustic treatments).
The possible range of the sum of the eight ratings ran from the minimum of eight, to a
maximum of 32 due to possible responses of 1-4 for each item. The observed range of
summed ratings for this sample of participants was from 10 to 32, with an average of
20.14, and a standard deviation of 4.76. The average of the individual ratings is 20.14
divided by eight, or 2.61, or in words, between inadequate and adequate.

A newer trend in education, the movement towards Charter and Magnet schools
received only limited representation within the overall pool of participants. Seventy-five,
or 84.3% of participants worked in what may be termed "traditional public schools."

Only two participants worked in charter schools, and eight worked in magnet schools for a combined 11.2% of teachers in the study. The final four taught at schools of the arts. Although interesting sub samples unto themselves, conclusive trends could not be verified given such few respondents in each category.

The racial/ethnic makeup of school student bodies ran as low as 0.24%, and as high as 99.22% African Americans, with a mean percentage of 30.34%, and a standard deviation of 31.32%. White students made up from 0.00% to 91.23% of the student bodies with a mean of 16.65% and a standard deviation of 19.96%. In order to qualify for this study, teachers must have been assigned to a school with at least 30% of the students receiving free or reduced price lunches. The actual range among the participants’ schools was from 32.06% to 99.55%, with a mean of 77.65% of students at or below the poverty level with a standard deviation of 22.04%.

The majority of teachers did not teach courses outside of their subject area. Only 13 teachers of the 89 responding teachers (14.6%) taught classes other than music. Eight of these taught only one course, three teachers taught two classes outside of their subject area, and two teachers taught four classes outside of their subject area. The majority of teachers worked at a single school (n=61, or 68.5%). Itinerant teachers were mainly band or orchestra teachers traveling between multiple schools for classes or private lessons at the elementary school level. Of the 13 participants identified as orchestra teachers, the majority (seven) were itinerant teachers.
Teachers' opinions and perceptions of teaching and the workplace.

The bulk of the survey attempted to probe teachers’ attitudes and perceptions using Likert-style items on the questionnaire. Generally speaking, Likert-style items on the questionnaire had four possible responses, without an opportunity for teachers to remain neutral on an item so that teachers would be forced into a choice of whether they were frustrated or not frustrated, supported or not supported. A neutral response was made available to teachers in the section regarding the philosophy of social justice as it pertains to music teaching, as teachers may never have considered these points in their teaching career. Scores on Likert-style items are summed, with stronger positive feelings about an aspect of teaching being associated with higher scores. When presented with four Likert-style items regarding satisfaction (see page 1 of the questionnaire in appendix A), each with four possible answers, the score of 16 would indicate the greatest satisfaction, and a score of 4 would indicate the greatest dissatisfaction. In order to increase reliability of responses four items on the questionnaire were reverse coded.

Teachers’ attitudes and perceptions were gauged with regard to their overall job satisfaction, feelings about the students at their school, the music teaching profession, their musical activity in and out of school, the philosophical stance regarding social justice and teaching, and support. The support category surveyed teachers regarding their perception of support from administrators, other faculty, and from the community.

Teachers’ attitudes and perceptions regarding their students were gauged using four Likert-style items on the questionnaire. Participants’ summed ratings ranged from 6-16 points, reaching the maximum score of 16 but not the minimum of 4. High scores indicated that a teacher had positive feelings about their students, student quality,
discipline and interactions with their students. Low scores indicated less agreement with statements regarding their students’ motivation, quality, discipline and the teacher’s ability to connect with students. The average of the summed ratings was 11.13 with a standard deviation of 2.47. The average of the individual ratings was 2.78 (average teachers’ ratings on individual items in this section indicated that responses were between agreement and disagreement on these items).

Teachers’ attitudes and perceptions of support for their teaching position were gauged using six Likert-style items on the questionnaire. Participants’ summed ratings ranged from 7-24 points, reaching the maximum score of 24 but not the minimum of 6. Higher scores by teachers indicated that they felt supported by their administrators, the community and other faculty members. The average of the summed scores was 15.11 with a standard deviation of 4.83. The average individual item score was 2.52. The six items were divided further into three distinct groupings: two items about administrative support, two items about support from the community, and two items about support from fellow non-music faculty members, each with a total possible sum of 8.

Perception of support from administrators was gauged from two Likert-style items. The average sum of the two ratings was 5.20 with a standard deviation of 1.75. The average of the individual ratings was 2.6 (an average teachers’ rating of 2.6 on individual items in this section indicated that responses were between unsatisfied and satisfied with administrative support). Perception of support from the community was gauged from two Likert-style items. The average sum of the two ratings was 4.92 with a standard deviation of 1.68. The average of the individual ratings was 2.46, meaning a slightly lower level of support than for administrators. Finally, perception of support from
the other faculty members was gauged using two Likert-style items. The average sum of the two ratings was 4.97 with a standard deviation of 1.59. The average of the individual ratings was 2.48, again, showing a slightly lower rating of support than for administrators, but a negligible difference from perception of support from the community.

Teacher's attitudes about the teaching profession, and their continued commitment to the music teaching profession were gauged using six Likert-style items. The possible maximum of the summed rating, 24, was met but the minimum of 6 was not. The lowest score observed was 11. The average of the summed scores was 18.02 with a standard deviation of 3.61. The average of the individual ratings was 3.00 indicating satisfaction with the music teaching profession.

Four Likert-style items were designed to examine teachers’ sense of musical fulfillment. The possible range of the summed scores was from 4-16, but the observed range was from 6-16, with a mean score of 12.71, a standard deviation of 2.29. Higher scores indicated teachers who were more satisfied with their musical interactions with their students, as well as being more satisfied with their own musical fulfillment outside of school. The average of the individual ratings was 3.18, indicating that teachers were generally satisfied with their musical interactions with students and with their own musical fulfillment.

Teacher's personal philosophies with regard to Social Justice were gauged using four five-point Likert-style items. Although the possible range of the summed scores was from 4-20, the minimum observed was 14, with an observed maximum of 20. The mean of the summed scores was 17.5, with a standard deviation of 1.81. Despite the greater
possible range than the other Likert-style sections of the questionnaire, the observed range was relatively smaller, with relatively smaller standard deviation. The average the individual scores was 4.375 out of a possible 5 (between the responses of “agree” and “strongly agree” on the questionnaire). A higher score indicated high concordance with four tenets of the philosophy of social justice.

The final variable measured was the teacher's attitude or perception of the labor market. This set of items on the survey asked teachers about their perception of the labor market outside of school teaching, as well as about their perceptions of adequacy of salary for teachers. Responses to four Likert-style items summed to create the value, ranging from 4-16. The entire possible range was observed within participants' responses. The average of the summed responses was 9.95, with a standard deviation of 2.40. The average of the individual ratings was 2.49, or between satisfied and dissatisfied on the questionnaire.

**Job Satisfaction and Attrition Rates.**

The variable of job satisfaction was quantified as the summed total of responses to four Likert-style items (Item 7 on page one of the questionnaire- see Appendix A for the entire questionnaire). The four questions each had four possible responses: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree. A score of 16, or four points on each of the four items represented the highest possible score for job satisfaction (most satisfied), while a score of 4 represented the lowest possible score (most dissatisfied). The complete range from four to sixteen was observed among the completed questionnaires returned by participants. The average of these summed job satisfaction ratings was 13.07 with a standard deviation of 2.40 (The average of the individual ratings was 3.27, or
between agree and strongly agree with statements indicting high levels of job satisfaction).

Participants were asked for both their plans for the coming school year (plans), as well as for their projected career plans in five years (intentions). Responses to items on the questionnaire resulted in teachers being placed in one of five categories. Teachers who responded that they would "remain a music teacher at the same school" were coded as "stayers." Those who indicated that they would remain a music teacher at a different school in the same district, or remain a music teacher in a different district were coded as "movers.” Those who indicated that they would quit being a music teacher temporarily or completely were coded as "leavers.” Those who indicated a desire to quit teaching to become an educational administrator or to teach in a non-public school setting were coded as "shifters” and finally, those who indicated that they would take early retirement or retire were coded as "retirees."

The majority of participants (75 of 89 participants or 84.27%) planned to remain a teacher at the same school the following year (stayers). Of the remaining 14 teachers who indicated they were leaving their current positions, seven indicated they would move to a different school, either within the same district or to another district, three indicated they would leave teaching entirely, and four indicated that they would retire from teaching. None of the respondents indicated a shift within the education profession or to another type of music teaching position. The large percentage indicating they would stay in their position for the following year (over 84 percent) can be compared with the smaller 51.7% of participants (46 of 89) who intended to stay in these same positions for at least five years, indicating that many of the participants did not have immediate plans
for attrition, but their career intentions are to leave their current jobs. When asked to project their possible future intended plans for remaining or leaving their jobs, 13 participants (14%) were intended movers, 11 (12%) were intending to leave the teaching profession entirely, four (4%) were intended shifters within the education profession. The largest sub-group within those who indicated that they would leave their positions in the next five years were the 15 teachers who would be eligible retirees (17%). (See Table 4 for plans and intended plans in 5 years of the respondents).

Table 4

*Plans and Intentions of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Plans</th>
<th>Intentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayer</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mover</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaver</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retiree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 1: Differences between Experienced and Novice Teachers in High Poverty Urban Schools**

Pearson Chi-Square coefficients were calculated to test differences between the experienced and novice sub groupings of the participants on continuous variables to find statistical significance. (See the definition of terms section on page 22 for a more
complete explanation of the terms "experienced" and "novice." The Pearson Chi-Square test was chosen as it can help to identify significant relationships between dichotomous or categorical variables. Differences on nominal variables between experienced and novice teacher sub groupings were calculated using Phi coefficients. No relationship was found to exist between band, choir, orchestra or general music teachers and experience, nor between type-mismatch and experience when viewed as a dichotomous variable. No significant trends were found between experience and level (elementary, middle and high). No significant relationship was found between experience and gender. No significant relationship was found between experience and SES while growing up, nor with whether they entered the teaching profession through a bachelors degree program, a Masters program or through an alternative certification program.

Though it is based on small sub samples within the main sample, a significant relationship was found between experience level and whether a teacher is employed at a charter, magnet or school of the arts ($x^2=8.276, p<.05$). Of the responding music teachers employed at charter schools, all were novices. Conversely, all responding music teachers employed at schools of the arts were experienced teachers.

A Pearson Chi-Square test also revealed a significant relationship between experience and race ($x^2=12.295, p<.05$). All 15 of the African-American music teachers who participated in the survey had at least five years of experience. Many of them were nearing retirement as well (see Table 5 for a greater expansion on this).
Table 5

*Teachers’ Self-Identified Race by Cohort*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1-5 years</th>
<th>6-13 years</th>
<th>14-23 years</th>
<th>25+ years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/PI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Am.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attainment of the requisite five years in urban schools to be considered an experienced urban teacher was also found to have a significant association with the attainment of a Masters degree in music education ($\phi=.322, p<.05$). Thirty-seven of 67 experienced urban teachers held Masters degrees. By comparison, only 4 of 22 novice teachers held Masters degrees.

While not analyzed for statistically significant differences, some comparisons are reported here for descriptive purposes. Teachers who have reached the five-year threshold to be considered experienced urban teachers were found in schools with slightly higher percentages of students on free or reduced lunch, but in schools with lower percentages of African American Students (see Table 6 for exact numbers) than their novice counterparts. Experienced urban teachers had, on average, lower numbers of
schools in which they worked, indicating that fewer experienced teachers were itinerant than novice teachers. Experienced teachers also rated their facilities and access to supplies higher than their novice colleagues. In addition, experienced teachers had generally higher opinions of their students, and of their own ability to connect to their students. Experienced teachers’ ratings of perception of support from administrators, fellow faculty and the community were higher than novice teachers. Experienced teachers were generally more satisfied with the music teaching profession than their novice colleagues. Similarly, experienced teachers rated the labor market more favorably than their less experienced colleagues. Little difference was seen between novice and experienced teachers in terms of musical fulfillment and social justice.
Table 6

*Experienced and Novice Teachers’ Scores on Continuous Independent Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Experienced</th>
<th>combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>13.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Afr. Am. students</td>
<td>40.26</td>
<td>28.38</td>
<td>30.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White students</td>
<td>18.52</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>16.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Free or red. lunch</td>
<td>71.48</td>
<td>78.88</td>
<td>77.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Schools</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>20.54</td>
<td>20.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>11.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall support</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>15.66</td>
<td>15.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. support</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community support</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty support</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>18.35</td>
<td>18.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical fulfillment</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>12.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>9.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 2: How Novice and Experienced Stayers Differ from Novice and Experienced Leavers**

The decision to stay or leave a teaching position was coded as a dichotomous variable created from all possible plan decisions. Stayers were those who indicated they
would return to the same school the following year. Leavers were those who had planned to either teach elsewhere, leave the teaching profession due to retirement, shifting, or other reasons.

Novice stayers, like experienced stayers had lower average numbers of schools than leavers. Stayers (both novice and experienced) rated their facilities higher on average than leavers. Similarly, teachers’ ratings of support from administration, non-music faculty and the community were higher for those teachers who were planning to stay than those who were planning to leave for the following school year. Stayers were generally more satisfied with labor market forces than leavers, indicating greater satisfaction with salary, benefits and professional associations. Finally, higher average ratings by teachers of their opinion and perception of the music teaching profession were also associated with experienced and novice stayers (see Table 7 for mean scores for each variable based on novice and experienced status and stated intention to stay or leave a position).

For both experienced and novice teachers, stayers were in schools with lower mean percentages of African American students than leavers. Results for percentages of White students and percentage of students on free and reduced lunch were mixed however (see table 7). Differences between leavers and stayers regarding musical fulfillment appeared to be negligible.
Table 7

*Experienced and novice stayers compared with leavers on continuous variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Stayers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Leavers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Exp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Afr. Am. students</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>27.36</td>
<td>43.64</td>
<td>39.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White students</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>21.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Free or red. lunch</td>
<td>77.14</td>
<td>79.41</td>
<td>87.86</td>
<td>66.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Schools</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>21.38</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>18.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>9.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall support</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>12.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. support</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community support</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty support</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>18.39</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>16.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical fulfillment</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>12.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>17.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>8.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 3: Factors most Predictive of Job Satisfaction

Correlations with Music teacher job satisfaction were calculated with each of the independent variables. Those continuous variables with significant linear relationships (alpha set a priori at .05) with the continuous dependent variable “satisfaction” were initially entered into the Linear regression calculation (See Table 8).
Table 8

*Pearson Product Moment Correlations between Music Teacher Job Satisfaction and Independent Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% African American</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>ns (not significant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Free or reduced lunch</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of non-music courses</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of schools</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Support</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Support</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Support</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years teaching</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years urban</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice/Exp status</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An examination of the correlation matrix (see Appendix E) revealed strong, significant positive correlations ($r \geq .80, p \leq .001$) between the overarching “support” category and each of the three types of support (administrative, non-music faculty and the community). Thus, only the overall support variable was used in the calculation of the regression analysis, omitting the variables administrative support, community support and faculty support. Higher ratings by participants on three continuous variables—teachers attitudes and perceptions of students, the music teaching profession and social justice were found to be significant predictors of higher teacher satisfaction at the $p \leq .05$ level (see Table 9).

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc Jus</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model was found to account for 44.7 % of the variation in Satisfaction, with an F-statistic of 9.249, with $p \leq .001$, indicating that the model is statistically significant overall without examining each individual variable. Beta is a standardized coefficient for
each of the continuous variables that can be used to compare the relative importance of each factor in the model. Beta weights in this case indicate how much each factor contributes to overall satisfaction. For each one-point increase in the predictor variable, (Profession for example) the dependent variable (satisfaction) increases by the Beta weight (.191).

In order for the impact of a predictor variable to be examined through linear regression, it must be a continuous variable, and must have a linear relationship with the outcome variable. Therefore ANOVA or analysis of variance was used to determine significant relationships between categorical variables (the participants’ SES, gender, race, highest degree earned, type of classes taught, type mismatch, type of room, level of the school, district) and the outcome variable (satisfaction). None of the categorical variables were found to significantly affect the outcome variable “satisfaction.”

**Question 4: Factors Most Predictive of Attrition or Retention Decisions**

Binary logistic regression was used to find the most predictive independent variables for the dependent variables the staying or leaving decisions of the participating teachers. Two separate regressions were run, the first for the immediate plans for staying or leaving, (plans) and the second for the dependent variable of intended staying or leaving within five years (intentions). Only those who indicated that they would stay in their present school in the succeeding year were placed into the "stayers" category, while all others were put into the "leavers" category (Movers, Leavers, Shifters and Retirees-see Table 5 on page 81), Teacher job satisfaction was found to significantly predict the intention to stay for at least five years, but it only approached significance as a predictor of immediate plans to stay or leave (see table 10).
Table 10

*Binary Logistic Regression Output for Intended and Planned Attrition Based on Teacher Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended Leaving</td>
<td>1.302</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Leaving</td>
<td>1.266</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The odds ratio can be interpreted to mean that with each one point change in satisfaction, the likelihood that one intends to leave increases by 1.302. If the likelihood that one intends to leave is not changed by job satisfaction then the odds ratio would be 1.000. The *p* value indicates the probability that this increase from 1 to 1.302 is due to chance. As with previous statistical analysis, the probability level (or alpha) was set at .05 a priori, so any *p* value higher than .05 would indicate a that the odds ratio cannot be said with statistical certainty to be different from the expected odds ratio of 1.000. Although intended attrition could be predicted by job satisfaction when considered alone, it could not be stated with any statistical certainty that music teacher job satisfaction affects teachers' immediate plans for attrition.

It should be noted that the subgroup of teachers whose immediate plan was to leave their position make up only 14 of 89 participants, and making any definitive pronouncements based on such a small sample is inappropriate. More confidence may be had in making more conclusive statements regarding intended leavers who account for 48% of the total pool of participants (see table 4 on page 90 for exact numbers).
When all variables were added into the equation, it was found that only the participants’ perception of the music teaching profession was a significant predictor of immediate plans to stay in a position (odds ratio of 1.705, \( p < .05 \)) See table 11 for odds ratios and \( p \) values for each of the continuous variables entered into the regression equation.

Table 11

Regression Table of Odds Ratios and Significance for Variables Predicting Immediate Plans to Stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% African American</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1.610</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1.569</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>1.705</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>1.438</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Urban</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>.336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Categorical variables (the participants’ SES, gender, race, highest degree earned, type of classes taught, type mismatch, type of room, level of the school, district) were cross-tabbed to discover relationships between sub-groups of the participants and their planned or intended attrition or staying decisions, then a Phi coefficient was calculated to
find statistical significance. Only the categorical factor of “race” had a statistically significant relationship with the outcome variable of the participants’ planned attrition or staying decision ($\Phi = .569, p = .017$).

Although job satisfaction predicted intended future retention when regression analysis was performed with satisfaction as the sole independent variable, when other variables were added to the analysis, satisfaction was no longer a significant predictor. The only significant predictors of teacher’s stated intention to stay in a position or to leave a position were that person’s perception of the labor market (which included adequacy of salary and availability of jobs outside of music education) and the number of years they had been teaching in urban schools (see Table 12).
Table 12

Regression Table of Odds Ratios and Significance for Variables Predicting Intention to Stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td>.645#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% African American</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>1.730</td>
<td>.030*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Urban</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05.; #While Satisfaction significantly predicted intended leaving in the bivariate analysis, once other variables were added to the regression equation, the effect of satisfaction on intended staying was no longer significant.

Cross tabs and Phi coefficients were calculated between each of the categorical variables and intended attrition or retention plans of the participants. As with planned immediate attrition or retention, the categorical variable relating to the participants’ stated race was found to have a statistically significant relationship with intentions (Φ = .644, p = .012). No other categorical variable had a statistically significant relationship with intended attrition or retention decisions of participants.
Results of Analysis of Open-Ended Responses

Three short answer questions were included on the questionnaire, intended to give respondents more of a voice in this study of their intentions, plans, thoughts and feelings regarding their chosen music education career. Each participant was assigned an alphanumeric tag to ensure confidentiality. Numbers indicated the order in which responses were received, while the letters correspond to the name of the district and whether the participants responded using the online or hard copy, thus “9DO” refers to the ninth response from Denver, and that the participant used the online form. Responses were collected, coded for themes, and frequency counts were tabulated for each coding for each question. If participants’ responses contained more than one sentence on different topics, each topic was coded separately. Because of this, there are more responses listed for questions two and three than there are actual participants. The complete response set for the open-ended questions is found in Appendix D.

The first question asked of the participants was "If you are considering leaving this teaching assignment, are there incentives that may cause you to change your mind, and if so, what are they?" The most common answers referenced greater compensation, or compensation commensurate with surrounding districts. An example of this is the Chicago teacher who responded “more comparable pay to suburban teachers,” or the Denver teacher who responded “Pay that is equal to the surrounding school districts, and/or better support and parent involvement of performing arts education from the community” (9DO- A novice urban teacher). See Table 13 for frequency counts of codes for responses.
Table 1

_Most Common Responses and Frequency of Responses for Question One_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Compensation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with Discipline</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Job Security</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling / more frequent classes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities / Security</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less time spent on testing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second question asked participants "What is the single aspect of your teaching position that brings you the most joy?" (See table 1 for frequency codes for responses). The most common responses dealt with the love of making music with students, seeing their growth over the course of their school years and the joys of working with motivated or talented students. Sometimes these ideas concerning love of music making, and joy at seeing student growth combined with ideas of Social Justice, such as the Philadelphia teacher, retiring with 40 years in urban schools who wrote, "As I get to know more and more about many of my students and the challenges they face, I often develop a deep respect for them. The joy comes from seeing the positive effect that learning to play an instrument has on them." Personal connections between music teachers and students also figured prominently, an example being the response of a 30 year teaching veteran in Atlanta who wrote that their greatest joy comes from “when the
children whom I taught come back to visit and discuss many remembrances of their musical experience in my class.”

Table 14

*Most Common Responses and Frequency of Responses for Question Two*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music making with students</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student success/growth</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with motivated students</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of personal connections</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice / Mission</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love of Teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third question asked participants "What is the single aspect of your teaching position that leads you to be most frustrated?" (See table 15 for frequency codes for responses). The three most common responses centered on testing, lack of administrative support and student apathy. A typical statement regarding testing came from a Denver music educator who expressed frustration with “the academic hierarchy, in which reading & math get class time, financial support, etc., while music is barely noticed.” A first-year Seattle music teacher expressed frustration at “The administrative support (or lack thereof), especially in scheduling field trips, assemblies, testing etc.” Lack of respect from students as a cause of frustration was not always blamed on the students themselves, but often on outside influences, as typified by a Chicago teacher’s frustration at the
“Complete lack of respect from students and complete lack of discipline and carrying out of consequences by security, administrators and other teachers.” Also garnering high frequency counts were frustrations regarding layoffs, particularly from Los Angeles teachers, where only those with the greatest seniority were to be rehired the following year. One Los Angeles teacher lamented “Watching teachers with many years of experience and track records of successful programs being laid off!” Also a concern was the scheduling of time to meet with students, a concern expressed by a Seattle teacher who worried that “They are cutting my hours next year to a part time job because music isn’t valued at this school anymore. I’d quit but the kids need me to continue at this High School.”

Table 15

*Most Common Responses and Frequency of Responses for Question Three.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Testing and/or the Place of Arts in Schools</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support - Discipline</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Apathy</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Policies / Layoffs</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling- more time, smaller classes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Findings

Four questions guided this study:

1. What factors (teacher attributes, job attributes, and opinions or perceptions regarding teaching or their workplace) distinguish experienced teachers in high-poverty urban schools from novice teachers?

2. Among experienced teachers on the one hand, and novice teachers on the other, what factors distinguish stayers from leavers?

3. Which factors are most predictive of overall music teacher job satisfaction in high-poverty urban school settings?

4. Which factors, including teacher job satisfaction, are most predictive of a music teacher's intention to leave or stay in a high-poverty urban school setting?

In this chapter, some tentative answers have been found, however a lower than expected response rate to the survey of teachers necessitates that some caution must be used in making decisive declarations.

Based on this sample, a greater percentage of experienced urban teachers than novice teachers held Masters degrees. More experienced teachers than novice teachers taught in music specific classrooms rather than general purpose classrooms or portable temporary classrooms. The experienced urban teachers surveyed also had a more diverse racial makeup than their novice counterparts. Of those teachers who responded to this survey, magnet and charter schools were found to be staffed by novice teachers while schools of the arts were commonly staffed by experienced teachers. Experienced teachers also, with few exceptions reported higher than novices on overall teacher satisfaction, and rated higher on Likert-type survey items designed to gauge opinions and
perceptions of the teaching profession, their students, quality of facilities, support for their programs, and other variables. Scores on opinion and perception Likert-type items were also generally higher among those novices and experienced teachers who were planning to stay in their current positions than among those teachers who were leaving their teaching positions.

Regression analysis revealed that job satisfaction of the participating music teachers was predicted by their opinion and perception of the teaching profession, their opinion of their students, and their belief in the philosophy of social justice, such that as each of these factors rose, there was an expected rise in the teacher’s reported job satisfaction. Although those teachers who intended to stay in their positions generally reported higher job satisfaction than leavers, retention in a position for the immediate future was predicted best by the participants’ opinions and perceptions of the music teaching profession. Participants’ intention to stay in a position for the next five years was best predicted by their opinion and perception of labor market forces and the number of years they had taught. Participants’ race was also found to be a significant factor in their attrition or retention decisions. The final chapter of this dissertation will delve more deeply into each of these issues.
Chapter 5

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to examine the factors that most influence job satisfaction (teacher attribute factors, job attribute factors, and factors relating to teacher opinion and perception of teaching or the workplace) and to find causes of planned or intended attrition or retention among music teachers in high-poverty urban schools. Additionally, a profile of experienced teachers in high-poverty urban schools was developed, and compared with those novice teachers whose stated intention was to stay in their positions to try to discover similar motivating factors. Teachers in six major metropolitan areas of the United States were surveyed regarding twenty-four variables relating to teacher characteristics, job attributes, and teachers’ opinions and perceptions of their workplace. Questionnaires were sent to 328 music teachers teaching in Title-I schools in Atlanta, Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, Philadelphia and Seattle. Responses were received from 89 teachers (27%). Regression analysis was performed to identify factors most highly related to teacher job satisfaction, teachers’ planned attrition or retention, and teacher’s career intentions.

Generalizability

It was hoped that through the random sampling process outlined in Chapter Three that generalizability of the findings of this dissertation might be possible to teachers in other urban areas of the United States. Due to the low response rate (see table 3 on page 80 for the exact numbers of responses from each district) findings of this study need to be viewed with caution. While results of statistical procedures used throughout this dissertation have often been found to have statistical significance, attempting to justify
any practical significance or generalizability based on such small sample sizes and even smaller sub-samples (e.g. the three respondents who self-identified as Hispanic) may be unwise. The low response rate creates an additional problem of potential bias, either in that teachers who responded may have been those who felt the strongest about their jobs, either positively or negatively, but the direction of the bias and even the existence of bias is not quantifiable based on the raw data or the aggregate data.

An attempt was made to address the low response rate by examining the responses of those participants who responded promptly and comparing those responses with the final surveys received, under the assumption that those who responded on the last possible date were perhaps similar to those teachers who were contacted but who did not respond. No significant differences were found with regards to either teachers’ job satisfaction or their attrition or retention decisions between the first surveys received and the last surveys received. This finding may bolster the strength of the conclusions and generalizations that may be made despite the low response rate.

**Question One: Discussion**

1. What are common factors (teacher attributes, job attributes, and opinions or perceptions regarding teaching or their workplace) distinguish experienced teachers in high-poverty urban schools from novice teachers?

   Based on this sample, a greater percentage of experienced urban teachers than novice teachers held Masters degrees. More experienced teachers than novice teachers taught in music specific classrooms rather than in general-purpose classrooms or portable temporary classrooms. The experienced urban teachers surveyed also had a more diverse racial makeup than their novice counterparts. Of those teachers who responded to this
survey, magnet and charter schools were found to be staffed by novice teachers while schools of the arts were commonly staffed by experienced teachers. Experienced teachers also, with few exceptions reported higher than novices on overall teacher satisfaction, and rated higher on Likert-type survey items designed to gauge opinions and perceptions of the teaching profession, their students, quality of facilities, support for their programs, and other variables.

Several trends of interest emerged through data analysis regarding question one, the first is that type mismatch (e.g. a teacher whose ideal position would be as a band teacher but who is employed as a general music teacher) appears common among novice teachers with 36.4% reporting type mismatch, while 22.4% of experienced teachers are type mismatched. When viewed across cohorts, the trend towards fewer type mismatches by number of years of teaching is more clear. From the 36.4% of novice teachers reporting type mismatch, incidence of type mismatches decreases to 33.3% for mid career teachers, further decreases to 22.7% for late-career teachers, and finally, only 5.6% of eligible retirees reported type mismatch (see table 16). This may be evidence that long-term career plans made prior to enrolling as an undergraduate (e.g. “I want to be an orchestra director”) continue to guide one’s career objectives later, and that while in the short term one might find employment despite a type mismatch, teachers in this situation may be constantly looking for more suitable opportunities. Said one Denver teacher, “I teach guitar club and love it. I teach choir and hate it.”
Table 16

*Types of Music Teachers and Mismatched Types by Cohort*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1-5 years</th>
<th>6-13 years</th>
<th>14-23 years</th>
<th>25+ years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mismatched</td>
<td>8/22</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>9/25</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>5/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Mismatch</td>
<td>14/22</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>16/25</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>18/23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Total of percentages on line 6 does not add to 100% due to this question being omitted by one participant*

A second trend that emerged was that although there were no African American teachers among the novice urban teachers, who were 81.8% White; African American music educators accounted for 16.8% of participants, 22.4% of experienced urban teachers, and 41.2% of eligible retirees. Career intentions of White teachers ran the spectrum from staying, leaving, moving, shifting or retiring. Career intentions of African American teachers were only stated as staying, shifting to a position in higher education or administration or retiring. This may be evidence that African American teachers exhibit greater commitment to the students and the communities they serve.

Interestingly, when the data were checked for satisfaction ratings of African American
teachers, they scored lower on average than White teachers (a mean of 11.6 out of a possible 16 points for African American teachers as compared to a mean of 13.39 for White teachers, or even compared to those teachers who planned to leave whose mean was 12.79).

Average summed scores of the experienced urban teachers on continuous variables relating to teachers’ opinions and perceptions of teaching and the workplace for consistently outpaced novice urban teachers. This may point to the importance of experience in shaping one’s working environment. Although stayers also consistently rated higher for all variables measured than leavers, the importance of experience was exhibited time and again. One interpretation could be that community and administrative support for music programs and music teachers are built, rather than simply there, perhaps that one’s respect for one’s pupils increases over time and that with experience comes higher salary, along with feelings that that one’s salary is adequate. Alternately, it may be that the most experienced teachers were more satisfied than novice teachers because younger teachers who were dissatisfied may not have stayed in their positions long enough to be considered as experienced teachers.

Higher scores by experienced urban teachers than their less experienced counterparts perhaps indicates that over the course of their careers experienced teachers have been able to help shape their working environment. In my own experience, during my first year at the middle school where I taught for eight years, I was assigned to teach on the stage, but as the program improved, and greater numbers of students were added, the orchestra room was moved to a large well-lit classroom near to the office, where the students could be shown off to visitors to the school. Examination of the correlation
matrix (see Appendix E) reveals that teachers’ summed ratings of the facilities was closely tied to their feelings of support from administration and support overall ($r = .553$ and $.561$ respectively, both with $p \leq .001$).

Two school districts had greater percentages of experienced teachers than other districts. Of participants from Atlanta, all nine were experienced teachers, and of participants from Los Angeles, eleven of twelve were experienced teachers. Los Angeles district policy may be driving this trend. Los Angeles is in the process of a RIF program, or a Reduction in Force, where the least experienced music teachers are being laid off each year, regardless of quality. One teacher with seven years of experience in Los Angeles who indicated that they were leaving, when asked what incentives might cause them to change their mind about leaving. This teacher responded simply, “to be re-hired at the same school (laid off)” indicating that their leaving was a district-level decision rather than through their own choice to leave.

Although ratings of facilities by teachers was not found to be predictive of higher teacher satisfaction, there was a significant positive correlation ($r = .435$, $p \leq .001$) between rating of facilities by teachers and their satisfaction rating on the summed Likert-style items. Although it could be argued that better facilities are built over the course of a career, ensuring that new teachers have the materials, supplies and a comfortable room for teaching may help to keep them in their positions. One teacher listed as their greatest frustration, "having to teach on stage while physical education classes are being held in the gym." Though at least one of the participants rated their facilities with a string of perfect 4’s for a score of 32, it was more common to hear about facilities causing frustrations. A Chicago band director wrote, "This year I literally have NOTHING as far
as materials and instruments. My classes lined up folding tables in the front of the Auditorium and knocked with our hands out rudiments on copies from a drum book that I have. We couldn’t even get sticks!” (emphasis in the original).

An examination of the correlation matrix calculated between all continuous variables (see Appendix E) revealed a significant positive correlation between participants’ rating of their facilities and their perception of support for their program ($r=0.561$, $p<0.001$). A similar significant positive correlation was calculated between participants rating of their facilities and perception of support specifically from administrators ($r=0.553$, $p<0.001$).

Experienced teachers were also found to be far more likely to hold advanced degrees than novice teachers (see table 17). Across the four cohorts that were formed based on years teaching in urban schools, there is a clear rise in number of teachers with Masters degrees between those teachers who are in their first five years of teaching (4 of 22 holding Masters degrees) and the early career teachers with 6-13 years in urban schools (14 of 26 holding Masters degrees) (see bolded line on Table 17). The number of teachers holding Masters degrees within each cohort levels off after this initial rise. This initial rise may be due to continuing education requirements in some states that either mandate or reward teachers for getting Masters degrees.
Table 17

Highest Music Education Degree Obtained by Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1-5 years</th>
<th>6-13 years</th>
<th>14-23 years</th>
<th>25+ years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Mu Ed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Two: Discussion**

Among experienced teachers on the one hand, and novice teachers on the other, what factors distinguish stayers from leavers?

Scores on opinion and perception Likert-type items were also generally higher among those novices and experienced teachers who were planning to stay in their current positions than among those teachers who were leaving their teaching positions.

Of some concern is a trend that can be seen among novice leavers. Although there were very few of them, these teachers were often in schools with the highest mean percentage of African American students, the highest mean percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch, and the lowest mean percentage of White students (see Table 18).
Table 18

*School Student Body Attribute Averages for Experienced and Novice Stayers and Leavers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N Leavers</th>
<th>N Stayers</th>
<th>E Leavers</th>
<th>E Stayers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% African American</td>
<td>43.64</td>
<td>31.55</td>
<td>39.25</td>
<td>27.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>21.92</td>
<td>15.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Free and Reduced</td>
<td>87.86</td>
<td>77.14</td>
<td>66.57</td>
<td>79.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The finding that those teachers who have fewer than five years of experience are leaving the schools with the highest percentages of African American students, the lowest percentages of White students and the highest concentrations of students at or below the poverty level echoes evidence from other sources these schools have the highest overall turnover rates. This may confirm suppositions from educational literature that have not been studied in depth in previous music education research literature (e.g. Hanson, Lien, Cavalluzzo & Wenger (2004)). These variables were not, just as in Hanson, Lien, Cavalluzzo and Wenger, found to be significant predictors of attrition plans for the following year.

**Question 3: Discussion**

Which factors are most predictive of overall music teacher job satisfaction in high-poverty urban school settings?

Regression analysis revealed that job satisfaction of the participating music teachers was predicted by their opinion and perception of the teaching profession, their opinion of their students, and their belief in the philosophy of social justice. As teachers
rating each of these factors rose, there was an expected, statistically significant rise in the teacher’s reported job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is important for several reasons, only one of which is that results of this study may indicate it to potentially be a causal factor in determining future career plans for music teachers in high-poverty urban schools. Career intentions have been shown to be a reliable measure of turnover (Vandenberg & Barnes-Nelson, 1999). If teachers state in a survey that they plan to leave high-poverty urban schools, or leave the teaching profession entirely, then they are more likely to actually follow up on that statement in the future, when an opportunity presents itself. In the midst of a recession, there may be few opportunities for these teachers, either in neighboring districts or outside of education.

Regression analysis revealed that job satisfaction of the participating music teachers was predicted by their opinion and perception of the teaching profession, their opinion of their students, and their belief in the philosophy of social justice, such that as each of these factors rose, there was an expected rise in the teacher’s reported job satisfaction.

When asked what single aspect of their jobs brought them the most joy, the most common answer by far was the students, accounting for 81 of 106 responses to the short-answer prompt. Teachers wrote about three aspects of working with their students in particular. Many participants mentioned their students’ growth or success, with responses similar to the Chicago music teacher who loved “Seeing the progression in the students especially when they see it too.” Others mentioned the joys that come from musicking with their students, such as a novice teacher from Philadelphia who enjoys
"watching the pride that my students have developed in their performances, and how much their dedication to the program has increased over the last two years." The third thread found in the qualitative responses regarding students was the joy that comes from working with dedicated and talented students, such as the Philadelphia teacher who found joy in working with a "student who ‘gets it’ and soars.” Though not as common, students were a source of frustration for their teachers as well. A novice Los Angeles teacher's frustration stemmed from “When students don’t take me or the music class seriously.” Frustrations with students, particularly with discipline were among the common complaints of teachers.

Also predictive of high job satisfaction was a commitment to, and a comfort in one’s role in the music education profession. Six questions were constructed to find out teacher’s feelings regarding the music education profession: satisfaction with the decision to enter music education, stability within the music education profession, and career prospects in music education, commitment to being a music teacher, and frustration or isolation associated with being a music teacher. Job stability was a concern of several music teachers, particularly those in Los Angeles who were subject to the Reduction In Force (RIF) mandate, wherein only those music teachers with the greatest seniority would be retained by the district, and the rest would be laid off (United Teachers of Los Angeles, 2011). These teachers often retained a commitment to their school and students. One Los Angeles teacher who had been laid off as a result of RIF, when asked what incentives might keep them at their school if they were considering leaving only wanted “to be rehired at the same school.” Three teachers mentioned as their greatest joy the act of teaching. One Atlanta teacher found the greatest joys in “Teaching my students the
skills, then having them to perform the final product.” Higher scores indicated greater commitment to the profession, less frustration and less isolation within their teaching position.

Teachers tended to believe that music does make a difference in the lives of their students, and that inner city students should have the same opportunities as students in the suburbs. Agreement with statements supporting a belief in the philosophy of social justice was also correlated with greater job satisfaction among music teachers in high-poverty urban schools. A Denver music teacher found greatest joy “When a child’s self-esteem grows from confidence in music exposure, ensembles, or performance or composition.” When asked which single aspect of their teaching position brought them the most joy, one Chicago teacher with forty-years of experience simply stated, “my mission.” Another Chicago teacher, although lamenting the lack of job stability stated that they “wouldn’t trade anything for the ultimate satisfaction of working in an urban school.” Even more to the point, several teachers saw great worth in the work they were doing in inner-city schools among under privileged students, as typified by a Denver teacher whose greatest joy was in “the realization that I am making a difference…”, or the Los Angeles teacher who most enjoys “working with inner city kids and watching them compete with the best of the best.” A Philadelphia teacher, also a 40 year veteran of urban schools has found that “as I get to know more and more about many of my students and the challenges they face, I often develop a deep respect for them. The joy comes from seeing the positive effect that learning to play an instrument has on them.”

Despite the expectation based on previous research that music teachers in high-poverty urban schools may have higher turnover rates than other types of teachers in
other types or urbanicities of schools, the music teacher attrition rate found in this study (15.7%) is virtually identical to the 16% attrition rate found by Ingersoll (2002) for all teachers in the United States. One Chicago teacher expressed this very sentiment in stating that “I want to leave this profession ONLY because of where I am. I can’t get interviewed out of the city because I have a Masters degree and experience. So my only option is a new career” (emphasis in the original).

**Question 4: Discussion**

Which factors, including teacher job satisfaction are most predictive of a music teacher's intention to leave or stay in a high-poverty urban school setting?

Although those teachers who intended to stay in their positions generally reported higher job satisfaction than leavers, retention in a position for the immediate future was predicted best by the participants’ opinions and perceptions of the music teaching profession. Participants' intention to stay in a position for the next five years was best predicted by their opinion and perception of labor market forces and the number of years they had taught. Participants’ race was also found to be a significant factor in their attrition or retention decisions.

As mentioned above, the relatively low response rate for this project worked against finding statistical significance predictors of immediate plans for leaving positions, although one predictor was found to have statistical significance- respondents’ opinion and perception of the music teaching profession- so perhaps some discussion is warranted.

The average summed score for the Likert-type items relating to professional commitment was 18.02 with a standard deviation of 3.61. The average summed score for
stayers was 18.44, which can be contrasted with the average summed score of 14.70 for those who planned to leave their positions at the end of the school year, nearly one full standard deviation lower.

Of the six items in the professional commitment section four dealt with teachers’ satisfaction with their decision to enter the teaching profession, their long-term prospects in music education, their commitment to music education and their frustration with being a music teacher. Those teachers who were most frustrated and least committed to music teaching were most likely to leave their positions.

Based on statistical analysis of data from the participants African American teachers seemed (based on a small sub-sample of respondents) to be more committed to staying in high-poverty urban schools, however this is not to say that African American teachers are more satisfied in their positions than White teachers (see table 19). African American teachers who responded to the survey had lower average summed satisfaction scores (11.60 as compared with Whites’ summed rating of 13.39). This finding is consistent with Liu & Meyer’s (2005) finding of lower job satisfaction ratings for African Americans teachers, which they coupled with African American teachers’ lower satisfaction rating with regards to salary. African American teachers’ lower mean satisfaction score may reflect less satisfaction with the state of urban education and with student discipline issues than White teachers, but at the same time, their commitment to stay in the schools and work to fix them from within is evidenced by lower percentages of African American teachers moving from or leaving city schools than White teachers (see Table 19). The finding in this study that a teacher’s race may be related to career plans in urban music teaching can be contrasted with the findings of Russell (2008) using
a similar survey tool that found no significant relationship between teacher’s race and planned or intended attrition decisions.

Immediate plans of the 15 African American teachers (all of whom are experienced urban teachers) show two moving and one retiring, but none leaving teaching. This is contrasted with White participants, two of whom are moving, two are leaving education and three are retiring. Phi coefficients calculated between teacher’s self-identified race and intentions to stay in or leave their current positions within five years (Φ=.644) as well as between teacher’s self-identified race and teachers’ immediate plans for attrition or retention (Φ=.569) were both found to be statistically significant at the $p<.05$ level. More telling are the intended career plans of African American teachers when contrasted with White teachers (see Table 19). It can be seen that many more White teachers than African American teachers intend to move from their urban teaching assignments or leave teaching entirely.

Table 19

*Plans and Intentions of White and African-American Music Teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Plan</th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th></th>
<th>African Americans</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It could also be noted that 18 of the 63, or just more than a quarter of the White teachers who responded were novices with five years or fewer in the music teaching profession. This can be contrasted sharply with the African American teachers who responded, all of whom had been teaching at least five years in urban schools ($x^2=12.295$, $p<.05$).

It may be that young African American teachers simply did not respond to the questionnaires and thus are not counted in this study. The lack of young African American music teachers in this study may be part of a troubling trend, and the questions should be asked whether schools of music are recruiting, attracting, admitting or graduating African American music educators.

**Emerging Trends from Responses to Open-Ended Questions**

**Support from administrators, fellow faculty members and the community.**

Administration and discipline were, along with apathetic students and complaints about testing the most common frustration based on frequency of responses to the question "What is the single aspect of your teaching position that leads you to be most frustrated?" A common frustration was voiced by a Los Angeles teacher who was most frustrated about, “Chaos or lack of a cohesive school-wide discipline program that is consistently followed.” A novice teacher from Philadelphia was frustrated that other faculty members are not as flexible and easy to work with as they could possibly be. I feel like because they don't necessarily understand what it takes to put together a concert or a musical performance, that they have no idea the breath of work and details that goes into the planning and preparation process.
Professional respect from their teaching colleagues was a source of frustration for many teachers who mentioned not just covering classes for other teachers or only having music class because it was regarded as a prep period for the other teachers. One eligible retiree was frustrated with the "Necessity to advocate for the importance of music in the curriculum and fight to keep programs every few years. Math teachers do not have to do this!" Regarding community support for music, one Los Angeles teacher noted the "Lack of parent support. Encouraging students to practice or attend their concerts."

Two trends emerged from examination of the responses to the open-ended question regarding the frustrations of urban high-poverty music teachers. Neither had been included in sections of the questionnaire, so further investigation is warranted. The first deals with implications from the standardized testing movement, and the second is in regard to scheduling and class sizes.

**Testing and the place of music education in the overall curriculum.**

One of the three most frequent responses to the third open-ended prompt (three themes emerged that were mentioned sixteen times total by respondents) was a frustration with testing, and with the low esteem that music teachers felt they were held in by the teachers of tested subjects such as math or reading.

Quotes from four different Philadelphia teachers make the case far more eloquently than I. That all four are from Philadelphia schools, which recently emerged from a state takeover of their schools due to low standardized test scores across the district seems prescient to note (Useem, Christman & Boyd, 2006). One Philadelphia teacher was frustrated by "Recent increases of testing and focusing curriculum in a narrow way to increase test scores. Time and support for music has been diminished,
making our jobs harder to do." A second Philadelphia teacher expressed frustration with "Not being treated as a professional music teacher. I am often covering classes, teaching math and reading and shuffled around. In this district specialists are considered ‘prep teachers’.” A third Philadelphia teacher was frustrated by “The idea that students can be taken out of music for tests, etc., because it’s not an ‘academic’ subject.” And the nearly inevitable conclusion supplied by yet another Philadelphia teacher: "The arts are always the first consideration when the district needs to trim its spending." The finding of a perception held by music teachers of a lack of subject respect (math or reading in opposition to music) from teaching colleagues was also found in Doyle’s (2010) study of Miami music teachers.

Uncertainty regarding music’s place in the curriculum from Philadelphia teachers, who were almost fresh out of the radical reform movement and state takeovers seemed to almost pale in comparison to the uncertainty and sometimes anger over job stability and cuts in music education funding expressed by one Los Angeles music teacher.

I have been at this school for 5 years and built the music program from scratch after a 20 year absence of music at this school. In just 4 years of competing my band has won the city championship twice and placed 2nd twice in division 1 as well as being runner-up in the State Finals. My Orchestra has been undefeated since they began competing 3 years ago and has received excellent and superior ratings at festival. So why is the district deciding to lay me off? There are programs that perform less than 1/4 of what we do? I really hope something happens before the summer but it is now June and I still have not heard if I will stay here. I really hope I do.
Anger among young Los Angeles teachers is echoed in the frustrations of those teachers who have adequate seniority to remain. Another Los Angeles teacher expressed frustration with “Watching teachers with many years of experience and track records of successful programs being laid off!” Statements like these point to the need for professional organizations such as NAfME to advocate strongly for the importance of music education in urban schools. In times of budgetary difficulties, that the pendulum swings in the direction of cutting music from the schools seems like an almost inevitable fight. The tremendous efforts of teachers to build and sustain music programs in tight budgetary times seem almost to be Herculean efforts requiring enormous resourcefulness on the part of the teachers. Without advocacy, these efforts may be wasted, if not in the impact on the students who participate in these music programs, but perhaps in considering the many years that it takes to build a successful, high quality music program, in contrast to the mere moments that are needed for a teacher to be considered too junior in years of experience to be retained by the school system that has employed them.

The plight of the novice music teachers of Los Angeles who lost their jobs as a result of the Reduction in Force program also brought to light a major oversight in the construction of the survey tool. There was no response on the survey for someone who lost their job due to budget cuts or other reasons that might be traced back to the district level, and so these teachers generally were seen to identify as “leavers.” Losing a job due to a budget cut is, in theory and in practice very different from leaving a job because of lack of support, dissatisfaction or any of a myriad of other possible reasons why one might choose to leave.
**Finding time for music, finding space for musicians.**

Previous research (Docker, 2010) found that city schools may have fewer music teachers given similar sized student body than did schools in the suburbs or in rural areas. Although this variable was not measured as part of this study, some evidence for this problem emerged from an examination of responses to open ended questions. Six teachers noted that having more time to spend with their students would be an incentive that might keep them in urban schools. Thirteen teachers expressed frustration with scheduling, expressing a need for more time with their students, a desire for smaller class sizes, or the wish to be based at a single school rather than having an itinerant position.

One Atlanta teacher stated that “Currently I am assigned to 4 schools and I see my students once per week for 30 minutes … I would stay if I need to [sic] see my students at least 2 times per week for 45 minutes.” A Denver teacher with 19 years invested who was planning to leave at the end of the year stated that he or she may have stayed if the position comprised “…smaller classloads, fewer duties (playground…) more class meetings per week.” Comments similar to these may be further evidence of the supposition that music teachers in urban schools are “spread thin,” and responsible for too many classes, with class times too short and classes too large.

**Attrition Rates and Causes of Attrition as Compared to Previous Studies**

Findings concerning plans for retention, shifting and moving between positions and were very similar to the findings of Russell (2006) using a similar survey tool. Russell’s study showed a retention rate of for the following year of 83.3% (as compared to 84.27% for the present study) and a retention rate of 51.7% at the fifth year (compare to 51.69% for this study).
Despite the expectation based on previous research that music teachers in high-poverty urban schools may have higher turnover rates than other types of teachers in other types or urbanicities of schools, the music teacher attrition rate found in this study (15.7%) is virtually identical to the 16% attrition rate found by Ingersoll (2002) for all teachers in the United States.

The Gardner study of 2006 found that the most important predictor of attrition or retention decisions was administrative support. Within the present study, the overarching category of support was used in the regression analysis because it was found in the correlation matrix that administrative, community and faculty support were generally redundant when used in conjunction with the support category. Each was found to have a strong positive correlation (.819, .807 and .816 respectively, \( p < .001 \)) with the support category. Support seemed to affect the immediate plans for attrition, though the \( p \) value only approached, and did not meet statistical significance (see table 11 on page 100). It should be noted however, that there was only a small subsample of teachers who were leaving their positions within the overall pool of respondents for this study unlike Gardner’s study using a very large nationally representative sample of teachers. Given a larger, more representative and generalizable sample of leavers, there may have been a different result.

In the Russell (2008) study, one-year plans were significantly related to work culture, perceived subject importance, student characteristics, position characteristics, the teacher’s SES growing up and perception of the importance of music education profession. In the present study, two of these variables were echoed- opinion and perception of the music education profession and opinion and perception of student
characteristics. That other findings were not echoed in the present study may indicate that the survey tool was different enough (with the addition of a section on social justice, which was found to significantly predict music teacher job satisfaction) or that urban music teachers may have distinct viewpoints from the American String Teacher Association members who made up the string teachers participating in the Russell study.

**Implications for Future Research**

As has been shown, the race of music teachers matters in predicting career paths, particularly when faced with retaining teachers in high-poverty urban schools (Boyd, Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2005). There presently exists in Atlanta a cohort of African American teachers who are aging and soon to retire from the music teaching profession. They have, on average, 28 years of teaching experience in urban schools, and together make up a majority of the identified African American teachers in high-poverty urban schools from this project. It would be interesting to see what their collective history has been, as well as the individual histories of each of these nine committed music teachers. This may be instructive for university schools of music in finding ways to interest, recruit and graduate African-American music educators.

A more formal descriptive study ought to be conducted of Los Angeles schools, a school system situated in one of the entertainment capitols of the United States but which has been gradually cutting music education programs from the schools. With this knowledge, NAfME, the National Association for Music Education, could properly describe the emerging situation wherein music teacher jobs are being cut as a result of state budget shortfalls and devise a plan of action and advocacy for the remaining teachers in Los Angeles.
Regarding this particular study, it would be informative to administer a survey of teachers in other urbanicities and for other non-Title-I schools using this same questionnaire to see if there is anything remarkable about this particular group of teachers in the surveyed schools. It may be that for teachers in other urbanicities and with students from different SES backgrounds there may be other predictors of music teachers’ job satisfaction.

Of some concern was the difficulty found in identifying, contacting and ultimately, hearing back from music teachers in high-poverty urban schools. The low response rate was confounded by a number of factors. Although it was hoped to randomize the initial selection of music teachers from a district such as Los Angeles (with almost 1200 schools) by choosing a single teacher from every 18th school, music teachers were listed on faculty roles at only one in seven schools, so instead of teachers being randomly selected, they were in fact chosen. Of the music teachers initially identified for participation in the project, no active email address was available for 110. The response rate from some of the districts rose considerably as a result of the reminder emails. Response rates of Atlanta, Denver, and Los Angeles teachers however, showed only single digit rises in their response rates after two reminders, perhaps indicating that either computer or email access for music teachers within these school systems is not widespread (see Table 3: responses by district).

Future studies will likely need to utilize different strategies to garner a higher response rate than this study in order to increase generalizability. Distractions in participant identification may have been avoided by utilizing data that had already been collected, as in the Gardner study (2006), or through contacting a pre-existing
membership list (as in the Russell study of 2008). A third option may have been to contact school districts that had arts or music supervisors who may have been able to provide contact lists for district music teachers.

Most important to me, after having worked on this project for several years now, is the essence of job satisfaction - that it is indeed a multifaceted emotion, from the seemingly simple feeling of “liking” your job, to all of the intricacies that contribute to this simple feeling. I was personally privileged to experience the great joys of urban teaching in High Point, North Carolina. I experienced the joys of making connections with students that developed over years of working together to accomplish musical goals. I experienced the triumphs of having my students successfully audition for honors orchestras, having students receive scholarships to major universities and many students who have written to me to express appreciation or to tell me that I had changed their lives for the better. I also experienced the heartbreak of working with neglected children, and children whose destinies seemed irrevocably shaped by circumstances well outside of their control. I learned through the process of working with these students that poverty is not a death sentence, and that a single teacher can make enormous differences in the lives of the children they teach, especially when connections can be made and then fostered over many years. The great majority of the respondents seemed to agree with me that joy comes from the connections with students that are made and fostered through the action of music making with musical students. That it is the students who bring joy to the teachers, and who in turn benefit from participation with their students in musical experiences that are worthwhile for all concerned.
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Appendix A: Questionnaire

**Name of your school_____________________ School District________________**

**About your teaching position:**

1. How many NON-music courses do you currently teach?  
   - 0  
   - 1  
   - 2  
   - 3  
   - 4 or more

2. What type of music courses make up the majority of your teaching load? (Check one please.)
   - Band  
   - Choral  
   - General Music  
   - Orchestra  
   - Music Theory  
   - Other

3. What type of music courses would you teach in your *Ideal* teaching position?  
   - Band  
   - Choral  
   - General Music  
   - Orchestra  
   - Music Theory  
   - Other

4. Which level best describes the school at which you spend the *Majority* of your school day? (check one only)  
   - Elementary  
   - Middle School/Junior High  
   - High School

5. At how many different schools do you teach during a normal week?  
   - 1  
   - 2  
   - 3  
   - 4 or more

6. Do you teach at a charter or magnet school or school of the arts?  
   - Yes  
   - No
   - if yes then is it a  
   - Charter School  
   - Magnet School  
   - School of the Arts

7. Identify the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I like teaching at this school. (or &quot;these schools&quot; if you teach in more than one building)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   | I dread coming to work on Mondays.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   | I feel good about the job that I'm doing at this school. (or these schools).  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   | My teaching is a source of pride and joy in my life.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Room in which you teach- Facilities, Resources and Materials:**

1. The room in which I teach the majority of my classes is  
   - a room designed for music classes  
   - a stage or other multi-purpose room  
   - a general classroom  
   - I move among several classrooms each day  
   - a trailer or other portable classroom
2. Rate the adequacy of the following aspects of your music room and necessary supplies for teaching music.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Poor or none at all</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Abundant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural light and windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature and/or humidity control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of chairs, stands, and instruments and risers (where applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheet music or books for my students and other materials and supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoustic treatments on the walls or ceiling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage for instruments, supplies etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**About the students you teach:**

Identify the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students in our school are motivated to do their best.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student quality and achievement are high at this school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can connect with my students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student discipline is a problem at this school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**About Support for You and your Music Program:**

How satisfied are you with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the level of administrative support at your school for you and your music program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the level of community and parent support for you and your music program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the support for the music program from non-music faculty at your school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How important do you feel...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>your administration thinks music education is to the overall curriculum at your school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents in your community think music education is to the their children's education?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the faculty at your school think music education is in the overall curriculum?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Your Feelings about the Music Teaching Profession:

How satisfied are you with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>your decision to enter the music education profession?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your job stability in this district?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long term career prospects in Music Education?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not Committed</th>
<th>Somewhat Committed</th>
<th>Committed</th>
<th>Very Committed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you best describe your commitment to being a music teacher?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How isolated or alienated do you feel at your school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you best describe your level of frustration with being a music teacher?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your Sense of Musical Fulfillment:

Rate the degree to which you agree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Totally Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Mostly agree</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My students are capable of high quality performances.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My music program's quality is as high as other area programs.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy making music with my students.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to remain active as a musician outside of school.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your Educational Philosophy:

Identify the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Musically is inherent in each individual.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through teaching music I make a positive impact on the lives of my students.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cultural backgrounds of my students play a part in my teaching.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music is necessary in the school because of its beneficial effects on the overall wellbeing of the child.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Labor Market Factors:

How satisfied are you with…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pay and benefits associated with the teaching profession?</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pay and benefits in this district compared with other districts or states?</td>
<td>Dissatisfied ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities to find a higher paying job outside of education?</td>
<td>Satisfied ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unions and teachers association (including MENC) work on behalf of music teachers?</td>
<td>Very Satisfied ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retention, Attrition, and Migration Plans:

1. What is the best description of your professional plans for next year? (check only one)

- Remain a music teacher at the same school ☐
- Remain a music teacher at a different school in the same district ☐
- Remain a music teacher in a different district ☐
- Quit being a music teacher temporarily for family, health, or personal reasons ☐
- Quit being a music teacher temporarily for educational or professional reasons ☐
- Quit being a music teacher to become an education administrator ☐
- Quit being a music teacher in a K-12 school to teach music in a non-public school setting ☐
- Take early retirement ☐
- Retire ☐
- Quit being a music teacher completely and permanently for reasons other than retirement ☐

2. What is the best description of your professional plans in the next five years? (check only one)

- Remain a music teacher at the same school ☐
- Remain a music teacher at a different school in the same district ☐
- Remain a music teacher in a different district ☐
- Quit being a music teacher temporarily for family, health, or personal reasons ☐
- Quit being a music teacher temporarily for educational or professional reasons ☐
- Quit being a music teacher to become an education administrator ☐
- Quit being a music teacher in a K-12 school to teach music in a non-public school setting ☐
- Take early retirement ☐
- Retire ☐
- Quit being a music teacher completely and permanently for reasons other than retirement ☐

3. If you are considering leaving this teaching assignment, are there incentives that may cause you to change your mind, and if so, what are they?

About you

1. Are you currently certified to teach music in public schools? ☐Yes ☐No

2. What is your gender ☐ Female ☐ Male

3. What is your race?

- ☐ American Indian
- ☐ Asian/Pacific Islander
- ☐ Black/African American
- ☐ Other
4. Which best describes your socio-economic status while growing up?
   - Poor
   - Lower Middle Class
   - Middle Class
   - Upper Middle Class
   - Well off

5. What is your highest music education degree? (check one)
   - Bachelors
   - Masters
   - Doctoral

6. Which best describes your original means of teacher certification? (check one)
   - Bachelors Degree
   - Masters Degree
   - Alternative Certification Program

7. How many years of experience do you have in the music education profession?

8. How many years (including this one) have you been teaching in urban schools?

9. What is the single aspect of your teaching position that brings you the most joy?

10. What is the single aspect of your teaching position that leads you to be most frustrated?
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Appendix C: Correspondence

Implied Consent Form Sent with Initial Mailing

Implied Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: Job Satisfaction of Experienced and Novice Music Teachers in High-Poverty Urban Schools

Principal Investigator: Robert Kenneth Docker- Ph.D. Candidate, A.B.D. in Music Education 940 Cricklewood Dr. #239 State College, PA. 16803 (814) 414-6034; rkd121@psu.edu

Advisor: Dr. Linda Thornton 232 Music Building I University Park, PA 16802 (814) 863-5723; lct12@psu.edu

1. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to investigate the influence of various job-related and personal characteristics on music teacher job satisfaction, which may lead to attrition or retention decisions of teachers in high-poverty urban public schools.

2. Procedures to be followed: You will be asked to answer 63 questions on a survey.

3. Duration: It will take approximately 10 minutes to complete the survey.

4. Statement of Confidentiality: Your participation in this research is confidential. The survey does not ask for information that directly identifies you as the respondent. No identifiable information will appear in the final report. In the event of any publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared that would allow it to be linked to your responses. The identities and responses of teachers who respond to this survey will not be shared with school administrators nor with central office personnel.

5. Right to Ask Questions: Please contact Robert Kenneth Docker at (814) 414-6034 with questions or concerns about this study.

6. Voluntary Participation: Your decision to be in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study.

Completion and return of the survey implies that you have read the information in this form and consent to take part in the research. Please keep this form for your records or future reference.
Dear Music Teaching Colleagues,

My name is Robert Docker, and I am a music teacher in Tyrone, PA, as well as being a doctoral candidate at Penn State University. I am now finishing up a Ph.D. in music education at Penn State and am in the process of writing my dissertation. The topic of my dissertation is "Job Satisfaction of Experienced and Novice Teachers in High-Poverty Urban Schools.” By some estimates, music teacher turnover in high-poverty urban schools is higher than other specialties, and in other teaching situations. I'm using a survey to look at new and experienced teachers’ opinions about their jobs, the schools they teach in, and their students. I want to know why some teachers LOVE their jobs and remain where they are for decades, while other teachers leave after much shorter times.

If you love your job, please take this survey and let me know what about your job makes you so happy. If you're frustrated and feel like venting then this is a place for that too. If you're somewhere between these two extremes then I need your opinions and thoughts as well. Whatever your experience level, from new teachers who started this year to thirty-year veterans thinking about retirement, I want to hear from you. Any thoughts or opinions about your job will be kept confidential, and your name and identity will not be revealed as part of this research project.

I've enclosed a copy of the survey along with a self-addressed stamped envelope for your convenience. If you would prefer to take the survey online, you can visit my website www.rkdocker.com where you will find a link to the survey and more information about this research project. Thank you for taking time out of your very busy schedule to help me with this project. Data collected will be used for research purposes only. You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this study.

Sincerely,
Robert Kenneth Docker
940 Cricklewood Dr.
Apt. 239
State College, PA. 16803
(814) 414-6034; rkd121@psu.edu
Email Recruitment Follow-up letter

Dear Participant (Names were inserted into individual emails)

You were recently invited to participate in a research project regarding job satisfaction of music teachers in high-poverty urban schools. This survey is part of my dissertation project being conducted at Penn State University. You may have gotten an envelope containing a survey and a more recent email regarding the research project: Job Satisfaction of Experienced and Novice Music Teachers in High-Poverty Urban Schools. The survey asks for your opinions regarding your music teaching position, your school and your students.

If you have lost or misplaced the original form, please take the survey online. Visit my website: www.rkdocker.com to learn more about me and about the project and to be directed to the online survey. You may also contact me directly at rkd121@psu.edu

If you love your job, please take this survey and let me know what about your job makes you so happy. If you're frustrated and feel like venting then this is a place for that too. If you're somewhere between these two extremes then I need your opinions and thoughts as well. Whatever your experience level, from new teachers who started this year to thirty-year veterans thinking about retirement, I want to hear from you. Any thoughts or opinions about your job will be kept confidential, and your name and identity will not be revealed as part of this research project. You must be at least 18 years of age to participate in this study.

If you have already completed the survey, Thank You so much for your help. If you haven’t yet completed it or sent it back, please consider doing so. Your input is valuable to this project, and to the music teaching profession as a whole in helping to build more understanding about the reasons why music teachers stay in, or leave their jobs.

Thank you so much for taking the time to read this email and to take the survey.

Sincerely,
Robert Kenneth Docker
Second Email Recruitment Follow-up Letter

Dear Participant (Names were inserted into individual emails)

You were recently invited to participate in a research project regarding job satisfaction of music teachers in high-poverty urban schools. This survey is part of my dissertation project being conducted at Penn State University. You may have gotten an envelope containing a survey and a more recent email regarding the research project: Job Satisfaction of Experienced and Novice Music Teachers in High-Poverty Urban Schools. The survey asks for your opinions regarding your music teaching position, your school and your students.

If you have been putting off taking the survey or have misplaced the original hard copy, then this is the last opportunity to have your voice heard on this important matter. Please visit my website: www.rkdocker.com to learn more about me and about this research project and to be directed to the online survey. If you have any questions or concerns, you may also contact me directly at rkd121@psu.edu

If you love your job, please take this survey and let me know what about your job makes you so happy. If you're frustrated and feel like venting then this is a place for that too. If you're somewhere between these two extremes then I need your opinions and thoughts as well. Whatever your experience level, from new teachers who started this year to thirty-year veterans thinking about retirement, I want to hear from you. Any thoughts or opinions about your job will be kept confidential, and your name and identity will not be revealed as part of this research project. You must be at least 18 years of age to participate in this study.

If you have already completed the survey, then I thank you for your help.

Thank you so much for taking the time to read this email and to take the survey.

Sincerely,
Robert Kenneth Docker
Appendix D: Open-Ended Questionnaire Responses

[prompt] If you are considering leaving this teaching assignment, are there incentives that may cause you to change your mind, and if so, what are they?

"I would leave this position only if I found a full-time conducting position that had a fulfilling work ethic" (12L- has doctoral music ed degree.)

"I have been at this school for 5 years and built the music program from scratch after a 20 year absence of music at this school. In just 4 years of competing my band has won the city championship twice and placed 2nd twice in division 1 as well as being runner-up in the State Finals. My Orchestra has been undefeated since they began competing 3 years ago and has received excellent and superior ratings at festival. So why is the district deciding to lay me off? There are programs that perform less than 1/4 of what we do? I really hope something happens before the summer but it is now June and I still have not heard if I will stay here. I really hope I do. If you would like to contact me please feel free to do so, I would love to be of help." (11L-)

"If there were an opportunity for me to become a mentor teacher specifically to music educators, I might consider working at least 10 years from now." (8A- 15 yr. experienced urban teacher with Masters)

"Safer school, better resources, more parent/community, better compensation package" (17P)

"More administrative support and more money." (11D)

"I am not considering leaving before retirement" (6A- 30 year experienced urban teacher)
"The next five years depends on what happens here with administration. We will have some major changes happening for the better next year, so I am hoping this will improve administrative support for my program." (20CO 2nd year teacher)

“Currently I am assigned to 4 schools and I see my students once per week for 30 minutes. If given the opportunity to leave, I would stay if I need to see my students at least 2 times per week for 45 minutes” (7AO- 15 year experienced urban teacher)

“More comparable pay to suburban settings” (18CO)

“Get rid of unqualified administration and raise music education to an important subject rather than just place students so the classroom teacher can have a planning period. And oh, most important- respect from the administrators to treat our music programs as a core class and give us the time to teach it.” (10DO)

“Yeah! Job Security.” (11PO)

“Pay that is equal to the surrounding school districts, and/or better support and parent involvement of performing arts education from the community” (9DO- Novice UT)

“I want to leave this profession ONLY because of where I am. I can’t get interviewed out of the city because I have a Masters degree and experience. So my only option is a new career. This year at this school has Killed the passion for music and for my passing of knowledge on to the younger generation and it has nothing to do with the students.” (16CO- 11 year experienced urban teacher - low scores on admin support, room quality and supplies)

“More money or less schools & better facilities and more support from teachers & parents” (9P- retiring as an experienced urban teacher with 39 years. Itinerant orchestra teacher)
“Improvement in handling behavior in our school, and less focus on teaching to/taking tests” (7P- 9 year experienced urban teacher, planning to leave)

“Job Security” (8L- 7 year experienced urban teacher, leaving)

“to be re-hired at the same school (laid off)” 7 year experienced urban teacher- leaving music education. (4L)

“Job stability. 40% of secondary music teachers will be laid off next year. Our district seems to have a plan to eliminate the arts electives.” (3L- leaving after 15 years as an experienced urban teacher)

“Getting away from district requirements which impede my teaching, such as testing” (7D)

“Pay for performance” (6D)

“Smaller class loads, fewer duties (playground…) more class meetings per week” (19 year experienced urban teacher, planning to move- 5D)

“No, there are no incentives to stay and if there was, I wouldn’t take it. I’ve been a music educator for 40 years. It’s time for me to start a new journey” (40 year experienced urban teacher, retiring. 4A)

“Nope, I’m just ready to experience another city”- experienced urban teacher with high level of job satisfaction (8C)

“I have considered quitting, sometimes on a daily basis. I have worked in well funded suburban schools and now here. I think the general condition of schools and education is terrible and I don’t want to teach to the test. I don’t want to lose my job when I am a great teacher.” 3 years of experience in urban schools, 6 years total. Intended attrition in near future. (5C)
“Better pay, better facilities, teaching strings more.” (5 years in urban schools, job is split between strings and general music) intends to take early retirement (2D)

“Finances!” (2nd year teacher. Intended attrition) (3S)

“I am 71” (2P retiring with 47 years in urban schools)

“Job Stability” (3P)

“Higher salary, better assignments and class schedule” (shifter- wants to be an administrator) (1A)

“More pay, less stress employment should it become available” (1DO)

“Administrative support of my program may have persuaded me to wait longer to begin my masters degree” (2DO)
What is the single aspect of your teaching position that brings you the most joy?

"Sharing music with children" (25C)

"Paycheck" (24C)

"When a student is able to express themselves enough technically to find meaning in playing an instrument" (12L)

"Experiencing students' love of music" (9S)

"Making music every day with my students" (22C)

"When students return with their success stories" (9A-32 year experienced urban teacher)

"The looks on the students faces after a performance especially after their first performance ever. The look: 'Wow did I just do that?" (11L)

"When students are able to connect a facet of music education with other core subjects and exhibit joy at a newly found level of understanding and appreciation" (8A)

"Hearing improvement in my students." (23C)

"Students' excitement about music and their willingness to do what they can to make music" (19P)

"Student success" (18P)

"The ability to personally connect with students in a musical setting"

"Watching the students really WANT to be better" (11D)

"Working with children who have few opportunities in the arts." (15P-18 year experienced urban teacher with a high rating on Social Justice scale)

"When students make progress on their instrument" (16P)
"As I get to know more and more about many of my students and the challenges they face, I often develop a deep respect for them. The joy comes from seeing the positive effect that learning to play an instrument has on them." (12P- retiring with 40 years)

"Working with the students and seeing their progress and enjoyment of performing music"

"When the children whom I have taught come back to visit and discuss many remembrances of their musical experience in my class" (6A- 30 year experienced urban teacher)

"students expression of excitement when they achieve successful performances" (1M)

"The kids. Well, some of them :) They are down to earth, cool, kids to be around and it is a thrill to watch them grow!" (20CO)

"What brings the most joy to what I do is that I bring something to the kids they never had. Some continue in High school or college." (10LO)

" I enjoy watching the pride that my students have developed in their performances, and how much their dedication to the program has increased over the last two years." (14PO- 2nd year teacher)

“Having the opportunity to teach my students without having to worry about giving a performance” (7AO- elementary band teacher)

“Performance with my band and small ensembles” (19CO)

“Seeing my students be successful!” (8SO)

“Seeing my underprivileged students achieve a high level of knowledge and performance, and take great pride in their accomplishments.” (18CO)

“Students who actually appreciate and enjoy what is taught” (10DO)
“The students” (11PO)

“Making positive connections with students and seeing students grow as individuals with music in their lives” (9DO)

“Teaching students to play the piano” (9LO)

“When all students achieve success in playing an instrument, singing, or understanding and appreciating music” (7SO)

“Success in making beautiful music with the ensembles I direct” (17CO)

“Seeing the progression in the students especially when they see it too.” (16CO)

“My mission” (15CO- 40 year experienced urban teacher- high scores on Social justice-staying)

“Motivated students’ progress” (14CO)

“The students’ love for music” (5A)

“Relationships/community” (12CO)

“Having a student who ‘gets it’ and soars” (10P)

“The empowerment of the kids- feeling the energy and excitement of their performance” (6S)

“Sharing music with the students” (5S)

“Seeing students take pride in their own progress” (4S)

“When children respond with respect and enthusiasm” (9P)

“Performing” (8P)

“Making music with my students” (7P)

“Seeing students make connections between music they listen to and music new to them” (6P)
“performances” (5P)

“Getting to know students and helping them grow” (4P)

“Day to day classroom teaching” (8L)

“I like the kids, making music daily” (7L- 29 year experienced urban teacher)

“When the students and I are ‘floating’, ‘in the flow’” (6L)

“Working with inner city kids and watching them compete with the best of the best in just 3 years from beginning instruments to jazz band” (5L- 23 year experienced urban teacher- 15/16 in musical satisfaction)

“The personal/academic/professional successes of my current and former students” (3L)

“The love of music I see in my students” (2L)

“Interaction with students- watching them grow as musicians and individuals” (8D)

“The realization that I am making a difference- seeing children enjoy themselves and their music making” (7D)

“When a child’s self-esteem grows from confidence in music exposure, ensembles, or performance or composition”(6D)

“Seeing student growth” (5D)

“Seeing the growth of my students throughout the school year” (4D)

“Kids learning something new” (3D)

“Watching a dedicated student succeed” (11C)

“Students who want to learn & perform” (10C)

“Preparing students for the ‘ultimate’ (sic) personal experience in performing” (9C)

“Teaching my students the skills, then having them to perform the final product” (4A)

“Observing/hearing my students improve year after year” (8C)
“When students greet me”- (African American experienced urban teacher with 30+ years) (7C)

“Our concerts and paydays” experienced urban teacher w/30 years) (6C)

“ADVANCED ORCHESTRA! It is why I come back everyday.” (5C)

“Working with young talented musicians” (4C)

“Seeing children getting enjoyment out of music class” (3C)

“Performance” (2C)

“Getting to know students and helping them grow” (19/20 for social justice score)

“Rehearsing orchestra” (2D)

“When the kids have fun in class and don’t want to quit” (3S)

“Talking and teaching music with the kids” (2S)

“Students” (1C)

“When students like the music and play it well” (2P)

“Getting to know students well over many years” (3P)

“Good performance” (2A)

“Great performance of my students” (1A)

“Student success” (1S)

“Seeing students graduate and move forward in their lives” (1L)

“Performing with my students” (1D)

“Watching students receive college band scholarships” (1AO)

“I teach guitar club and love it. I teach choir and hate it. When there is a subject that the students are “into”, then it makes the job so much more satisfying.” (1DO)

“Connecting with the students” (2DO)
[prompt] What is the single aspect of your teaching position that leads you to be most frustrated?

"Preparation at home for class" (25C)

"Students think music class is a joke. They don't take it seriously" (24C)

"The complete lack of understanding, complete denial, and complete ignorance of career educators, administrators, parents and taxpayers to see or admit the high value of music education, beginning at the age of 3 and continuing into high school. This value is undeniable through anecdotal as well as research and quantifiable evidence. Why do we have to keep fighting for our programs when music is ubiquitous?" (12L)

"The needing to constantly be on top of the program" (9S)

"The poor quality of the space in which I teach" (22C)

"Not having enough time (presently 30 minutes per week per class)" (9A)

"Sorry I can't narrow it down; Uncertainty of administration, school district, and funding for the arts." (11L)

"Not being allotted a time in the schedule to develop a chorus or other music-based performance group, primarily due to my position being shared between two schools." (8A)

"Disinterest amongst students in a topic or subject." (23C)

"Not getting enough time to teach the students since I only see them once a week." (19P)

"The arts are always the first consideration when the district needs to trim its spending." (18P)

"A tie between the following: Students' apathy, administrators' apathy and fear of being laid off." (17P)
"The leash of Administrators and crabby parents." (11D)

"Recent increases of testing and focusing curriculum in a narrow way to increase test scores. Time and support for music has been diminished, making our jobs harder to do." (15P- 18 year experienced urban teacher)

"Lack of classroom resources." (16P)

"Very little administrative support and few resources to help motivate students" (12P)

"Necessity to advocate for the importance of music in the curriculum and fight to keep programs every few years. Math teachers do not have to do this!" (13P- 35 year experienced urban teacher)

"Not enough time with the children each week. We only have 40 minutes each week per class" (6A)

"The lack of acknowledging the importance of a music/performance program" (1M)

"Lack of parent support. Encouraging students to practice or attend their concerts. Parents in my community understand that the music is important, but do not know how to encourage them. The same is with their homework." (10L)

"I am frustrated that other faculty members are not as flexible and easy to work with as they could possibly be. I feel like because the don't necessarily understand what it takes to put together a concert or a musical performance, that they have no idea the breath of work and details that goes into the planning and preparation process." (14PO)

“Not being able to see my students, and having to teach on stage while p.e. classes are being held in the gym” (7AO)

“Funding and budget issues” (19CO)

“Lack of support and understanding from administration and faculty” (8SO)
“Apathetic students” (18CO)

“Administration and the politics they create” (10DO)

“The students, administration, teachers and parents sometimes” (11PO)

“No instrumental feeder program in the articulation area and open enrollment lead to very few students coming into the school. The typical suburban band program paradigm for concert band centered instrumental program doesn’t work in urban schools. Transient population. Overall lack of community and administrative support. Sorry. Couldn’t pick just one.” (9DO- planning to leave urban schools for a position in another district)

“Chaos or lack of a cohesive school-wide discipline program that is consistently followed” (9LO- department head, 12 year experienced urban teacher, 25 years total)

“The occasional challenging student” (7SO)

“When students don’t take me or the music class seriously” (17CO- novice teacher 2 years)

“Administration and Lack of Anything to use to teach. This year I literally have NOTHING as far as materials and instruments. My classes lined up folding tables in the front of the Auditorium and knocked with our hands out rudiments on copies from a drum book that I have. We couldn’t even get sticks!” (16CO- High school band director-11 year experienced urban teacher)

“me” (15C)

“Student Apathy” (14C)

“Not enough time each week” (5A)

“Lack of parental support/social promotion” (12C)

“Kids not practicing and teaching lesson one over and over and over…” (10P)
“Red tape from district- Terrible administrative support. No district funding for music purchases. Professional development. Lack of collaboration within my music department” (6S)

“Too large of a student load, and lack of materials” (5S)

“The administrative support (or lack thereof), especially in scheduling field trips, assemblies, testing etc.” (4S- first year teacher)

“Too many students at one time” (9P)

“The idea that students can be taken out of music for tests, etc., because it’s not an ‘academic’ subject. I also am certified in mathematics (dual degrees) and notice a very different attitude towards the subjects. I doubt I would feel as secure if I only teach music [sic].” (8P)

“Testing driven schools/districts” (7P)

“Lack of parent involvement & how unaware people are of all the legwork that is invisible it takes to put a diverse dynamic program together” (6P- 2 years exp.)

“band rehearsals” (5P- elementary band teacher)

“Not being treated as a professional music teacher. I am often covering classes, teaching math and reading and shuffled around. In this district specialists are considered ‘prep teachers’.”(4P- first year elementary school teacher)

“School district/Union politics/Budget cuts” (8L- leaving LA, teaches in a School of the arts)

“Inability to build a large program- some kids don’t return. Getting kids to do a minimal amount of outside school practice” (7L- 29 year experienced urban teacher)
“administrative disrespect [sic] and lack of communication, including valuing of test scores. (not at my 2 day/week school though ;-)” (6L- itinerant teacher, fears Reductions in Force (RIF) in LA School district)

“The bad reputation unions are giving teachers. Why can’t we act like professionals and compete on our record.” (5L)

“Watching teachers with many years of experience and track records of successful programs being laid off!” (3L)

“Politically motivated bureaucracy that takes so much time and money away from my students” (2L)

“Admin!” [sic] (8D)

“Lack of student motivation due to external factors such as standardized testing, poverty, and other urban school factors” (7D)

“When students are pulled from my class for other things (behavior, homework, detention, testing etc.)” (6D)

“The academic hierarchy, in which reading & math get class time, financial support, etc., while music is barely noticed” (5D- planning to move)

“Level of talent” (4D)- planning to move

“Music is not looked at as an academic subject- we are left out of academic conversations” (3D- planning to leave music teaching)

“Student apathy” (11C)

“The Chicago Board of Education” (10C)

“Apathetic disruptive audiences” (9C)

“Discipline is horrible and there is no (sic) administrator support” (4A) retiring
“Lack of consistent policies (Administration)” (8C)
“Undisciplined student behavior” (7C)
“Lack of resources from the district, lack of resources from the state, the ignorance of politicians, the rise of the charter school, the stupidity of the ‘reform movement’. The lack of responsibility of the state in supporting its public servants and keeping its promises, and the media blaming teachers and unions for societies ills” (6C) (taking early retirement)
“Complete lack of respect from students and complete lack of discipline and carrying out of consequences by security, administrators and other teachers” (5C) (IA)
“$ for supplies” (4C)
“Lack of job stability. I wouldn’t trade anything for the ultimate satisfaction of working in an urban school” (3C)
“General music discipline problems” (mismatch example- teaching general music, ideal position would be orchestra) (2C)
“Not being treated like a professional music teacher. I am often covering classes, teaching math and reading and shuffling around. In this district specialists are considered ‘prep teachers’” (4P)
“Pressures to prove myself as a teacher coming from the district (constant evaluations/new procedures/data)” (2D)
“Inexperience, budget restraints” (3S)
“They are cutting my hours next year to a part time job because music isn’t valued at this school anymore. I’d quit but the kids need me to continue at this High School” (2S)
“Lack of motivation” (1C)
“When you are forced to have students perform early in the AM or right after a vacation.”

(2P)

“1. Seeing a promising student become a teenager and quit music/practicing, and that seems to be ok with the student, their parents/families. It frustrates me when no one is willing to join me in challenging a student to improve.

2. In Philadelphia, upper and lower administration is constantly changing. It’s hard to stay consistent and focused on the environment, much less challenge myself and my students to constantly improve” (3P)

“Time and bureaucracy” (2A)

“Scheduling, itinerant schedule mainly” (at 2 schools) (1A)

“meetings and professional development that have nothing to do with music” (1S)

“Lack of effort by students” (1L)

“Administrative interference” (1D)

“No money for instruments and instrument repair” (1AO)

“Poor behavior and lack of engagement” (1DO)

“Lack of support from administration and the school community” (2DO)
Appendix E: Correlation Matrix

Variable List

1. Satisfaction
2. Percentage of White students
3. Percentage of African American Students
4. Percentage of students receiving free or reduced price lunch
5. Opinion or perception of facilities
6. Opinion or perception of students
7. Opinion or perception of support
8. Opinion or perception of support specifically from administrators
9. Opinion or perception of support specifically from the community
10. Opinion or perception of support specifically from non-music faculty colleagues
11. Opinion or perception of the music teaching profession
12. Opinion or perception of musical fulfillment
13. Rated agreement with tenets of the philosophy of social justice
14. number of years teaching
15. number of years teaching in urban schools
16. Teacher’s stated socio-economic status while growing up
17. Teacher’s highest attained music degree

Note- all listed values are Pearson Product Moment Correlations.

* indicates significant correlations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.435*</td>
<td>.469*</td>
<td>.465*</td>
<td>.463*</td>
<td>.480*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>-.261*</td>
<td>-.520*</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.261*</td>
<td>.293*</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.520*</td>
<td>.293*</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.384*</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.435*</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.329*</td>
<td>.561*</td>
<td>.553*</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.469*</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.384*</td>
<td>.329*</td>
<td>.559*</td>
<td>.414*</td>
<td>.644*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.465*</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>.561*</td>
<td>.559*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.819*</td>
<td>.807*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.463*</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.553*</td>
<td>.414*</td>
<td>.819*</td>
<td>.468*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.480*</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>-.319*</td>
<td>.348*</td>
<td>.644*</td>
<td>.807*</td>
<td>.468*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.464*</td>
<td>.303*</td>
<td>.816*</td>
<td>.511*</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.521*</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.481*</td>
<td>.333*</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.487*</td>
<td>.397*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.320*</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.438*</td>
<td>.283*</td>
<td>.246*</td>
<td>.329*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.283*</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.435*</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.287*</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.420*</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.227*</td>
<td>.247*</td>
<td>.215*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>-.136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.521*</td>
<td>0.320*</td>
<td>0.283*</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.110</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.464*</td>
<td>0.481*</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.435*</td>
<td>0.420*</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.303*</td>
<td>0.333*</td>
<td>0.438*</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.816*</td>
<td>0.504*</td>
<td>0.283*</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.287*</td>
<td>0.227*</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.511*</td>
<td>0.487*</td>
<td>0.246*</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.271*</td>
<td>0.247*</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.504*</td>
<td>0.397*</td>
<td>0.329*</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.215*</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
<td>-0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.343*</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.229*</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.343*</td>
<td>0.330*</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.255*</td>
<td>0.219*</td>
<td>0.241*</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.255*</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.219*</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.862*</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>0.279*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.240*</td>
<td>0.241*</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.279*</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Dr. Docker is active as a performer, presently playing cello with the Arkansas Philharmonic Orchestra. He previously served as principal cellist of the Altoona (Pennsylvania) Symphony and as a cellist with the Lynchburg (Virgina) Symphony Orchestra and numerous theatre companies. He grew up in Dunnville, Ontario and Ossining, New York where he studied cello with a member of the Metropolitan Opera orchestra. He also enjoys playing Cape Breton style fiddle music and various folk styles on the guitar. In his spare time he spends entirely too much time whittling.