Job Attributes as Predictors of Attrition and Migration in Oregon Music Teachers: A Linear Regression Analysis

by

Olivia Salzman

A dissertation accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in Music Education

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Beth Wheeler, Chair

Dr. Jason Silveira, Core Member

Dr. Melissa Brunkan, Core Member

Dr. Lisa Mazzei, Institutional Representative

University of Oregon

Spring 2024

DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

Olivia Salzman

Doctor of Philosophy in Music Education

Title: Job Attributes as Predictors of Attrition and Migration in Oregon Music Teachers: A Linear Regression Analysis

Currently, career movement in the field of teaching, both for migration and attrition reasons, is a national concern for stakeholders, teachers, and researchers alike. Teacher demographics, job attributes, and expectations for working conditions seem to affect attritional intentions amongst teachers, but there is a need in the field for research that considers music teachers specifically. The purpose of this study was to pinpoint possible predictors of attrition/migration in Oregon music teachers based on their current job attributes and demographic factors. An anonymous online survey emailed directly to music teachers or their principals, was used to collect this data.

Analysis included compiling descriptive statistics to determine the demographic makeup of Oregon music teachers and their typical job attributes. Then, a linear regression analysis was conducted to compare these factors and intentions to remain in the profession. Results reflected elevated burnout levels in all areas for Oregon music teachers. No job attributes were predictors of migration or attrition, but two burnout factors (the ability to manage the amount of work given and find time for leisure activity) were significant predictors of retention. Age was the only demographic factor that predicted retention with an increase in age predicting a modest increase in attrition intentions. Oregon music teachers were on average, middle-aged, white, and had career lengths of approximately 13 years and average school tenures of seven years. Most

participants were elementary music teachers and very few were part-time or itinerate. The participant sample in this study did not report high rates of dissatisfaction with pay or with their work conditions/job attributes. These results have the potential to inform conversations about retention initiatives for Oregon music teachers, give a clear profile of a typical Oregon music teacher's demographics, and report on typical burnout and career satisfaction rates for Oregon music teachers.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Olivia Salzman

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene Oregon
University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison Wisconsin
University of Oregon, Eugene Oregon
Lane Community College, Eugene Oregon

DEGREES AWARDED:

Doctor of Philosophy, Music Education, 2024, University of Oregon
Master of Music, Music Education, 2018, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Bachelor of Music, Music Education, 2016, University of Oregon
Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer degree, Music, 2013, Lane Community College

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Graduate Employee, University of Oregon, 2021-present

PreK–8 Grade Music Teacher, Ashbrook Independent School, 2019-202

K–12 General Music, Band, and Choir Teacher, Reedsport School District, 2018-2019

Graduate Teaching Assistant, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2016-2018

GRANTS, AWARDS, AND HONORS:

Virginia Whitfield Memorial Scholarship, University of Oregon, 2023/2024

Tutt Family Scholarship, University of Oregon, 2022/2023

Virginia Whitfield Memorial Scholarship, University of Oregon, 2021/2022

Graduate Employee, University of Oregon, 2021-2024

Jordan Cove Community Grant, 2019

Graduate Teaching Assistantship, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2016-2018

Ruth Close Musical Fellowship, University of Oregon, 2015/2016

Gladys Stone Wright/John Stehn Scholarship, University of Oregon, 2015/2016

Virginia Whitfield Memorial Scholarship, University of Oregon, 2015/2016

Laurel Tuition Remission Scholarship, University of Oregon, 2015/2016

PUBLICATIONS:

"Rethinking the First Year: What Teaching Elementary General Music Taught Me About Beginning Band," Oregon Music Educator, Spring 2023, cover article.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Beth Wheeler for her guidance throughout the process of writing this dissertation and learning to critically think like a researcher. I appreciate your endless patience, compassion, kindness, and every whiteboard session we've shared. I would also like to thank the other members of my dissertation committee. To Melissa Brunkan, Jason Silveira, and Lisa Mazzei, thank you for your help.

To Kendra Taylor, thank you for your friendship and your openness. You have helped me grow in countless ways and I appreciate every helping hand you've given me. I would also like to thank my colleagues Joe Rondeau, Cody Kiesling, Grace Kuo, Casson Scowcroft, G Choi, Michelle Sulaiman, Mallory Wood, Tracy Zehner, and Cam Siegal for your collaboration and friendship over the years. My days are a bit brighter and work a bit lighter because of you. To Russel Sweet, Michael Buckman, Nick Graham, and Bryan Fike thank you for the creativity, music-making, and friendship we've shared. Thank you to my past teachers who have helped me grow as a musician and person. Idit Shner, Jesse Cloninger, Doug Doerfert, Hisao Watanabe, Seth Mulvihill, Julia McCallum, Scott Teeple, Darin Olson, Teryl Dobbs, and Thea Lee; I appreciate the energy and encouragement you've given me over the years and all the ways you have demonstrated what it means to be an invested, authentic teacher.

I would like to thank my village of family and friends who have patiently supported me through many long days and hectic schedules. Jennifer Salzman, Andreas Salzman, Madeline Salzman-McIntire, Ross McIntire, Nolan Hoggard, Calvin Hoggard, Meg Hintze, Kris Gilmore, Justin Lindgren, Cole Hairston, Leah Rinde, Matt Norton, Erin Cline, Tysen York, Astro Cline, Kenneth Cline, Tanner Cline, Tori Radke, Kristina Wilhelm, Peter Wilhelm, Sue Coon, Sarah Coon, Becky Coon, Josh Swearingen, Riley Haney, Jonas Swearingen, and Jed Swearingen; you

will never know how much your kind words have meant these past three years. To Matthew Boatman, thank you for being a best friend and role model. You've often made me rethink, reconsider, and remember to slow down for moments of joy.

To my Ashbrook family, Rachel Sechler, Erik Olson, Kayla Jara-Webber, Melissa Capps, Amanda Kelley, Kimberley Gifford Olbrich, Lexi Elliot, Kristina Wonderly, and Julie Buchert; thank you for your inspiring teaching and warm friendship. To Jerry Uhling, the entire Reedsport School district staff, and my UW-Madison friends and students, thank you for helping me find my teacher voice.

Finally, to Joshua Coon and Amelia Salzman-Hoggard; you two have given me more grace and love than I can express. This entire chapter of my life would not have been possible without you. From the bottom of my heart, thank you.

DEDICATION

For Joshua. Thank you for every late-night dog walking session, pep talk, and rescheduled doctor's appointment. Thank you for washing recorders, sorting sheet music, and making sure I always had dinner in the fridge. I will always be thankful for the love you share with me, but I will never understand how I got lucky enough to be your friend. We did it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter……. Page

Abstract……iii

Curriculum Vitae ……...…v

Acknowledgments……vii

Dedication……ix

I. Introduction……1

II. 19th Century Education and Music Education……..2

III. 20th Century Education and Music Education……10

IV. 21st Century Education and Music Education……21

V. 21st Century Recruitment, Mobility, and Career Attributes……30

Early Career Concerns of Music Teachers…… 32

Movers, Stayers, and Leavers…… 33

Dismissal for Poor Performance…… …35

VI. 21st Century Job Attributes of Teachers and Music Teachers……36

Purpose……...40

VII. Methods……40

Participants……40

Materials……..…42

Procedure……43

VIII. Results……45

Descriptive Analysis……...45

Regression Analysis……...48

Limitations……59

Discussion……...61

Implications/Future Research…… …69

REFERENCES……73

APPENDICES……..85

A. INFORMED CONSENT MATERIALS……...85

B. TEACHER RECRUITMENT LETTER……88

C. ADMINISTRATOR RECRUITMENT LETTER……..…88

D. QUESTIONNAIRE…….. 89

E. TEACHER FOLLOW-UP SURVEY EXCERPT……100

F. OLDENBURG BURNOUT INVENTORY……102

G. TABLE 1 (MODEL SUMMARY OF MIGRATION/DEMOGRAPHICS) …..103

H. TABLE 2 (MODEL SUMMARY OF ATTRITION/DEMOGRAPHICS) …....104

I. TABLE 3 (COEFFICIENT TABLE OF ATTRITION/DEMOGRAPHICS)…...105

J. TABLE 4 (MODEL SUMMARY OF MIGRATION/JOB ATTRIBUTES)……107

K. TABLE 5 (MODEL SUMMARY OF ATTRITION/JOB ATTRIBUTES)……108

L. TABLE 6 (MODEL SUMMARY OF MIGRATION/TFS ITEMS)……...…109

M. TABLE 7 (COEFFICIENT TABLE OF MIGRATION/TFS ITEMS)……110

N. TABLE 8 (MODEL SUMMARY OF ATTRITION/TFS ITEMS)…….111

O. TABLE 9 (COEFFICIENT TABLE OF ATTRITION/TFS ITEMS)……..112

P. TABLE 10 (MODEL SUMMARY OF MIGRATION/OLBI ITEMS) ……113

Q. TABLE 11 (COEFFICIENT TABLE OF MIGRATION/OLBI ITEMS) ……114

R. TABLE 12 (MODEL SUMMARY OF ATTRITION/OLBI ITEMS) ……...115

S. TABLE 13 (COEFFICIENT TABLE OF ATTRITION/OLBI ITEMS) ……116

T. TABLE 14 (FREQUENCY TABLE OF RETENEITON/MIGRATION) ……....117

U. TABLE 15 (FREQUENCY TABLE PARTICIPANT JOB ATTRIBUTES) ……118

V. TABLE 16 (FREQUENCY TABLE OF PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS)…120

W. TABLE 17 (SELECTED MEAN DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES) ……...122

X. TABLE 18 (FREQUENCY TABLE OF OLBI ITEMS) ……123

Y. TABLE 19 (MEAN OLBI SCORES) ……....124

Z. TABLE 20 (FREQUENCY TABLE OF TFS ITEMS) ……...…125

AA. RAW DATA (JOB ATTRIBUTES) ……128

BB. RAW DATA (TFS FIRST HALF) ……....142

CC. RAW DATA (TFS SECOND HALF/CONF. ATTENDANCE/FACTORS)...…157

DD. RAW DATA (OLBI FIRST HALF) ……....172

EE. RAW DATA (OLBI SECOND HALF) ……....187

FF. RAW DATA (PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS) ……202

GG. RAW DATA (PARTICIPANT COMMENTS) ……...217

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Linear Regression Analysis of Migration and Participant Demographics…….49/103
2. Linear Regression Analysis of Attrition and Participant Demographics……...50/104
3. Direction/Magnitude of Sig. Attrition and Participant Demographic Variables…50/105
4. Linear Regression Analysis of Migration and Job Attributes……51/107
5. Linear Regression Analysis of Attrition and Job Attributes……..52/108
6. Linear Regression Analysis of Migration and OLBI Items……53/109
7. Direction/Magnitude of Sig. Migration and OLBI Variables……54/110
8. Linear Regression Analysis of Attrition and OLBI Items……55/111
9. Direction/Magnitude of Sig Attrition and OLBI Variables……55-56/112
10. Linear Regression Analysis of Migration and TFS Items……56/113
11. Direction/Magnitude of Sig. Migration and TFS Variables……57/114
12. Linear Regression Analysis of Attrition and TFS Items…….58/115
13. Direction/Magnitude of Sig. Attrition and TFS Variables……..59/116
14. Frequency Table of Attrition/Migration Intentions…….61/117
15. Frequency Table of Job Attributes……..118
16. Frequency Table of Participant Demographics……...…120
17. Selected Mean Demographic Variables……..122
18. Frequency Table of OLBI items……...……..123
19. Mean Sample Scores on OLBI Items ……..……..124
20. Frequency Table of TFS items……...125

Introduction

Media coverage in recent years has warned of an attritional crisis amongst teachers on a national level (Goldhaber & Theobald, 2022). Similarly, researchers have found that teacher attrition is outpacing the retirement rate, pointing to an impending shortage of qualified teachers (Garcia et al., 2009; Guarino, et al., 2006; Ingersoll, 2001). These proclamations of impending trouble accompany a series of challenges teachers have faced in recent years. Teachers tend to want more autonomy over course content, have lower salaries than other jobs requiring similar qualifications, and report lower respect for the profession (Griffin, 1997; Holloway & Brass, 2018; Sparks et al., 2015; Weishart, 2022). There has also been an increase in federal oversight of education during the age of high-stakes testing and accountability (Steeves et al., 2009; Weishart, 2022). At the same time, an increased politicization of the profession began at the turn of the twentieth century, increasing over time with unprecedented political attacks occurring during the COVID-19 pandemic (Weishart, 2022).

In addition to these challenges, the field of music teaching lacks diversity when compared to other teaching specialties (Shaw & Auletto, 2022). This contributes to the unique attritional risks of teaching music when considering the inclination of teachers to pursue jobs that match their own schooling experience (Reininger, 2012). For Oregon music teachers, the history of racial exclusion in the state housing and educational systems makes Oregon teachers and residents some of the least diverse in the nation (Wang et al., 2019). This historical context means that focusing on Oregon music teachers could offer insight into the effect increasing student diversity may have on a teaching force that is not maintaining a similar diversity increase.

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between teacher demographics, job attributes, and attritional intention among Oregon music teachers. First, a review of the literature will explore the historical underpinnings of job attributes for music teachers and the history of race and ethnicity on teacher retention. This overview of historic influences will allow the reader to trace the many factors affecting teachers through the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first centuries, better illuminating the web of influences affecting the profession.

A questionnaire was sent to Oregon music teachers asking them to report on their current working conditions. These conditions included their job attributes, demographic information, self-reported burnout rates, satisfaction rates with job attributes, and their intention to leave the field or change teaching positions. These data were analyzed using a linear regression model to look for predictors of attrition and migration in Oregon music teachers. All responses were also descriptively analyzed to look for patterns of demographic factors, burnout rates, and satisfaction rates among participants. These results have the potential to inform conversations about retention initiatives for Oregon music teachers, give a clear profile of a typical Oregon music teacher's demographics, and report on typical burnout and career satisfaction rates for Oregon music teachers.

19th Century Education and Music Education

Education as we think of it today, including compulsory attendance at the K–12 level, public funding, and a focus on preparing students for the demands of society, started developing in earnest during the nineteenth century. This period saw societal and educational events that shifted the trajectory of schooling in the US, including the Civil War, the industrialization of the US, the development of the common school model, and the increasing standardization of teacher training. During the nineteenth century, local and state-level authorities were primarily in charge

of developing and overseeing schools. This expansion was because the Constitution did not specify whether the federal government oversaw education, making it the domain of the states instead. A rift developed between schooling styles in the Northern states and Southern states, which were fairly dissimilar culturally throughout the Antebellum and Civil War era of the nation, encompassing most of the nineteenth century.

In northern states, the format of schooling was the common school model which focused on the education of students up to what we would now call the eighth-grade level (Griffin, 1997; Mark, 2008; Mark & Gary, 2007). Common schools were concentrated on maximizing the impact of education through a focus on the improvement of students' minds, bodies, and sense of morality, essentially ensuring that teaching was working toward Horace Mann's ideal of "achieving human perfection" (Mark, 2008; Mark & Gary, 2007, p. 118). In the southern states education was a luxury for rich, white children funded through private study or supported through plantation owners' philanthropy, not necessarily publicly funded common schools like in the north (Mark, 2008).

After the Civil War, education reformers advocated for a standardized system of educating students both to unify the country and to promote upward social mobility for students. Even though there was no unified achievement or teaching standard at the national level, reformers and educators across the nation would run schools similarly by the end of the nineteenth century, due to years of professional conferences, American diaspora, and method books circulating the country (Mark & Gary, 2007). Music education would be similarly unified by the end of the century after establishing its roots in a regionally specific manner during the early years of the nation.

Some of the earliest examples of music education began in singing schools which were led by mostly male singing masters throughout northern and southern regions as early as the eighteenth century (Mark, 2008). These singing schools got their start in the northern colonies of the New England area, but they spread through to southern colonies as well where even poor community members could gather and sing (Mark & Gary, 2007). It was perhaps the accessibility of singing schools that led to their downfall. Community members stopped attending them, in part because they began to be seen as uncouth and for the lower class by the nineteenth century (Mark, 2008; Mark & Gary, 2007). It is also possible that the inclusion of music in common schools played a role in the downfall of singing schools since people were learning to sing in during their public school education without needing to attend community-based singing schools.

Singing schools' aim was to improve the quality of singing in church and community events. Students and community members were learning hymns and folk tunes primarily by ear before singing schools began, leading to large discrepancies in tunes across the ever-growing country (Mark, 2008). After the quality of singing began to improve in the nation, attendance started to suffer during the nineteenth century. The focus on teaching singing did not, however. Most common schools were offering music education to students, but only in the form of singing and music literacy lessons. These lessons were justified for a wide range of reasons, but with a particular focus on individual and societal improvement through learning, much like education in general at the time.

Lowell Mason, an influential music educator of the nineteenth century, asserted that hands-on learning of music and building a discriminating ear in students would allow students to improve their voice in all ways (Mason, 1834/2013). Mason promoted pursuing music of high

quality to serve this goal, influencing many other educators and schools to do the same. Horace Mann, educational reformer and leader, wrote in his 1844 report to the Massachusetts State School board that music in schools was essential for physical, spiritual, and intellectual reasons (Mann, 1844/2013). Many educational advocates of the nineteenth century, including John Dewey in his 1897 *Aesthetic Elements in Elementary Education* lobbied for improving intellectual and moral character through meaningful, quality performances, and supporting social cohesion in communities and families (Mark, 2013b).

To keep up with the growing demands of schools, teachers were trained for the classroom primarily at Normal Schools (Mark & Gary, 2008). These schools were classrooms with students and teacher candidates, where veteran and/or highly trained teachers would observe their teaching, give feedback, or model teaching techniques. These schools were highly efficient and offered a place for students to access public education and preservice teachers to be trained, all in the same facility. The curriculum taught at both normal schools and subsequently common schools included vocal music as early as 1882, though music classes were still supervised by a highly qualified expert (Almack, 1920). General classroom teachers would teach singing and musical literacy using method books to guide their teaching and assessing of music. Intermittently, music supervisors would attend these classes to check progress and help assign new lessons and activities based on the progress the students had made with their general classroom teacher.

Increasing quality expectations for teachers and schooling led to more supervision by administration. A more nuanced system of structuring within leadership and performance reviews for teachers was established in an attempt to increase regulation. This type of bureaucracy and oversight may have influenced job factors for teachers, including the overt

focus on controlling teachers' personal lives and morality outside the classroom, the lower pay of the profession, and the overwhelming feminization of the field of teaching, particularly in elementary grades (Almack, 1920; Griffin, 1997; Mark, 2008; Mark & Gary, 2007; Tyack, 1967).

The more orderly the students were in their mannerisms and attitudes, the more administrators saw the teachers as having command of the room and reviews would improve accordingly (Griffin, 1997; Tyack, 1967). Low pay for teaching was common, in part because of the local funding needed to run schools in these early times, but also in reaction to the primarily female teachers who were essentially a "captive workforce" reporting to primarily male administrators and supervisors, who saw more pay benefits in their more prestigious roles (Griffin, 1997, p. 7; Tyack 1967).

Women in education were expected to act as "motherly" and morally sound influences for their pupils (Griffin, 1997, p. 7). At the same time, the American public began the debate on defining the purpose of public education. Education was compulsory, though poorly enforced regionally in the US during the nineteenth century. Stakeholders who were required to send their students to school wanted teachers to fit their idea of a role model. In some cases, expectations for teachers in early American schools included upholding morality and acting as virtuous role models for students. These expectations were often established and upheld by men who were not teachers. Voting at this time was only allowed for white men, so female and minority teachers were unable to vote on educational measures in local elections. Similarly, administrative, and supervisory roles were also mostly held by men, meaning that school rules and expectations were often not created by the mostly female teaching force. Some men chose to teach during this era, but most men choosing to teach were high school teachers.

In the era of common schools, high schools were not public at first, but rather private schools for those students who chose to continue their studies (Mark, 2008; Mark & Gary, 2007). As such an exclusive institution, high schools attracted teachers who were not necessarily female or trained at Normal Schools, but rather college and conservatory-trained specialists, bringing an increase in prestige to the job (Mark, 2008; Mark & Gary, 2007). Eventually, high schools transitioned to public institutions as states and cities grew larger, the nation industrialized, and education was increasingly seen as a path to a better occupation (Almack, 1920; Mark, 2008).

In music, teachers who were trained beyond Normal School music courses and attended conservatory had three options; teach as a specialist at the high school level, teach music techniques at a Normal School, or become a music supervisor (Mark, 2008). Today, the role of a district music supervisor is not as commonplace outside of larger districts and does not necessarily hold alternative educational requirements compared to classroom teachers. Normal Schools were eventually dissolved shortly after the turn of the twentieth century. Normal Schools were replaced with university-based education programs. This was due to more standardization in the licensure process, the increasingly complex courses offered to public-school students, and the establishment of the US Department of Education in 1867, which started overseeing the quality of teaching and teacher-preparation (Mark, 2008; Mark & Gary, 2007).

As teacher training transitioned from the two-option system of normal schools and college programs to accredited college programs in the 1920s, men saw more opportunities for access to these programs or teaching jobs at the secondary level (Mark, 2007). An increase in the popularity of instrumental music coincided with military band members returning home after World War I. This influx of musicians was one factor that contributed to an increase in male music teachers at the secondary level in public schools. Another factor was the passage of the GI

Bill which allowed men to return home and attend college free of charge after serving in the military. This bill helped more men study at the college level to become secondary teachers, a requirement of high school teachers at the time (Mark, 2008). Considering the implementation of the draft during World War II and the continued higher pay and respect for high school teachers and school administrators, men continued entering the field of education in these positions and with higher pay than female teachers (Griffin, 1997; Mark & Gary, 2008). The evolution of public education in Oregon faced a slightly more complex origin than in northern and southern states, considering the relatively late colonization of the West.

The state of Oregon was established in 1859, but before its recognition as a state, the area was a US territory in the nineteenth century. Recalling back to the northern and southern educational debate, this territory was established well after the rift in educational values between regions was established. Most settlers coming to Oregon, or the Oregon territory were from the Midwest, not New England or the Deep South, and had very little income, education, or musical education (Howard, 1923). The move to Oregon offered these pioneers the chance to raise their fortunes by moving to the West, where there were land claims and farming opportunities.

Predating the establishment of Oregon as a US territory in 1848 were fur traders who lived and worked in the Pacific Northwest. One of the most successful fur trade companies, the Hudson Bay Company, employed one of the region's first teachers, John Ball to work with children of company employees in 1832 (Down, 1933). Ball later moved from this Fort Vancouver-based job to the Willamette Valley, where he was one of the first public teachers, working with missionaries to indoctrinate abducted native children (Down, 1933). Most early public schools in Oregon were created in this vein, with settlers' children attending common schools after towns and counties were established (Down, 1933).

Oregon continued to grow educationally with the establishment of common schools and normal schools, though the lack of transportation to schools and sprawling nature of residence meant it grew at a slower pace than both California and Washington (Down, 1933; Howard, 1923). Some historical accounts cite the economic impact of the Civil War and the abolishment of slavery as a reason that Oregon public schools developed slower than either California or Washington (Down, 1933). These claims seem precarious considering that Oregon, despite enacting racists policies that negatively impacted Black citizens like Sundowning Laws, was admitted in 1859 as a state without slavery (Millner, 2021). However, the geographical spread of towns did have an undeniable impact on the establishment of schools and made traveling to a schoolhouse difficult for many children.

The development of railroads in Oregon addressed some transportation challenges in the 19th century allowing supplies and people to travel across the state, but it did not solve daily commute challenges for students. This travel challenge meant that public schools in larger cities were possible. Teachers could board a train and come to larger towns to teach students. They could even order supplies and method books to aid their instruction if needed. At the same time, more rural school-aged children still had inconsistent access to school.

Portland established its first school in 1851 and was the first city in the state to have over 1000 school-aged students. High schools could only be created if cities met a population requirement of 1000 school-aged children and had a public primary school, Portland met these qualifications in 1878 (Howard, 1923). Before 1878, high schools in Oregon were only private in the state and there was much public outcry over establishing a public high school including citizen critiques of the curriculum choices (Down, 1933; Howard, 1923). Slowly, Oregon populations continued growing and stakeholders in the area began to retire. These stakeholders

were slowly replaced with high school graduates who saw the value of a public high school education (Howard, 1923; Tyack, 1967).

The state of Oregon relaxed teaching requirements after WWI in the wake of a teacher shortage, but these relaxed standards soon contributed to the disestablishment of normal schools in the state. Normal schools were one of the only methods to keep up with the teacher demand in Oregon, but the expectation for teachers completing a normal school program was simply that they demonstrated "good morals and sufficient scholarship" (Almack, 1920. p. 108).

The standards for teacher training would shift and become more demanding with the rest of the nation in the early twentieth century and increasing licensure requirements would follow. Even into the twentieth century, Oregon teachers would experience low pay, fewer women in positions of leadership, and a lack of public respect for their profession (Tyack, 1967). By the turn of the 19th century, teaching was an increasingly professionalized career, but with less respect than other careers nationwide.

20th Century Education and Music Education

Federal funding for education increased during the 20th century to address financial demands during the Great Depression, support the returning workforce after World War I and World War II, and encourage educational improvement through grants and funding initiatives. As state and federal governments got involved in school funding, more oversight was given to both teacher preparation and K–12 education programs. It would not be until the 1950s that the federal government, keen to help students achieve competitively on a global level, would intervene in school requirements, and help supplement the funding schools received (Mark, 2008).

Schools continued to be governed on an individual level as they were during the 19th century and were highly subject to the income and property value of residents living in the bounds of school districts. After the Great Depression, taxes needed to be capped to ensure that residents were able to afford them (Walker, 1984). When property taxes were capped, state funding for education increased to make up the difference. There was some federal funding to supplement these taxes, however, federal funding made up the smallest portion of funding for districts, comprising only 8% of overall funding throughout the 20th century (Walker, 1984).

Around this time in 1933, the Roosevelt administration passed a piece of legislation called The New Deal that supported a series of federal programs designed to reinvest in the nation's citizens. These programs were intended to help citizens increase their disposable income and in turn spend more money and reinvigorate the economy. They also had a large effect on the racial composition of neighborhoods.

One aspect of the New Deal was the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) initiative to move people out of poverty-stricken neighborhoods and into neighborhoods with more quality housing, (Flournoy, 2021). The HUD needed criteria for approving loans, so a color-coded map of neighborhoods was developed by the Home Owner's Loan Corporation (HOLC) which compared affluence, location, cosmetic factors of neighborhoods, and resident race into maps that determined desirable and less desirable locations for new loans and home builds (Flournoy, 2021; Ryan, 2018). From this combination of events, the practice of redlining was established to maintain the racial and fiscal makeup of residents in neighborhoods investigated by the HOLC. Community members who were not white were denied home loan applications in neighborhoods that were primarily white (Flournoy, 2021).

Scholars debate the role the HUD and HOLC played in redlining. Some speculate that Asian, Hispanic, and BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, People of Color) would-be homeowners were barred from owning homes due to "racial proxies" or lower income and less desirable renting history based on racist policies of the time (Harris, 1999, p. 462). Others have argued that the HOLC maps were not used to exclude certain races from purchasing homes in primarily white areas, but rather to determine if interest rates should be hiked for these applicants in anticipation of missed payments or the likelihood of foreclosure (Ryan, 2018). These arguments seem to miss the overall impact of redlining housing maps and discriminatory loans; nonwhite citizens were only able to live in lower-income neighborhoods where taxes were collected at a lower rate and schools and infrastructure suffered accordingly. Through the practice of redlining, racial discrimination was allowed to affect the geographic segregation of residential neighborhoods and offered inequitable access to educational resources as a result. Due in part to these racist housing initiatives of the 1930s and the lack of equal rights and access legally given to Black Americans, the US became a highly segregated country in the early 20th century.

In 1941, Pearl Harbor was bombed by the Axis powers and the US officially entered World War II. For the five years of wartime, the US still relied on the draft to recruit for the armed forces. This mandatory military service meant a major portion of young men served overseas. After the war, to address the huge influx of men returning home, the US enacted benefit programs including the GI Bill and large-scale housing initiatives. These programs were designed to offer more opportunities for expansion and employment post-war time. To address the need for more housing, a highway initiative was established and supported by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), but only white families qualified for home loans in suburbia and had the financial means to commute to a job from the suburbs (Denton, 1995). Again, low-

income, and non-white populations had less mobility to move and lower property values, resulting in inequitable resources for schools.

The US Supreme Court ruled in 1954 that school segregation was unconstitutional and weighed in again in 1968 to declare that desegregation of schools could not be gradual. Southern schools were the first regions to be desegregated, with Northern and Western regions receiving a legal mandate to desegregate in 1973 (Orfield, 1983). Initially, rates of segregation dropped after these court orders, but due to housing practices and generational racial discrimination affecting mobility rates, schools in 1980 were even more segregated than they were in 1968 (Orfield, 1983).

The state of Oregon reflects this history of inequitable access to education, but with the relatively late settlement of the state, it has some unique factors contributing to its makeup as well. When settlers began coming west in the 1840s, 50s, and 60s, slavery was banned in the territory, but freed black Americans were also banned. This policy was in place to ensure that land claims in the area would only be given to white settlers (Millner, 2021). Oregon laws in the 1840s and 1850s established racially based landownership and residential laws, which were often repealed as unconstitutional, only to be replaced with another piece of legislation (Millner, 2021). Whether these laws were in effect at the time or not, black settlers could be sure that Oregon was a racially intolerant state. Even as a free state during the Civil War, poll taxes were enacted to exclude nonwhite voters from exercising their civil rights (Millner, 2021).

Well into the twentieth century laws were in place allowing business owners to refuse service to customers based on their race (Millner, 2021). Meanwhile, land sales were often conducted only with clauses that barred new owners from selling their property to buyers of certain races, often Black, Hispanic, and Native people (Smith, 2018). Oregon was highly

segregated and had a low population of Black Americans even before redlining hit the West Coast, but during the New Deal's housing loan program, the state was evaluated by the HOLC, divided by race, and redlined.

As the largest city, Portland had the state's first National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) chapter which fought to address segregation in schools and hate groups in Oregon. Even with the NAACP working to support Oregon residents, non-white residents still found themselves at the mercy of unjust policies. Black-owned businesses were most acutely affected by the Great Depression in Oregon, meaning that many closed their doors (Millner, 2021). After World War II, black workers who had been hired to work shipyards and other specialized trade jobs in Oregon were fired to make room for white workers returning to the state (Millner, 2021). As infrastructure development took place in Oregon, including the creation of the Interstate-5 highway and other modernizing efforts, black-owned and other minority-owned homes, and neighborhoods were destroyed to make room for these developments (Millner, 2021).

The 1950s saw the passage of some legislation addressing racial inequality in Oregon, but just a decade later riots in Portland over police brutality exposed racial biases in the police force and citizens of Oregon, but it would be twenty more years before any legislation for police reform was passed (Millner, 2021). In addition to being dominantly white, Oregon became home to racial hate groups. In fact, by the twentieth century, Oregon hosted the largest chapter of the Ku Klux Klan "west of the Mississippi River" (Millner, 2021, p. 4). In the 1980s a skinhead group called the White Aryan Resistance took up residence and the state as well, reflecting the ongoing racial discrimination in the state.

Schools reflected the imbalance of power in Oregon during this time. For example, the Portland school board proposed in the 1970s that the solution to desegregation of schools was to simply shut down all historically black schools in the area, 45 in total, (Millner, 2021). This proposal was abandoned after its namesake, school board member Blanchard, was fired in 1979 (Millner, 2021). Oregon schools would continue to struggle to find ways to support student achievement and inequitable access throughout the 20th century.

Similarly, on a national scale during the 20th century, educational resources and access became increasingly inequitable. These school conditions may have been responsible in part for the concern regarding student achievement outcomes. One of the first attempts to standardize teaching outcomes and student achievement on a national level in the US started with the 1953 establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). HEW was established to address "illiteracy, the relationship between school dropouts and juvenile delinquency, special instruction for exceptional children, the education of children of migratory workers, and the education of teachers" (Mark, 2003, p. 3). Before the establishment of HEW educational issues were handled on a local and state level, leading to a wide range of educational results across the country.

Educational reforms in the following years included 1965's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EHA) of 1975. The ESEA addressed the financial needs of schools nationally. When President Johnson signed this act into law it was with the express intention of giving schools help financially and making equal education "our first national goal" (US Department of Education, 2023a). The EHA was passed to address the abysmal inclusion rates students with exceptionalities were facing in the seventies.

As many as one in five students with exceptionalities were simply excluded from public education altogether (US Department of Education, 2023b).

Reform of education through the mid-twentieth century saw the eventual closure of normal schools as states enacted stricter policies for gaining licensure. Teacher education was moving toward a model of industrialized efficiency through competency checks and organizations overseeing the preparation of teachers including the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), which was established in 1954, the same year as the establishment of HEW (Steeves, et al., 2009; Stone, 1999).

During the mid-20th century, music education leaders and organizations were pursuing higher student achievement and rigorous expectations for teachers, supporting a more specialized pursuit of the federal goals for improvement explored so far in this literature review. Inspired by educational innovation in the 1950s and 1960s, the US government sponsored the Yale Seminar. This 1963 seminar was held using a government grant and invited musicologists, composers, and performers to come together to "analyze school music programs and propose improvements" (Mark, 2003, p. 2). This was an attempt to encourage stakeholders to examine music teaching in schools and look for ways to standardize and improve music education on a national scale. It was not lost on music educators that the guests and clinicians were not themselves music educators. In response to the Yale Seminar, the Tanglewood Symposium was held in 1967 with much the same goals; establish goals for improvement in music education on a national scale but with the input and support of music educators.

The Goals and Objectives Project (GO Project) of 1969 was established to address concerns outlined at the Tanglewood Symposium with the support of the Music Educator's

National Conference (MENC). The GO Project highlighted 35 objectives to be addressed with the following eight marked for special focus.

> (1) lead in efforts to develop programs of music instruction challenging to all students, whatever their socio-cultural condition, and directed toward the needs of citizens in a pluralistic society; (2) lead in the development of programs of study that correlate performing, creating, and listening to music and encompass a diversity of musical behavior; (3) assist teachers in the identification of musical behaviors relevant to the needs of their students; (4) advance the teaching of music of all periods, styles, forms, and cultures through grade 6 and for a minimum for two years beyond that level; (5) develop standards to ensure that all music instruction is provided by teachers well prepared in music; (6) expand its programs to secure greater involvement and commitment of student members; (7) assume leadership in the application of significant new developments in curriculum, teaching-learning patterns, evaluation, and related topics, to every area and level of music teaching; and (8) lead in efforts to ensure that every school system allocates sufficient staff, time, and funds to support a comprehensive and excellent music program, (Madsen, 2003, pp. 6–7).

These goals were intended to increase the quality of music education in the US but did not explicitly address music teacher retention or recruitment.

In addition to the GO Project, the MENC also sponsored the creation of the National Commission on Organizational Development and the National Commission on Instruction. The National Commission on Instruction was tasked with many jobs to promote the expansion of the field, but one of the most influential was the sponsorship of music education journals that would support and distribute music education research and music education philosophies. While

philosophical writings on education and music predate these events, the latter half of the twentieth century would see a rise in American music education philosophies published in books and journals to guide decision-making and create consistent goals for teachers (Abeles, 1995).

Over the next twenty-five years, music educators and researchers worked toward supporting the GO Project objective, but without any standards to guide this progress. In the realm of general education, stakeholders were still concerned about student outcomes and performance, but the next flashbulb event in education would be during the Reagan Administration. In a landmark 1983 report to then Secretary of Education from the National Commission on Excellence in Education, chairman of the committee David P. Gardner reported that American students were still not reporting acceptable outcomes or equitable achievement, (Gardner et al., 1983; Spelling, 2008). This report called *A Nation at Risk*, also explained that American students were not competitive on a global scale. The suggested improvements for education included more schools days/longer days, national educational standards, improvement in teacher-training rigor, and federal intervention to ensure that more students were able to access educational resources (Gardner et al., 1983). Shortly after this report in 1989, the (George H. W.) Bush Administration held the Charlottesville Educational Summit with state governors in attendance. This summit set the national goal for all subjects to have national standards designed and implemented before the year 2000. This summit and other educational priorities of the late 20th century effectively renewed focus on rigorous curriculum in all areas so student could be globally competitive, much like during the era of Sputnik in the 1950s.

During the Clinton Administration from 1993 to 2001, there was a push to require schools to demonstrate understanding by progress toward an objective or standard (Clinton White House Archives, 2024). Low-income schools that were able to demonstrate progress

toward educational goals were given Title I funding. This, in addition to Clinton's focus on accountability for student performance through strategic funding, served as a precursor to the upcoming No Child Left Behind era and the (George W.) Bush administration (Clinton White House Archives, 2024). In much the same way, Clinton's focus on addressing rigor of teacher preparatory programs and training was an attempt to address the reported lack of rigor in American schools from reports like *A Nation At Risk* and the post-Sputnik focus on making American students globally competitive.

In 1994 the MENC-sponsored music standards, the first national standards for music were created and states that adopted these standards were in compliance with the goal of content standards before the year 2000. The music national standards included nine content-specific goals for students in grades kindergarten, fourth grade, eighth grade, and twelfth grade. The progression of teaching all K–12 grades was meant to prepare these benchmark grades to demonstrate the following objectives, but with age-appropriate complexity;

> (1) sing, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music (2) perform on instruments, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music (3) Improvise melodies, variations, and accompaniment (4) Compose and arrange music (5) Read and notate [music]; (6) listen to, analyze, and describe music; (7) Evaluate music and musical performances; (8) Understand relationships between music and the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts; (9) understand music in relation to history and culture (Mark, 2013a, p. 127).

These standards were met with mixed reviews from music teachers and other music education stakeholders, but they marked the first attempt at content standards in the field.

As the needs for educators and music education programs continued to shift and change in the wake of technological and social progress, another symposium was held at Florida State

University in 1999 called the Housewright Symposium. This symposium invited music educators Michael Mark, Bennet Reimer, J. Terry Gates, Paul Lehman, Judith Jellison, Calista Elliott Spearman, and Cornelia Yarborough, to present papers, commissioned by MENC, on topics affecting music education in 1999. These topics were similar to the topics discussed at the Tanglewood Symposium of 1969. The historical context of music education, technological advances affecting music education, human love of music, lifelong musical participation, teaching and learning while using national standards, and reasons for including music in the school curriculum were all topics addressed in these papers (Madsen, 2003).

Once the papers were completed and presented, panels of music educators, selected by MENC would meet, deliberate, and outline a response to the paper as a group. Then one panel member would write up their findings and it would be published in *Vision 2020: The Housewright Symposium of the Future of Music Education*. This written record of the symposium, and the symposium itself, was created to establish goals for music educators and MENC, which would be renamed the National Association for Music Education (NAfME) to achieve by the year 2020. There were twelve goals in total, all agreed upon by presenters and response panels and outlined in the *Housewright Declaration*. The *Housewright Declaration* does make one mention of teacher recruitment and retention in these goals.

> Recruiting prospective music teachers is a responsibility of many, including music educators. Potential teachers need to be drawn from diverse backgrounds, identified early, led to develop both teaching and musical abilities, and sustained through ongoing professional development. Also, alternative licensing should be explored in order to expand the number and variety of teachers available to those seeking music instruction. (NAfME, 2023, p. 219).

These goals for diversity in music teacher recruitment are promising, but twenty-four years later, we have made very little progress toward diversity in music teachers.

21st Century Education and Music Education

Current factors that impact job attributes and teacher retention in the US are a product of the many educational movements and trends, including the beginning of the age of high-stakes testing. In 2001 and 2004 respectively, the ESEA and EHA were renewed and expanded under the George W. Bush administration. The renewal of ESEA expanded with No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the EHA expansion and renewal became known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). NCLB was passed to renew the funding for education given by President Lyndon B. Johnson in the initial ESEA, but with incentivization to increase student achievement rates. This incentive program required schools to show evidence of progress toward standards of achievement through a planned program of study and high-stakes testing. If standards were not met, school districts would lose funding as a result. IDEA made provisions for early intervention programs, more accountability through outcome achievement, and stricter requirements for special education teacher qualifications (US Department of Education, 2023b).

One result of NCLB and IDEA requiring a process toward a standard goal of achievement was the creation of the Common Core Initiative (CCI). This initiative was developed by state governors and educational commissioners in 2009 as a method to address the national focus on standardized outcomes and evidence of achievement in K–12 schools. The goal of the standards designed by the CCI Commission was to address career readiness and outline expected achievements that spanned from elementary school through high school graduation. These standards focused on literacy through the topics of English/language art and math (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2023).

In the Common Core model of standards, students would show evidence of achievement through English/language arts and math, by focusing on applying reading, writing, and mathematical skills to all subjects, including science and social studies. The idea of demonstrating core knowledge and understanding through lesson activities in many subjects was an idea the CCI adopted from the textbook, *Understanding by Design* which was originally published in 1998 by Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe. This textbook articulated the idea that student learning should seek to address deep, transferable understandings of key "big ideas" to be explored through teacher-facilitated lesson activities (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005).

States were not required to adopt these standards under NCLB, but the adoption of the program would clarify the process of showing evidence of achievement with a focus on reading, writing, and math, which were the topics included in high-stakes testing to verify student improvement/achievement. Most states have adopted the Common Core standards, including Oregon which still operates using these standards to this day (CCSSI, 2023). These standards had one large oversight; music, dance, fine arts, and theater arts were not included in any way in the Common Core standards. This meant that if you taught in a Common Core state, there were no standards for the arts or achievement requirements under these standards.

Just one year after the Common Core roll-out, the National Core Arts Standards (NCAS) were created to establish standards for showing evidence of achievement in the arts and an increase in students' art-based literacy. The National Coalition for the Core Arts Standards NCAS standards were based on Wiggin and McTighe's *Understanding by Design* just like the Common Core standards. The NCAS standards also focused on a push for inter-disciplinary literacy by sharing "core standards" including performing, responding, creating, and connecting, across all arts-based subjects (National Association for Music Education, 2023). For music

teachers, the NCAS standards are often called the NAfME standards since the music-specific track of these standards was endorsed by the National Association for Music Education (NAfME). When referring to music standards, these names can be used interchangeably. The state of Oregon adopted the Common Core standards in 2010 and adopted the NCAS standards in 2015. Both standards are still used in Oregon today (Oregon Department of Education, 2022; National Coalition for Core Arts Standards, 2015).

In 2012, shortly after the adoption of the Common Core and NCAS standards, the Obama administration started an initiative of their own called Race to the Top (RTT). RTT would grant funding based on achievement, but rather than revoking funding, high-stakes tests were posed as an opportunity to encourage competition amongst schools, competition in the form of out-performing neighboring schools to bring in more funding. Race to the Top made provisions for charter and magnet schools to receive funding to pursue specialized programs focusing on career preparation, science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM), the arts, or other topics. During this time, as during the era of NCLB, content standards adopted from the CCI and NCAS remained in place with high-stakes testing deciding the budgetary fate of schools.

Over time, the era of accountability under NCLB and RTT would cause schools to prioritize subjects with requirements for evidence of achievement and narrow the curriculum students were offered in school. To address the narrowing of the curriculum, the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA) required all schools to offer high-quality classes that addressed the need for career preparation and have a wide range of topics offered to students (US Department of Education, 2023a). ESSA did not, however, make room for an increase in funding to achieve these goals, but did allow for some flexibility in defining and meeting achievement standards at the state level.

The push for greater accountability and student achievement through teacher training and high-stakes testing has had a large impact on the current state of education. Teachers in accredited licensure programs with state-wide requirements have found that they have more effective teaching strategies, are more prepared to stay in their jobs, and have higher student achievement results when compared to nontraditional licensure programs like Teach for America (Kane, et. al., 2008). In addition to an increase in student achievement and teacher retention, high-quality teacher preparation programs offer teachers with traditional licenses more career mobility which decreases overall attrition rates (Goldhaber & Cowan, 2014). This suggests that federal intervention, state licensure reciprocity, and the standardization of teacher training may have offered certain benefits to teachers and students. In much the same way, Holloway, and Brass (2018), found that teachers who received their licensure after the enactment of NCLB saw accountability measures and content standards as a reality of the profession, not necessarily a loss of autonomy, as pre-NCLB trained teachers did.

High-stakes testing is still a part of accountability measures, but parents now have a right to review the opt-out policies of the tests. There is room for states to limit the amount of time that can be spent on testing, and there are currently states piloting new techniques for showing evidence of achievement and growth without high-stakes testing (NEA, 2022). The enactment of ESSA also marked a shift from the continued increase of federal oversight to granting state-level oversight more power, a bipartisan adjustment that received Congressional support (Weishart, 2022; Wong, 2020). This yield of oversight did not, however, coincide with a decrease in the national politicization of education from all stakeholders.

The Trump Administration of 2016 inherited the updated ESSA. This piece of legislation allowed states more flexibility in how they would address achievement standards, though high-

stakes tests are still being administered in most states and Common Core standards have not been replaced. In 2016 as the ESSA began rolling out, each state needed to submit an accountability plan to the US Department of Education, headed by then Secretary of Education, Betsy DeVos. DeVos approved all state plans for accountability by the end of 2018 without any bargaining process between states and federal education officials (Wong, 2020). Some states' plans were even approved without provisions for addressing subgroups of historically underserved students (e.g., students who were low-income or part of a racial minority), (Wong, 2020). The choir to not negotiate state plans reinforced a main prerogative of the Trump Administration; deferring to state and local-level oversight instead of federal oversight. This hand off approach was mirrored in the roll-back of federal protections for discrimination in public schools and universities, previously granted under Title IX.

Another priority of the Trump Administration was the promotion of School Choice. School Choice allowed families to pull students from public schools and enroll them in private schools while still receiving financial support from the government. In effect, this program would bleed funding from public schools by not only decreasing their student body, and thereby funding, but by also offering a voucher to subsidize the cost of education for students attending private school. Vouchers available for students attending private schools would utilize funds otherwise meant to go to public schools, lowering federal funding for public schools. School choice also challenges the ability of states to report accurate progress toward achievement goals when students are withdrawn from public schools at higher rates. DeVos and the Trump administration promoted an increase in School Choice to increase the control parents had over their students' education and increase autonomy for families. The work of the 1950s and 1960s

to increase access to free and equitable education was under threat with the enactment of this policy.

Private schools must remain accredited by the state to stay in operation, but they can be selective in their admission standards. Similarly, if a student is not achieving the expected standard, they can be removed from the school, as private schools are not required to offer free and equitable education to all students in the area, as public schools are. Private schools are also under less obligation to accommodate student needs, for example, free bussing, special education programs, and free lunch programs are not guaranteed in private schools. It would be an oversimplification to assert that private schools never offer these supports, but private schools are not required to have them. For all this built-in flexibility and autonomy, private schools do not report significantly higher achievement rates than public schools (Wang et al., 2019).

In a National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)–sponsored study, Wang and colleagues (2019) found that private school enrollment was overwhelmingly white and showed no significant increase in achievement when compared to public and public charter schools. In this same study, Wang and colleagues explored student attributes compared to enrollment levels and found that students who were Black and Hispanic were most underrepresented in private schools, public charter schools, and homeschooling settings. While on the surface school choice sounded to some stakeholders like a method for addressing a lack of educational autonomy, it further compounded the historic underrepresentation of BIPOC and Hispanic students with no progress toward higher achievement for the students who were able to enroll in private schools. After grappling with two years of School Choice debates, rollbacks of civil rights protections at public schools, and working through state-wide ESSA achievement plans, schools and teachers were about to face a global pandemic.

During the COVID-19 pandemic of 2020, schools in the United States faced a nationwide shutdown of all in-person activities. This shutdown was at first supposed to be a two-week pause in activities to avoid spreading COVID through large groups of people, but in most states would lead to schools ceasing all in-person events through the end of the school year. Remote schooling was the most common solution for this challenge. Remote schooling asked teachers to plan lessons that could be completed online or via printed materials printed and sent to students. Lessons were planned as live, synchronous lessons via online video chat, or were designed for students to complete asynchronously and submit online or by somehow dropping written materials off at school in a safe manner and without person-to-person contact. The exact form of remote schooling was decided by districts and states. Districts could design the format of lessons and the typical daily structure for students. Meanwhile, state-level government, governors in particular, would track the local cases of COVID and give guidelines for when in-person instruction could continue (Weissert et al., 2021).

This abrupt change in schooling was mirrored across the country with many jobs pivoting to online work models, rethinking how to safely keep in-person workers on the premises, or shutting their doors completely. Only workers deemed “essential” were able to continue working in person, but state-level government controlled how many people were allowed to gather and what jobs were considered essential. Students were now working online from home and many of their parents were working right beside them, posing logistical issues for both students and their families. Essential workers faced a childcare crisis while their children remained at home, but childcare and schools closed their doors. Households with lower socioeconomic status were affected most of all. Access to quality education was directly affected by the ability of students to get online and get help navigating online classrooms from working parents if they had access

to a computer and internet at all. If remote school was completed using packets of materials, the turnaround for teacher feedback was limited by the ability of students and families to either mail their work to their teachers or safely drop them off at the school, and in turn receive the graded work. This time of heightened stress was reflected in the public's perception of teachers working during the pandemic.

At first, watching teachers work with students through remote schooling led stakeholders to hail them as "heroes," but when a return to in-person learning was threatened by teacher demands for safe working conditions, they were immediately under attack (Weishart, 2022, p. 863). The stress of the pandemic was at a boiling point and with teachers posing an obstacle to a return to normalcy, politicians saw an opportunity to vilify teachers. Many governors ordered a return to normalcy, even with COVID surges happening nationally (Weishart, et al., 2021). When teachers and teachers' unions protested the lack of protection and insufficient personal protective equipment (PPE), even with emergency federal COVID funding, they began to experience public attacks from all stakeholders. By publicly politicizing education as a threat to autonomy, teachers became an obstacle to the return of normalcy and politicians found a strong talking point for their stump speeches during the 2020 election cycle.

While the federal oversight of education had been reigned in, the power afforded to governors during the COVID-19 pandemic seemed to grant them more power and set the stage for the politicization of education (Weishart, et al., 2021). Post-COVID governors have passed legislation directly controlling the curriculum teachers can employ in their classrooms. Governor Ron DeSantis of Florida has made national headlines by passing legislation banning Critical Race Theory and any mention of LGBTQ relationships and lifestyles in K–12 classrooms. Teachers do not have an absolute right to curricular free speech (Weishart, 2022). This lack of

protection means that, while unprecedented, governors are legally within their rights to enact curricular policy but rely on administrators to uphold these policies. COVID wasn't necessarily a "mass exodus" of teachers compared to previous years' attrition rates, but it was a remarkable low in the morale of teachers nationally (Burkholder & Theobald, 2022, p. 1).

In addition to the increasing political and social challenges US teachers are facing in the 21st century, attending college and becoming licensed to teach is becoming disproportionately expensive when compared to 19th–20th-century resources. Attending college in the US has become the most expensive it has ever been. Allegretto and Mishel (2016) explain that "wages have stagnated since the mid-1990s" as higher education costs and cost of living continues to increase (p. 19). While seeking a traditional path to teaching through attending college and earning a professional license yields the best results for student outcomes and teacher retention, the process to gain licensure is costly and difficult to afford as a student and later, as a student-loan-paying inservice teacher (Allegretto & Mishel, 2016; Goldhaber & Cowan, 2014). Students intending to pursue a college degree may be better served by choosing a career that will make the repayment of loans easier. If students still have their hearts set on being a teacher, the short-term fiscal demands of pursuing an education degree may sway them into pursuing restricted or conditional licensure paths. While these programs may not yield the best professional outcomes, they are affordable in the short term which many college-based teacher preparation programs are not. Further complicating the cost-benefit balance of pursuing a degree in education is the web of racial and socioeconomic factors that affect access to higher education.

Jackson and Reynolds (2013) found that white students tend to take out student loans at a lower rate than black students and have overall higher completion rates when pursuing bachelor's degrees. These researchers followed up with participants over the course of six years

and observed that white students tend to accrue debt at a slower rate, have less risk of defaulting on loans, and have less debt on average than black students. Historic racism has made college an inequitable endeavor for students who would pursue teaching as their career. By enacting housing discrimination practices and allowing employment discrimination practices until the late twentieth century, the US has made access to generational wealth and social advantages lopsided in favor of white Americans.

Even for those who can navigate higher education costs and the path to licensure, career attributes are also a challenge to teachers' long-term satisfaction. Autonomy in teaching is often decried as the missing element for teaching satisfaction, but conflating professional accountability with high-stakes testing practice would overlook the benefits of modernization throughout American education. The national push for quality education led to the creation of university-based teacher programs that produce teachers with high levels of professional mobility and effectiveness (Burkholder & Cowan, 2014). To many post-NCLB teachers, content standards are an effective source of guidance and accountability as they work toward equitable student achievement (Holloway & Brass, 2018).

21st-Century Recruitment, Mobility, and Career Attributes

Renewed effort toward recruitment to address the demand for qualified teachers has the potential to address the lack of diversity among public school teachers. For music teachers specifically, it would also attempt to meet the goal of recruiting and supporting a new generation of teachers as outlined in the *Housewright Declaration* (Madsen, 2003). The outlined points are important goals for the future of education and music education, but recruitment alone cannot address the current demand for more qualified teachers. As with any profession, there is an expected rate of turnover for teachers nearing retirement age, but the rate of teachers leaving the

profession now well outpaces the rate of retirement (Garcia et al., 2009; Henry et al., 2001; Ingersoll, 2001). Recruiting teachers may act as a temporary fix for the high demand for teachers, or a constructive goal to foster more diversity in public school teachers, but it does not address the current demand for teachers based on the rate of turnover.

In a review of empirical research, Guarino and colleagues (2006) found that the risk for attrition amongst teachers is most pronounced during the first five years of teaching and again after fifteen years. Somewhat at odds with these findings, Borman and Dowling (2008) asserted that the odds of attrition amongst teachers are lowest in the first five years, with a steady increase with each ensuing year, but this information was found after pooling articles into a meta-analysis and ranking the odds of attrition. It is possible that retirement is skewing the results of this study since the first five years of teaching have been correlated with high attrition in other studies (Arviv Elyashiv & Navon 2021; Guarino et al., 2006; Henry et al., 2001; Ingersoll, 2001). Regardless of the exact level of attritional risk during the first five years, both early career and veteran teachers in all subject areas experience some level of attritional risk.

Fostering early career teachers and veteran teachers to maximize retention in addition to recruiting new teachers may help fill vacancies. Trying to outpace turnover with recruitment alone does not examine the cyclical challenges or "organizational sources" of stress that may be contributing to attrition (Ingersoll, 2003, p. 499). Again, fostering efforts for recruitment offers valuable service to the field of teaching, but it must be pursued in combination with retention efforts to address the rate of attrition. The scope of this study will therefore be limited to retention strategies to address attrition needs, but not as the exclusive solution for the issue. An array of recruitment and retention efforts will be needed to keep pace with the national need for teachers in general and music teachers specifically.

Early Career Concerns of Music Teachers

Music teachers tend to cite job factors when giving advice or reflecting on the challenges of the job itself, not pedagogy or subject matter (Fredrickson & Hackworth, 2005). Perhaps this is because of the complexity of joining a new network of professionals, as you could expect in any career, but it may also be due to what Ballantyne (2007) called "praxis-shock," or shock at the real demands of teaching (p. 181). In her study, Ballantyne found that isolation and large workloads contributed to the dissatisfaction of early-career music teachers with not only their current positions but also their careers in general. While this study was focused on Australian music teachers, Gallo (2018) found similar patterns of isolation in the early years of teaching music based on the School and Staff Survey (SASS), which collected data from American schools and teachers. Music teachers tended to have fewer professional development, mentoring, and onboarding opportunities than their general education peers (Gallo, 2018). Isolation is a concern in these conditions, but if praxis shock is also at play in American schools, we can infer that early-career music teachers may be facing similar career dissatisfaction as their Australian counterparts.

Bell-Robertson (2014) similarly found that isolation is a common topic of discussion in online social media support groups for music teachers. The rise of social media has led to the development of online support groups that allow novice and veteran teachers to ask for help, share advice, and talk about their experiences. In her 2014 study, Bell-Robertson followed eleven participants through their experience in these groups and found that they allowed teachers to feel more connection with other people who understood their situation and made them feel less alone. These social elements and opportunities for professional growth are essential to fostering retention in music teachers. As emphasized by Keltcherman (2017), attrition rates are the results

of not only career demands but the social needs. These social needs inspire teachers not only to leave the field but to move to new jobs in the field or stay at a job that fosters their needs. Teachers considering their career possibilities are often nick-named “movers, stayers, and leavers” in educational literature as a shorthand.

Movers, Stayers, and Leavers

Simply put, movers are teachers who intend to continue teaching, but at a new school, leavers are teachers who are looking to leave the field of teaching altogether, and stayers are teachers who will remain at their current job. Six percent of the teaching force leaves the profession (Hancock, 2009), but this rate outpaces other career fields and cannot be explained by retirement alone (Henry et al., 2011). The average national rate of turnover for all industries in 2022 was less than five percent (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2024). Movers often leave one job for a better opportunity in the same field, while understandable, leads to lower achievement standards for students experiencing a lack of stability (Ronfeldt et al., 2013).

In a New York City-based study, Ronfeldt and colleagues (2013) found that students in certain school districts, including districts with lower socio-economic status, higher rates of English Language Learners, and more Black students tended to have higher rates of turnover in their teaching staff. The observed turnover in this study led to lower outcomes in standardized tests and disrupted teachers who chose to stay in the district as they worked to help onboard new teachers, fill in student knowledge gaps, and felt the social drain of high staff turnover. Both Arviv Eylashiv and Navon (2021) and Barnes and Crowe (2007) confirmed these results in similar studies; districts with higher rates of racial minority students or lower-income students, tended to have higher teacher turnover and lower student achievement.

Moving is often influenced by the desire of teachers to work in a district that mirrors their own childhood experience because quality educational experiences during childhood seem to inspire students to pursue a career in education (Reininger, 2012). For music teachers, the most effective recruitment window seems to be before college, which is when 80% of music teachers say they decided to enter the profession (Bergee et al., 2001). This means that schools with low-quality music programs are inspiring far fewer students to become music teachers and fewer students from these schools are going to be searching for careers at districts that mirror their childhood. Quality is a subjective measurement for a music program and may be affected by teacher effectiveness or teaching technique, but it is also possible that students with less resources and funding perceive a lower quality experience in their music. Perhaps the process of underserving districts with more students from racial minorities is why Robinson and Russell (2022) found that movers and leavers in music education tended to leave schools with more racial diversity in their student body. In the state of Oregon, over 87% of all K–12 teachers are white, but regionally, only 17% of students attending school in western states are white, posing a stark disconnect between student and teacher experiences (NTSP, 2018).

It is difficult to accurately untangle this web of influences while also considering the context of historic racism in the US already explored earlier in this literature review. Still, similar patterns are present across teaching specialties. Music teachers and non-music teachers move, leave, and stay at similar rates (Hancock, 2009) and both fields of general education and music education tend to mostly fit the white, middle-class demographic model (Guarino et al., 2006; NCES, 2022b; Russell & Robinson, 2022; Shaw & Auletto, 2022). This demographic trend means that school districts that do not have mostly white, middle-class student bodies face a higher risk of teacher turnover.

Dismissal for Poor Performance

Most literature exploring teacher turnover focuses on teachers leaving the profession by choice, rather than teachers fired for misconduct or ineffective teaching. This is because the rate of teachers dismissed for misconduct or ineffective teaching is overall very low with only 3% of teachers being dismissed and 1.4% of teachers being non-renewed in the 2008/2009 school year (NCES, 2022a). Administrators can choose to dismiss teachers for poor performance, not renew their contract, or informally counsel them out of their position. Administrators tend to dismiss teachers who are a poor fit for the school, rather than ineffective at teaching since teachers are coached before being dismissed, giving them the chance to improve their teaching (Donaldson & Mavrogordato, 2018). Often poor performance by teachers is attributed to assignments outside of specialty areas, meaning that coaching or reassignment is a better choice than dismissal (Futernick, 2010).

Jacob (2011) found that teachers in Chicago tended to be dismissed for lower student test scores, a history of poor-quality teaching without improvement, or chronic absenteeism, but principal attributes and school attributes tended to be predictors of higher dismissal rates, more so than even teacher attributes. Older principals had degrees from more expensive universities and oversaw schools with lower achievement rates, which tended to dismiss teachers at a higher rate (Jacob, 2011). In the same vein, after comparing NCES statistics to current news stories about the so-called poor quality of teachers in the US, Futernick (2010) asserted that administrators and officials in charge of budgeting, working conditions, and job assignments are just as responsible for low-performing schools as teachers, if not more so.

Attributing the poor performance of some schools to one member of the staff is not an accurate method for increasing student achievement. However, it is accurate to say that dismissal

of teachers generally lowers the achievement rate of students more than coaching a less effective teacher (Ronfeldt et al., 2013). Likewise, overall attrition due to poor performance in the field of teaching occurs at a low enough rate that it falls outside the scope of this study which will focus instead on movers and leavers by choice. when examining attrition rates (NCES, 2022a).

21st-Century Job Attributes for Teachers and Music Teachers

Working conditions and job attributes have been consistently linked to teacher attrition through data analysis and self-reports by teachers. The relatively low salary of teaching, as compared to other fields requiring a bachelor's or master's degree, is often cited as a reason for teacher attrition, which is in part accurate. Imazeki (2005) found that increased salary reduced the risk of exiting the profession, but not transferring teaching jobs. This could mean teachers were looking for better paying jobs even when satisfied with other working conditions if they saw their possible compensation as acceptable. Imazeki suggested that raising the minimum pay for all teachers in her focus state of Wisconsin may address migration rates, considering the disparity in pay between districts. Movers were prepared to seek out better-paying jobs in the state, but if their district was competitive in their pay scale, teachers may be satisfied with their current positions and stop looking for new positions. Corroborating these findings, Garcia and colleagues (2009) found a significant relationship between salary and attrition, pointing to higher pay as a measure for decreasing attrition and attracting veteran teachers to districts in need of their experience in Texas schools.

Pay is not the only job attribute contributing to attrition, isolation, lack of respect for the profession, and a loss of autonomy have all been linked to attrition. Teachers who have the highest rates of attrition are typically academically capable (according to test scores) and tend to teach math (Guarino et al., 2006). Guarino and colleagues (2006) suggested that academically

capable teachers may be frustrated with the lack of respect in the field and move on to a different career while teachers who are less academically capable may stay in the field longer, rather than gambling on a new career choice. Specifically in Oregon, 17% of teachers have a second job to supplement their income, which may be because OR is one of the top ten most expensive states to live in (NTSP, 2018; MERIC, 2022). Between 2000 and 2020, the national average salary for all teachers decreased by 1.3% to $61,730 while the average salary for Oregon teachers increased by 1.8% to $64,385 during the same time frame (NCES, 2022a). While Oregon teacher salaries are higher than their out-of-state counterparts, this average income is still approximately $12,000 below the median household income in Oregon (US Census Bureau, 2020).

Meanwhile, support from administrators, mentoring/induction programs for new teachers, and self-efficacy increased retention and recruitment rates among teachers (Guarino et al., 2006). Similarly, in a series of interviews with Australian teachers, Buchanan and colleagues (2013) found that support, not only from administrators, but from teaching peers, professional development opportunities, access to quality resources, and good working conditions tended to increase job satisfaction and cut down on isolation and attritional intentions in early-career educators. While Buchanan's study did not focus on American teachers, the US does have a history of isolating teachers through heavy workloads and overly regimented schedules (Griffin, 1997), which suggests that isolation may also be a factor contributing to American teacher turnover. Relatedly, Carver-Thomas and Darling-Hammond (2019), established that lower administrative support and work in lower-income districts had increased rates of attrition.

Sparks and Malkus (2015) discovered that American teachers also felt that they had experienced a loss of autonomy over book choices, planning curricular content, choosing homework assignments, and determining consequences for student misbehaviors. This loss of

autonomy tends to be reported by teachers in districts that have more than 34% of their students receiving free or reduced lunch, are urban/town-based schools, or are currently working in secondary schools (i.e., middle schools, and high schools) (Sparks & Malkus, 2015). Interestingly, Sparks and Malkus (2015) found an overall decrease in autonomy among subgroups of teachers except for arts teachers, including music teachers who reported an increase in autonomy. Music teacher attrition is affected by many of the same factors as teachers of other subjects, but the unique job attributes of music teaching positions may also affect attrition and retention rates.

Gardner (2010) analyzed the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) 1999/2000 School and Staffing Survey (SASS) and 2000/2001 Teacher Follow-Up Survey (TFS) to look for patterns of attrition in music teachers. Gardner found that music teachers were more likely to be part-time or itinerate, typically had less support when working with students with special needs, left the profession for a better salary, and switched teaching positions typically for jobs with better school conditions. The results also indicated that administrative support had a large effect on teachers staying in their positions. Madsen and Hancock (2002) had similar findings when they interviewed recent music education graduates beginning their careers. The team found that personal life challenges and administrator support were the main reasons given for leaving the field. This study also found that gender impacted when teachers chose to leave the field in the first 10 years of their careers, with women initially leaving at higher rates earlier in their careers, and all participants leaving at similar rates later in their careers (Madsen & Hancock, 2002).

Matthew and Koner (2017), like Gardner, used the NCES's TFS and SASS data to explore the interaction between attrition in music teachers and the demographic characteristics of teachers. Firstly, very few music teachers (28%) had pursued additional certification through

professional development such as Orff or Kodaly certification. Secondly, music teachers, like general educators, tend to be female, between 20 and 40 years old, Caucasian, and attended college at some level (Guarino et al., 2006; Matthew & Koner, 2017). Conversely, teachers who do not fit this demographic description face higher rates of attrition (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019). In Matthew and Koner's (2017) study, teachers who were satisfied with their position tended to cite student engagement and relationships as factors that impacted their decision to continue teaching or move/leave. These results are consistent with other research findings. In general student, peer, and administrator support are positive influences and reduce attritional risk (Garcia et al., 2022; Guarino et al., 2006).

Music teachers are similar to the general teacher population in some ways, like the reasons they report for leaving the profession. Sanderson and colleagues (2019) found several themes in music teacher interviews that supported findings in general education studies including that professional development was the most common source of dissatisfaction, and community socioeconomic status affected teachers' perceptions of their school and other schools. Interestingly, the research team also found that much of the time teachers were judging other schools by their perception of their working conditions and support, not based on first-hand accounts of what it was like to teach in that school (Sanderson et al., 2019). These findings suggests that expectations for success or resources that teachers have when entering their positions may influence the decision of teachers to become movers or leavers.

From general education literature, we know that less support from administration, fewer professional development opportunities, and lower salary all contribute to attrition, all of which are typical in music teaching positions (Buchanan et al., 2013; Garcia et al., 2009; Guarino et al., 2006; Imazeki, 2005). There are also some conditions more common in music teaching than

other specialties, like itinerate and part-time teaching positions. Itinerate and part-time teaching positions are not exclusively music teacher attributes, but they are common in the specialty, making them an important factor to consider in music teacher attrition. Further research in the field of music teacher attrition may also offer an exploration of the impact of itinerate teaching and part-time teaching in other teaching specialties.

More research addressing attrition in the field of music education is needed to gain an accurate picture of all the current attritional risks facing music teachers. Job attributes seem to interact with teacher characteristics, thus increasing attritional risk, but very little research has been conducted focusing on the unique demands of music teaching that may contribute to attrition.

Purpose

The purpose of this research was to establish what factors of a music teacher's career affected their decision to migrate to new teaching positions or leave the career field. The focus of this study was job attributes including school factors, burnout dimensions from the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI), and career planning factors from the NCES's 2008 Teacher Follow-Up Survey (TFS). In addition to these career factors, demographic information was collected to look for possible predictors of migration or attrition in subgroups of the music teaching population in Oregon.

Methods

Participants

Participants in this study were currently employed public and private school music teachers in the state of Oregon teaching in K–12 schools. Each participant in this study was contacted via email and participated in the study via a Qualtrics online survey. This survey began

with an informed consent form, approved by the University of Oregon's Institutional Review Board. The form indicated that (1) this survey focused on teacher retention and job attributes, (2) that participants would face no foreseeable risk in participating, (3) that no identifiable information was collected, (4), that participation was completely optional, and (5) that if they did choose to participate, they were free to withdraw from the study at any point with no penalty. Rather than signing this agreement, which would then be identifiable data, participants were asked to click a box labeled "I have read the informed consent details and agree to participate in this study." Participants were only allowed to proceed to the data collection portion of the survey if this box was checked (Appendix A).

Any K–12 music teachers currently working in the state of Oregon were eligible to participate in this study; 1200 teachers met this criteria and were contacted. To accurately analyze the data collected for patterns between teacher attributes, job attributes, and attrition rates, basic demographic information was also collected from each participant. This information included participants' highest level of education, current licensure type, additional certifications completed, how long they have been teaching music, how long they have been employed at their current school, and their basic demographic information (race, ethnicity, age, and gender).

Participants were recruited using the Oregon State Directory, compiled, and updated annually by the Oregon Department of Education (ODE). This directory has an exhaustive list of all K–12 public schools in Oregon. This list of schools was used to look up direct email addresses for music teachers at each school on publicly available district websites. If it was not possible to find the email address for a music teacher on a district website, the contact email for that school's principal, available in the ODE directory, was used instead. Each email address

received one of two standardized emails depending on whether they were a music teacher or school principal (see Appendix B and Appendix C).

This process of directly contacting each school was used instead of a state-wide music educators list available via the OMEA (Oregon Music Educators Association) to reach music educators who may not be members of the association and help contact as many qualifying participants as possible. Unfortunately, the ODE directory only compiles information for public and public charter schools. This means the names and contact information for private schools were gathered using the OMEA data, specifically the Oregon Student Music Access Program (OSMAP). This directory lists names of schools, public and private, known to have music in the state of Oregon. Since there is not an official government-compiled list of private schools, this is the most dependable choice for finding private school information available, even with its limitations.

Materials

This survey was comprised of five main parts; (1) participant job attributes that described typical working conditions and assignment types which were reported using ten multi-choice questions, (2) likelihood of career movement, for attrition or migration, which was reported using two Likert-style questions, (3) working conditions as they related to career-planning in participants, utilizing Likert-style questions from the 2008–2009 Teacher Follow-Up Survey, (4) burnout dimensions using Likert-style questions from the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory, and (5) demographic questions which were reported using multiple-choice questions. One optional short answer question was also included before the demographic section of this questionnaire to allow participants the opportunity to share any job attributes, working conditions, perceived stress, or burnout concerns they may have. To avoid stereotype threat, this optional short-answer question

did not define any terms for participants and appeared after all job attribute, burnout, and career-planning questions were asked.

Procedure

In addition to the teacher attributes described above, participants were asked about their current job attributes, satisfaction with working conditions, self-reported levels of burnout, and whether they intended to continue teaching music or continue teaching at their current job. To avoid stereotype threat, burnout was not defined for participations, simply questions about burnout facets were administered. The specific job attributes included in this questionnaire were selected based on current literature and research in the field of teacher attrition (Graham, et al., 2011; Nedea, 2020). Job attributes acted as the independent variable for this study and were compared to both participant attributes, burnout rates, working conditions, and attritional intentions. The specific job attributes that were included in the survey were (1) itinerate teaching schedules, when applicable, (2) subject/class assignments, (3) school/district type, (4) current and anticipated full-time equivalency (FTE), (7) range of grades taught, and (8) professional development opportunities (Appendix D).

To assess the validity and reliability of the survey designed for this study, a pilot study with 34 participants was completed. All participants took the survey twice to allow for test-retest reliability. The pilot sample of teachers was recruited using convenience sampling and were either music teachers working outside of Oregon or non-music teachers from Oregon. This meant that no possible participants for the full study were participants in the pilot study. The pilot study results were analyzed for reliability using Cronbach's Alpha and reported α=.867, meeting the threshold for strong reliability (Bujang et al., 2018; Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). To address

validity all questions were adapted from previous surveys on job attributes or were directly adapted from previously employed instruments.

The 2008–2009 Teacher Follow-Up Survey, conducted by the NCES was used as a method of collecting data on attritional intention amongst participants with consideration for validity and reliability. The questions used in this survey were adapted from "Series F" of the *Documentation of the Teacher Follow-up Survey* (Graham, et al., 2011, pp. C42–C43). These questions were Likert-style questions that asked participants to rate the impact each job factor has on their intention to either change jobs or change careers (Appendix E). Similarly, the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OBLI) was used to offer a method for measuring overall burnout among Oregon music teachers and to analyze the specific burnout types among Oregon music teachers (Appendix F). The OBLI is comprised of sixteen questions, all of which are answered using a four point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" and focus on the subcategories of emotional exhaustion and disengagement (Nedea, 2020).

Much like the pilot study participants, participants for this study were recruited via email. All email addressed were contacted three times in total. The first contact took place on June 6th 2023, to ensure preliminary contact was established before summer vacation began. The second contact took place on September 13th, 2023, when teachers had returned to work from summer break. The final contact was made on October 13th, 2023, during the Oregon statewide inservice day. These contact times were selected to maximize the likelihood that teachers would be actively checking their emails and have time to participate. Data collection ended one week after the final email reminder on October 20th, 2023.

The analytic plan for this study utilized linear regression analysis to determine if there were any possible predictors of migration or attrition intentions when examining job attributes,

burnout factors, or teacher demographics. Using SPSS, linear regression analyses were conducted six times, with migration and attrition acting as the covariate for four groups of variables each; demographics, job attributes, Teacher-Follow Up survey items and Oldenburg Burnout Inventory items. If statistical significance was found for the group of variables, linear regression tables were analyzed to pinpoint which variables were statistically significant predictors.

Based on a G*Power a priori analysis, a sample size of *N*=201 participants was needed to maintain sufficient statistical power (1-β= .80, f^2= .10, and α= .05). Three hundred and ninety-nine current Oregon music teacher participated in this study with an 11% attrition rate (*N*=354 completed the survey), offer sufficient sample size for this analysis.

Results

Descriptive Analysis

Based on descriptive analysis of the participants' career factors, it appears that Oregon music teachers have an average career length of approximately 13 years and school tenure of approximately seven years (*M*=13.07, *SD*=10.12; *M*=7.05 *SD*=6.86). Music teachers in Oregon who participated in this study are mostly cisgender with slightly more women than men, (male *f*=152, 45.3%; female *f*= 179, 53%) and a small percentage of teachers identify as non-binary, (*f*=5, 1.5%). The average age of music teachers in Oregon was 41 years (*M*=41.69, *SD*=12.13), while most Oregon music teachers identify as white (*f*=307, 90.8%).

Further descriptive analysis of demographic information outlined participants' highest level of education, licensure type, certifications completed, type of school district attended as a student, and whether the participants completed their K–12 education in Oregon. At 54% (*f*= 182) of the sample, slightly more participants attended K–12 schooling in Oregon than in other

states. Seventy-six point nine percent of participants hold a master's degree, and 46.7% of these master's degrees are in music education.

The most common type of licensure among participants was a professional teaching licensure with a music specialization (*f*= 190, 56.2%), followed by a preliminary teaching license with a music specialization (*f*= 108, 32%). Many participants had no additional certifications after their higher education training (*f*=198, 51.4%). Finally, when asked what type of district they attended as a student, participants mostly attended school in small cities (*f*= 85, 25.3%), small-towns (*f*= 77, 22.9%), suburban areas *(f*= 72, 21.4%), and large cities (*f*= 63, 18.8%), in similar rates with very few teachers attending other district types as students.

Oregon music teachers on average, do not intend to leave the profession of teaching. The mean score for attrition intention was four on the given Likert-scale, or "very likely to continue teaching" on the Likert-scale question (*M*= 4.05, *N*= 383). Meanwhile, the migration intention was approximately three on the same scale, meaning that the Oregon teaching force tends to be "undecided" about whether they will continue in their same position for five more years (*M*= 3.22, *N*= 383).

In addition to these demographic factors, job attributes were descriptively analyzed to offer an overview of typical Oregon music teaching jobs. Oregon music teachers tended to be full-time, (*f*=326, 84.5%). Also, Oregon music teachers work in districts that are mostly in small cities (*f*= 107, 26.8%), small towns (*f*= 92, 23.8%), suburban areas (*f*=71, 18.4%), and large cities (*f*=51, 13.2%). While the exact percentage breakdowns vary, the top four district types teachers currently work at and those they attended as a student are the same with, small city districts being the most common district in both categories. These frequency results suggests that

teachers working in Oregon have a strong likelihood of teaching in a district similar to their own childhood district.

Other job attributes in this study included grades taught, music courses taught, non-music courses taught, conferences attended/factors impacting conference attendance, and whether participants are itinerant teachers. The most common grades taught were K–5 (*f*=141, 26.5%) followed by 6-8 (*f*=74, 19.2%). The most common music courses taught were general music (*f*=240, 62.2%*)*, choir (*f*=158, 40.9*%*), and band (*f*=143, 37%). Most music teachers do not teach non-musical subjects (*f*=304, 78.8%). The comments section of this question suggested that any replications of this study should offer leadership as a class choice as it was commonly mentioned in write-in responses. Most music teachers attended the Oregon Music Educators Association (OMEA) conference in the past five years (*f*=247, 70.2%), but when participants were not able to attend conferences, it was mostly because of a lack of district funding for PD travel (*f*=225, 64.5%). Finally, very few Oregon music teachers were itinerant teachers (*f*=76, 19.6%)

The last descriptive analysis completed examined job attributes and career planning items from the NCES's Teacher Follow-Up Survey (2008) and the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory. The mean scores of each subcategory for the Teacher Follow-Up Survey (TFS) fell between two and three on the Likert-style scale, indicating between a "slightly important" and "somewhat important" level only. The highest average concern rating was for salary (*M=2.6, SD*=1.40) followed by workplace conditions (*M*=2.42, *SD*=1.41), but neither was more than "somewhat important" to participants.

When descriptively analyzed, items from the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory suggested overall medium or high levels of burnout in all areas. A score lower than 1.63 is considered low burnout while 1.63-2.67 is medium burnout and above 2.67 is high burnout (Nedea, 2020). The

highest level of burnout was recorded for the following prompts; feeling tired before work (*M*=3.35, *SD*=.68), worn and weary (*M*=3.02, *SD*=.83), followed by feeling drained during work (*M=2.92, SD=.88*), and needing more time for recovery (*M*=2.87, *SD*=.92) (see appendix Y for full frequency table).

Regression Analysis

Migration intention was regressed on sample demographics including age, gender, race, education/certification/licensure type, and career length. Linear regression analysis was completed using the statical analysis program SPSS. The dependent variable, the likelihood of migration, was entered using a numeric value from the Likert-style answers. For demographics, the independent variables were all nine demographic questions, which included age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest level of completed education, licensure status, certifications, location of school attended as a student, and type of district attended as a student. Any non-numeric data collected was converted to numeric values for analysis. For all independent variable except age, the numeric value given to variables corresponded with the number it was given in the questionnaire option list for participants to choose from. SPSS was prompted to analyze these variables using a linear regression model. After reviewing a model summary table for possible significant predictors of attrition, a covariance table was created so each independent variable could be analyzed for statistical significance.

The independent variables did not significantly predict migration intentions in the sample population ($F(25, 310)=1.09$, $p= .351$), which indicated non-significant results with too high a p-value to reject the null hypothesis (Table 1).

Table 1. *Linear Regression Analysis of Migration and Participant Demographics.*

R	Adjusted R^2	*SE*	*F* change	df 1	df 2	*p*
.284	.007	1.284	1.091	25	310	.351

Note: $*p<.05$. Dependent variable: the likelihood of staying at a current job (higher value means more likely). Predictors: demographics (including license, certification, age, gender, race, and education level

Attrition intention was regressed on sample demographics including age, gender, race, education/certification/licensure type, and career length. Linear regression analysis was completed using the statical analysis program SPSS. The dependent variable, the likelihood of attrition, was entered using a numeric value from the Likert-style answers. For demographics, the independent variables were all nine demographic questions, which included age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest level of completed education, licensure status, certifications, location of school attended as a student, and type of district attended as a student. Any non-numeric data collected was converted to numeric values for analysis. For all independent variable except age, the numeric value given to variables corresponded with the number it was given in the questionnaire option list for participants to choose from. SPSS was prompted to analyze these variables using a linear regression model. After reviewing a model summary table for possible significant predictors of attrition, a covariance table was created so each independent variable could be analyzed for statistical significance.

The independent variables significantly predicted attrition intentions in the sample population ($F(25, 310)=2.06$, $p<.05$, $R^2= .073$) indicating that demographics significantly predict attritional intentions yielded an R^2value of .073. This value indicates that 7.3% of the variability observed in attritional intentions can be explained by the demographic variables included in the model. (Table 2). It is important to note that this R^2 value indicates a relatively weak relationship. Therefore generalizations should be avoided.

Table 2. *Linear Regression Analysis of Attriration and Participant Demographics.*

R	Adjusted R^2	*SE*	*F* change	df 1	df 2	*p*
.377	.073	1.338	2.060	25	310	.003

*Note: *p*<.05. Dependent variable: likelihood of continuing to teach K–12 music (higher value means more likely). Predictors: demographics (including license, certification, age, gender, race, and education level.

All independent demographic variables were assessed to find the influence of each factor on this significant result. It was found that only age (β= -.026, *t*= -2.467, *p*<.05) was a significant predictor of attrition. This implies that for every one-year decrease in age, attritional intentions decrease by .026 units on the Likert scale. In other words, attrition intentions increase by one step on the Likert scale for every four additional years of age (Table 3).

Table 3. *Direction/Magnitude of Sig. Attrition and Participant Demographic Variables*

			95% CI				
Variable	Beta	*SE*	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	*T*	ß	*p*
(Constant)	3.808	.896	2.045	5.571	4.250		<.001
Age	-.024	.010	-.045	-.004	-2.371	-.230	.018

*Note: *p*<.05; Dependent variable is the likelihood of staying at the current job for 5+ years. This table only reports significant results (see page 104 for a complete table).

Migration intention was regressed on job attributes including conference attendance, itinerate teaching status, classes taught, and how long teachers had been at their current school. Linear regression analysis was completed using the statical analysis program SPSS. The dependent variable, the likelihood of migration, was entered using a numeric value from the Likert-style answers. For job attribute variables not covered by the burnout and Teacher Follow-Up Survey sections of this instrument, the independent variables were the first ten questions, which included confirmation that participants were K–12 educators, the number of years participants had been teaching, the number of years at their current school, itinerate teaching

status, the numbers of schools/distance between schools if participants were itinerate, music classes taught, non-music classes taught, grades taught, district type, and FTE (full-time equivalency). Any non-numeric data collected was converted to numeric values for analysis. For all independent variable except age, the numeric value given to variables corresponded with the number it was given in the questionnaire option list for participants to choose from. SPSS was prompted to analyze these variables using a linear regression model. After reviewing a model summary table for possible significant predictors of migration, a covariance table was created so each independent variable could be analyzed for statistical significance.

The independent variables did not significantly predict migration intentions in the sample population (F(17, 56)= .606, p= .87), which indicated too high a *p*-value to reject the null hypothesis (Table 4).

Table 4. *Linear Regression Analysis of Migration and Job Attributes*

R	Adjusted R^2	*SE*	*F* change	df 1	df 2	*p*
.394	-.101	1.223	.606	17	56	.873

*Note: *p*<.05. Dependent Variable: the likelihood of staying at a current job (higher value means more likely). Predictors: job attributes (including itinerate status, courses taught, PD/conference attendance, and school tenure).

Attrition intention was regressed on job attributes including conference attendance, itinerate teaching status, classes taught, and how long teachers had been at their current school. Linear regression analysis was completed using the statical analysis program SPSS. The dependent variable, the likelihood of attrition, was entered using a numeric value from the Likert-style answers. For job attribute variables not covered by the burnout and Teacher Follow-Up Survey sections of this instrument, the independent variables were the first ten questions, which included confirmation that participants were K–12 educators, the number of years

participants had been teaching, the number of years at their current school, itinerate teaching status, the numbers of schools/distance between schools if participants were itinerate, music classes taught, non-music classes taught, grades taught, district type, and FTE (full-time equivalency). Any non-numeric data collected was converted to numeric values for analysis. For all independent variable except age, the numeric value given to variables corresponded with the number it was given in the questionnaire option list for participants to choose from. SPSS was prompted to analyze these variables using a linear regression model. After reviewing a model summary table for possible significant predictors of attrition, a covariance table was created so each independent variable could be analyzed for statistical significance.

The independent variables did not significantly predict attrition intention in the sample population ($F(17, 56)= 1.031$, $p= .442$), which indicated too high a p-value to reject the null hypothesis (Table 5).

Table 5. *Linear Regression Analysis of Attrition and Job Attributes*

R	Adjusted R^2	*SE*	*F* change	df 1	df 2	*p*
.488	.007	1.316	1.031	17	56	.442

Note: $*p<.05$. Dependent variable: likelihood of continuing to teach K–12 music (higher value means more likely). Predictors: job attributes (including itinerate status, courses taught, PD/conference attendance, and school tenure).

Migration intention was regressed on burnout factors from the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI). Linear regression analysis was completed using the statical analysis program SPSS. The dependent variable, the likelihood of migration, was entered using a numeric value from the Likert-style answers. For burnout, the independent variables were all sixteen OBLI questions, which were reported as numeric values from the Likert-style questions. SPSS was prompted to analyze these variables using a linear regression model. After reviewing a model

summary table for possible significant predictors of migration, a covariance table was created so each independent variable could be analyzed for statistical significance.

The independent variables significantly predicted attrition intentions in the sample population (Table 26; $F(16, 323)=3.297$, $p<.001$), indicating that burnout significantly predicts attritional intentions. Also, the adjusted R^{2}= .98, suggests that 9.8% of the variance in migration intentions are explained by burnout factors. It is important to note that while these are statistically significant results, 9.8% is a relatively weak relationship between the predicted linear model and the actual data.

Table 6. *Linear Regression Analysis of Migration and Oldenburg Burnout Inventory*

R	Adjusted R^2	*SE*	*F* change	df 1	df 2	*p*
.375	.098	1.218	3.297	16	323	<.001

Note: **p*<.05. Dependent variable: the likelihood of staying at a current job (higher value means more likely). Predictors: Oldenburg Burnout Inventory categories.

Additionally, all independent variables were assessed to find the influence of each factor on this significant result using a SPSS generate covariance table (Table 7). It was found that the feeling of being worn and weary after work (β= -.026, *t*= 1.983, *p*<.05), energy for leisure activities (β= -.288, *t*= -2.718, *p*<.05), management of the amount of work during a given day (β= .370, *t*= 3.003, *p*<.05), and the ability of participants to imagine doing other jobs (β= -.234, *t*= -3.007, *p*<.05) were significant predictors of migration. However, when analyzed on a *t*-table, feeling worn and weary did not have a high enough critical *t* value to be considered a significant predictor. The ability to manage work well and find time for leisure activities were positive predictors of retention. Meanwhile, the ability to imagine working in other fields was a negative predictor of retention.

Table 7. *Direction/Magnitude of Significant Migration and OLBI Variables*

Variable	Beta	*SE*	95% CI Lower Bound	95% CI Upper Bound	*t*	ß	*P*
(Constant)	4.933	.789	3.382	6.485	6.256		<.001
After working, I have enough energy for my leisure activities.	-.288	.106	-.497	-.080	-2.718	-.189	.007*
After my work, I usually feel worn out and weary.	.260	.131	.002	.518	1.983	.169	.048*
This is the only type of work that I can imagine myself doing.	-.234	.076	-.383	-.084	-3.077	-.178	.002*
Usually, I can manage the amount of my work well.	.370	.123	.128	.613	3.003	.189	.003*

*Note: *p*<.05; Dependent variable is the likelihood of staying at a current job for 5+ years. This table only reports significant results (see page 102 for a complete table).

Attrition intention was regressed on burnout factors from the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (Table 8). Linear regression analysis was completed using the statical analysis program SPSS. The dependent variable, the likelihood of attrition, was entered using a numeric value from the Likert-style answers. For burnout, the independent variables were all sixteen OBLI questions, which were reported as numeric values from the Likert-style questions. SPSS was prompted to analyze these variables using a linear regression model. After reviewing a model summary table for possible significant predictors of attrition, a covariance table was created so each independent variable could be analyzed for statistical significance The independent variables significantly predicted attrition intentions ($F(16, 323)=7.470$, $p<.001$), indicating that burnout significantly predicts attritional intentions. Also, the adjusted $R^2= .234$ suggesting that 23.4% of attritional intentions are due to burnout factors.

Table 8. *Linear Regression Analysis of Attrition and Oldenburg Burnout Inventory Items*

R	Adjusted R^2	*SE*	*F* change	df 1	df 2	*p*
.520	.234	1.210	7.470	16	323	<.001

*Note: *p*<.05. Dependent variable: likelihood of continuing to teach K–12 music (higher value means more likely). Predictors: Oldenburg Burnout Inventory categories.

Additionally, all independent variables were assessed to find the influence of each factor on this significant result using as SPSS generated covariance table (Table 9). It was found that energy for leisure activities (β= -.352, *t*= -3.345, p<.001), engagement levels when at work (β= -.557, *t*= -.292, p<.05), management of the amount of work (β= .303, *t*= 2.474, p<.05), negative talk about work (β= .276, *t*= 2.154, p<.05), and the ability of participants to imagine doing other jobs (β= -.356, *t*= -4.721, p<.05) was a significant predictors of migration. However, after further analysis using a t-table, engagement levels during work and negative talk did not have a strong enough critical *t*-value to be considered a statistically significant predictor. The ability to manage work well and find time for leisure activities were positive predictors of retention. It is important to note that some items, including leisure time, were recoded to allow for clearer analysis (i.e., all higher values indicate higher levels of burnout). When reviewing these results, all items with an "(R)" indicate an item that was recoded using the following formula: (max Likert score + 1) – score = reversed score. Meanwhile, the ability to imagine working in other fields was a negative predictor of attrition.

Table 9. *Direction/Magnitude of Sig Attrition and OLBI*

Variable	Beta	*SE*	95% CI Lower Bound	95% CI Upper Bound	*t*	ß	*P*
(Constant)	-.353	.105	-.560	-.145	8.578		<.001
It happens more and more often that I talk about my work in a negative way.	.276	.128	.024	.529	2.154	.171	.034*

After working, I have enough energy for my leisure activities.	-.288	.106	-.497	-.080	-2.718	-.214	<.001*
This is the only type of work that I can imagine myself doing.	-.356	.075	-.508	-.208	-4.721	-.251	<.001*
Usually, I can manage the amount of my work well.	.303	.123	.062	.544	2.474	.143	.014*
I feel more and more engaged in my work.	-.577	.133	-.818	-.296	-4.187	-.292	<.001*

Note: **p*<.05; Dependent variable is the likelihood of teaching K–12 music for 5+ years. This table only reports significant results (see page 104 for a complete table).

Migration intention was regressed on job attributes/career planning factors examined in the NCES's 2008 Teacher Follow-Up Survey (Table 30). Linear regression analysis was completed using the statical analysis program SPSS. The dependent variable, the likelihood of migration, was entered using a numeric value from the Likert-style answers. For job attribute variables covered by the Teacher Follow-Up Survey sections of this instrument, the independent variables were the seventeen questions included in the Likert-style TFS section of the questionnaire. All answers were numeric and were entered as a number between one and five. SPSS was prompted to analyze these variables using a linear regression model. After reviewing a model summary table for possible significant predictors of migration, a covariance table was created so each independent variable could be analyzed for statistical significance.

The independent variables significantly predicted attrition intentions in the sample population ($F(16, 335)=3.731$, $p<.001$), indicating that burnout significantly predicts attritional intentions. Also, the adjusted $R^2= .111$ suggests that 11.1% of the variance in attritional intentions are due to job attributes/career planning factors.

Table 10. *Linear Regression Analysis of Migration and Teacher-Follow-Up Survey Items*

R	Adjusted R^2	*SE*	*F* change	df 1	df 2	*p*

.389	.111	1.211	3.731	16	335	<.001

*Note: *p*<.05. Dependent variable: the likelihood of staying at a current job (higher value means more likely). Predictors: Teacher Follow-Up Survey job attributes/career planning factors.

Additionally, all independent variables were assessed to find the influence of each factor on this significant result using an SPSS generated covariance table (Table 11). It was found that being laid off (β= .179, *t*= 2.486, *p*<.05), pursuing positions outside of K–12 teaching (β= -.287, *t*= -4.8332, *p*< .05), and retiring (β= -1.63, *t*= -3.777, *p*<.05) were significant predictors of migration. However, when analyzed on a t-table, being laid off did not have a high enough critical *t* value to be considered a significant predictor after further analysis. The pursuit of a career outside of education and retirement were negative predictors of retention (specifically non-migration). These results indicate typical career planning patterns (e.g., folks considering retirement will leave their current jobs in the next 5 years) and help support the claim that this instrument is a valid and reliable tool.

Table 11. *Direction/Magnitude of Sig. Migration and Teacher Follow-Up Survey Variables*

Variable	Beta	*SE*	95% CI Lower Bound	95% CI Upper Bound	*T*	ß	*p*
(Constant)	3.551	-.217	3.124	3.978	16.370		<.001
Laid off or transferred involuntarily	.179	.072	.037	.320	2.486	.158	.013*
Leaving K–12 education for other job	-.287	.066	-.417	-.157	-4.332	-.288	<.001*
Retiring soon	-.163	.043	-.248	-.078	-3.777	-.204	<.001*

*Note: *p*<.05; Dependent variable is the likelihood of staying at a current job for 5+ years. This table only reports significant results (see page 106 for a complete table).

Attrition intention was regressed on job attributes examined in the Teacher Follow-Up Survey (Table 12). Linear regression analysis was completed using the statical analysis program SPSS. The dependent variable, the likelihood of attrition, was entered using a numeric value

from the Likert-style answers. For job attribute variables covered by the Teacher Follow-Up Survey sections of this instrument, the independent variables were the seventeen questions included in the Likert-style TFS section of the questionnaire. All answers were numeric and were entered as a number between one and five. SPSS was prompted to analyze these variables using a linear regression model. After reviewing a model summary table for possible significant predictors of attrition, a covariance table was created so each independent variable could be analyzed for statistical significance.

The independent variables significantly predicted attrition intentions in the sample population ($F(16, 335)=8.083$, $p<.001$), indicating that burnout significantly predicts attritional intentions. Also, the adjusted $R^2= .244$ suggests that 24.4% of the variance in attritional intentions are due to job attributes/career planning factors.

Table 12. *Linear Regression Analysis of Attrition and Teacher Follow-Up Survey Items*

R	Adjusted R^2	*SE*	*F* change	df 1	df 2	*P*
.528	.244	1.199	8.083	16	335	<.001

*Note: *p*<.05. Dependent variable: likelihood of continuing to teach K–12 music (higher value means more likely). Predictors: Teacher Follow-Up Survey job attributes and career planning factors.

Additionally, all independent variables were assessed to find the influence of each factor on this significant result using an SPSS generated covariance table (Table 13). It was found that dissatisfaction with student/teacher accountability measures and state testing (β= -.189, *t*= -2.856, *p*<.05), dissatisfaction with teaching as a career (β= .178, *t*= 2.578, *p*<.05), dissatisfaction with professional development (β= -.177, *t*= -2.618, *p*<.05) pursuing positions outside of K–12 teaching (β= -3.79, *t*= -5.780, *p*<.05), and retirement (β= -.225, *t*= 5.259, *p*<.05) were significant predictors of attrition. The pursuit of a career outside of education, dissatisfaction with teacher accountability measures/student testing requirements, dissatisfaction with teaching as a career,

and retirement were negative predictors of retention. Meanwhile, dissatisfaction with professional development opportunities was a positive predictor of retention. Some of these results indicate typical career planning patterns (e.g., folks considering retirement will leave the field of education in the next five years) and help support the claim that this instrument is a valid and reliable tool.

Table 13. *Direction/Magnitude of Sig. Attrition and Teacher Follow-Up Survey Variables*

			95% CI				
Variable	Beta	*SE*	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	*t*	ß	*P*
(Constant)	4.724	.215	4.302	5.147	21.991		<.001
Dissatisfied with professional development	.178	.069	.042	.313	2.578	.150	.010*
Dissatisfied with teaching as a career	-.202	.077	-.353	.-.050	-2.618	-.177	.009*
Leaving K–12 education for other job	-.379	.066	-.508	-.250	-5.780	-.379	<.001*
Retiring soon	-.225	.043	-.309	-.141	-5.254	-.225	<.001*
Taking courses to improve career opportunities within education	.146	.053	-.041	.251	2.734	.145	.007*

*Note: *p*<.05; Dependent variable is the likelihood of staying at a current job for 5+ years. This table only reports significant results (see page 108 for a complete table).

Limitations

The biggest threat to the validity of this study is the potential for overstating results found based on a limited sample. To recruit as many Oregon music educators as possible, an exhaustive list of all schools and school districts from the ODE was used for looking up contact information for participants. This yielded a large sample of 1200 possible participants, 399 (or approximately 33%) participated, yet it only includes results from Oregon music educators and does not include many private school music teachers in Oregon. While the Oregon Music Education Association's database was used to augment the list of public-school music teachers with any known private

school music teachers in Oregon, these names only include music teachers who have participated in OMEA events or attended conferences. This recruitment technique means that many private-school music teachers in remote or isolated districts can be missed in this database.

Another limitation is that participants in this study were only current Oregon music teachers. This means that generalizing results to other music teachers in other states should be limited. The specific pay scale, working conditions, funding policies, and cost of living may be affecting participant answers. In states with lower overall pay scales, salary may be more at play than in Oregon, where the overall pay has fallen only 3% since COVID, compared to the national average teacher pay decrease of 7.8% (NCES, 2022a). A replication of this study that includes participants from all states would offer a more generalizable picture of the current landscape of music teacher attrition/migration intentions.

Similarly, Oregon has relatively smaller urban communities than other states. The largest city in Oregon is Portland, which has a population of approximately 640,000. This is substantially lower than other American cities like New York or Los Angeles which have millions of residents (US Census, 2024). Nowhere in Oregon are teachers working with students who are attending schools in highly populated urban districts. This missing experience in Oregon leaves a gap in the findings that cannot be addressed with only Oregon participants.

Another missing student/teacher population in this study is large military bases with on-base housing and regular relocations for students, like Schofield Barracks in Hawaii or Fort Bragg in North Carolina. Oregon does not have any districts with anticipated and regular transient students, like a large-scale military base. Constant turnover of students may be affecting the decision of teachers to look for new positions or careers, but this metric of teaching was not available for analysis in the Oregon teaching population.

Discussion

Participants in this study showed an intended rate of attrition that more than outpaces the national average. As discussed in the literature review of this study, average national rate of turnover for all industries and turnover types (including migration and dismissal) was less than five percent in 2022 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2024). Of participants planning to change jobs or careers, teachers who were likely movers made up 17.7% of the sample (*f*=64) and participants who were likely leaves made up 11.9% (*f*=43), (see Table 20).

Table 20. *Participant Migration/Attrition Intentions*

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	*N*
How likely are you to continue teaching K–12 music for another five or more years?				
Unlikely	64	17.2%	17.7%	373
Somewhat unlikely	26	7%	7.2%	373
Undecided	84	22.5%	23.3%	373
Somewhat Likely	144	38.6%	39.9%	373
Likely	43	11.5%	11.9%	373
How likely are you to continue teaching at your current job for another five or more years?				
Unlikely	43	11.5%	11.9%	373
Somewhat unlikely	17	4.6%	4.7%	373
Undecided	29	7.8%	8%	373
Somewhat Likely	69	18.5%	19.1%	373
Likely	203	54.4%	56.2%	373

This rate of attrition supports the assertion that turnover in the field of teaching is outpacing other career fields and cannot be explained by the rate of retirement alone.

Descriptive analysis of participants showed that the average age of Oregon music teachers participating in this study was 41, which is similar to the national average of 42 (NCES,

2022a). Participants tend to be more equally represented by gender than the national teacher population, which has more female teachers (NCES, 2022a). Participants did overwhelmingly identify as cisgender, with only five nonbinary participants. It is difficult to know how these frequency results compare to the national population of teachers since only binary male/female data are reported by the IES/NCES (NCES, 2022a).

Music teachers in Oregon are mostly white at a higher rate than the national average, reporting 97% white participants in this study compared to the national average of 80% (NCES, 2022a). A lack of diversity and a primarily white workforce for music teachers has been outlined in other music education research (Matthew & Koner, 2017; Shaw & Auletto, 2022). This lack of diversity could be because the recruiting process for music education programs relies on well-established high school ensemble programs, which tend to serve mostly middle- and upper-class school districts with more funding for these activities. Through historic and systemic racism in US housing practices and school districting guidelines, more affluent schools tend to have more white students (Flournoy, 2021; Harris, 1999; Ryan, 2018).

The average career length of music teachers in Oregon was thirteen years while the average school tenure was seven years, both of which are one year shorter than the average for Oregon teachers in general and teachers nationally (NTPS, 2021). While this does not suggest overly frequent migration rates compared to other careers (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2024), a career length of thirteen years is substantially shorter than the anticipated career length of an American spanning early twenties until the national retirement age of sixty-eight. Oregon music teachers in this study also reported an overall intention to remain in the field, with some indecision about how long they would stay at their current school district. This result implies that teachers are migratory and looking for opportunities for career changes, but mostly within the

field of music education. Salary was not a great concern for participants of this study, but burnout factors were.

Nationally, teachers tend to be evenly split between bachelor's and master's degrees, but in this study, 76% of Oregon music teachers had master's degrees while only 23% teach music with a bachelor's degree (NCES, 2022a). At 56.2%, more Oregon music teachers hold professional teaching licenses while only 32% teach with a preliminary license. Comparing this to a national average is difficult, since the IES/NCES reports only that 90% of teachers work on "regular" licenses, which combines preliminary, professional, teacher leader, and national board licenses into a single category (NCES, 2022a). In Oregon, music teaching is a professional degree and can be taught with a preliminary license with only a bachelor's degree. The higher rate of teachers with master's degrees may be because of the financial incentive on the pay scale for teachers to have their master's degree. It is also possible that the rate of professional licenses in Oregon is higher than preliminary licenses since you can apply for a professional license with a master's degree. While the national average of degrees takes into account general education, where oftentimes a master's degree is required, this study was solely music teachers making the relatively high rate of master's degrees a surprising finding since Oregon stopped requiring a master's degree to teach nearly ten years ago.

When considering salary and general job attributes, descriptive analysis results indicated that these items were not major concerns for Oregon music teachers. Regression analysis also showed that job attributes were not significant predictors of attrition or migration (Tables 4 and 5). One of the most interesting findings was that Oregon music teachers are generally not dissatisfied with their pay (Table 20). This result may be because, compared to the national average, Oregon teachers have better pay. Between 2000 and 2020, the national average salary

for all teachers decreased by 1.3 percent to $61,730 while the average salary for Oregon teachers increased by 1.8% to $64,385 during the same time frame (NCES, 2022a). It may be that salary would be a concern for teachers in states experiencing an overall decrease in pay. It could also be a concern for teachers who are not making salaries so close to the national average, such as those working in West Virginia, who have the lowest average pay and have experienced a 9% decrease in pay between 2000 and 2020 (NCES, 2022a). Additionally, it could be that public school teachers in Oregon have similar pay scales, increasing transparency in pay and overall satisfaction, a solution to migration/attrition suggested by Imazeki (2005). A replication study in a state with different pay conditions would shed more light on these findings.

In addition to outlining possible discrepancies between states based on job attributes, these results also indicate a possible new direction for retention efforts on the part of administrators and recruiters. It seems that burnout is a much more effective predictor of both migration and attrition than job attributes. Focusing retention efforts on facets of burnout, rather than financial incentives, may increase the overall retention rate more effectively.

In this study, the ability to manage work effectively and find time for leisure were positive predictors of retention and intent to remain at current jobs (Tables 9 and 11). One effective method for protecting leisure time and making sure work can be managed during the school day is to protect the prep time of teachers. For Oregon music teachers, this can mean avoiding over 1.0 FTE assignments and finding opportunities to have concerts and other performances during the school day. In addition to concerts, zero-period ensembles, pep bands, marching bands, overnight trips, festivals, and other off-contract commitments are expectations for music teachers. These findings suggest that maximizing the amount of prep time and minimizing the number of off-contract expectations may be essential when trying to retain more

music teachers. If the amount of work that teachers can complete on contract hours feels manageable and can be finished at the end of the workday, the amount of at-home work needed to keep up will be eliminated and maximize the energy and time for leisure teachers will have during the school year.

Eliminating time commitments that fall outside contract hours could be a solution. Less off-contract commitments could be achieved by holding all concerts during the school day. Another solution could be hiring multiple teachers for each school and dividing duties, with one teacher's contract hours starting later in the day. For a band program during sports seasons, one teacher's eight-to-nine-hour working day can encompass marching band and pep band with a later start time while their colleague handles the early morning jazz band rehearsals and leaves campus in the afternoon, with two directors working together to direct overlapping ensembles and plan together on their prep hours. Additionally, the ability to manage the amount of work in a day may increase with experience in the job and the anticipation of the needed demands of busy seasons. However, this possibility was not supported by the regression analysis of demographic factors in this study.

Regression analysis indicated that for every four additional years of age, retention intentions increased by one step on the Likert-style scale utilized in this study (Table 3). If all educators started their careers at the same age, these results would support research in the field that pinpoints early career as the highest risk time for attrition in teachers (Arviv Elyashiv & Navon 2021; Guarino et al., 2006; Henry et al., 2001; Ingersoll, 2001). However, these results were not corroborated with regression analysis of school tenure in either the migration or retention categories. Instead, it seems that the older participants were, the less likely they were to change careers. This result may be because aging participants are closer to retirement age and

less interested in starting a new career, rather than because they have more career experience. Or possibly, the older participants were more likely to have families, a career factor that decrease intended mobility/attrition, as highlighted in other studies (Madsen & Hancock, 2022). Similarly, when interpreting results from the Teacher Follow-Up Survey portion of this survey, it seems that very few of the specific job attributes covered by the TFS have an impact on retention.

Most items from the Teacher Follow-Up Survey in this questionnaire supported the efficacy of the instrument, rather than possible job attributes contributing to attrition/migration. For example, retirement, being laid off, and pursuing new jobs outside of K–12 education were all negative predictors of retention, both in terms of migration and the intent to leave the career. This relation is expected as participants who are planning to leave the profession for one of the above reasons would rate their likelihood of leaving the field of their job accordingly. These results support the claims of validity outlined in the methods section of this paper. While these questions helped illuminate how common each of these factors was in the teaching force as a whole, it is not as relevant to analysis in this study.

In addition to these expected predictors, self-reported dissatisfaction with professional development was a positive predictor of retention (Table 13). Participants who were dissatisfied with professional development may have had more experience, meaning that they were less likely to leave the field because they have experience finding ways to manage their work. It is also possible that participants who are dissatisfied are looking for specific techniques for specific challenges they are facing and PD offerings are rarely targeting their interest areas. This could mean an interaction with the burnout predictors of attrition and TFS items is at play and the ability to manage most work tasks, with only specific exceptions, is causing participant dissatisfaction. Finally, it is possible that simply confidence in pedagogical and instructional

techniques supports both retention in the field and disinterest in professional development opportunities. However, as explored in the review of literature, this would be at odds with other music education research (Fredrickson & Hackworth, 2005).

The last negative predictor of retention in the Teacher Follow-Up Survey items on this questionnaire was "dissatisfaction with school accountability measures, student accountability, or teacher quality measures" (Graham et al., 2011. p. C-42). Higher rates of dissatisfaction with these accountability measures predicted the intention of leaving the field, but not migrating within the field of education. One possible explanation of this is a frustration with educational tasks unrelated to teaching itself. It is also possible that these accountability measures decrease the feeling of control or self-efficacy that teachers feel they have in their careers. Other research supports the claim that higher self-efficacy supports higher satisfaction in teachers (Guarino et al., 2006). Considering leaving the field altogether over these measures, rather than changing districts or schools, may be because of the widespread nature of these measures on a state and national level.

In the comment section of this study, participants supported the themes of leisure time and manageable workloads when explaining their concerns about the career. There were conflicting accounts about autonomy amongst approximately ten participants. Some participants cited autonomy as a positive of their career while others felt unsupported with very little curricular structure or supervision support. Only four participants brought up COVID-19 as a reason for their current frustrations in the career of music teaching, less than one percent of the total sample.

There were two large recurring themes in the comments section; student misbehavior as a factor in burnout and a need for more support from administration, families, and colleagues to

succeed in the career. Participants explained that dealing with student misbehavior often contributed to feelings of ineffectiveness or frustration. In addition, some participants reported that these behaviors felt more frustrating when combined with no consequences or discipline support from administration or students' parents/guardians. Lastly, when outlining the lack of support many participants explained that they felt their colleagues only saw them as "babysitters" or someone to cover their prep. These perceptions were described as a feeling or impression from participants, rather than an account of an interaction or conversation they experienced. While some participants were labelling this as an issue of support, it could be a feeling of isolation or otherness that is causing their perceptions of unease, as outlined in other studies (Ballantyne, 2007; Gallo, 2018).

Perceived lack of support and student misbehavior mentioned by the participants may be similar to the TFS item of "dissatisfaction with school accountability measures, student accountability, or teacher quality measures" (Graham et al., 2011. p. C-42). Both the perceived lack of support and this specific TFS item center around hierarchical relationships in the life of music teachers and the at times punishing measures taken in the name of accountability and rigor. For some commenters, less support meant feeling devalued by their colleagues or losing funding. Their perception was that they were not as valued in the school ecosystem as their colleagues. This action works to destabilize the confidence of teachers and diminish their sense of efficacy in their classroom. It also may raise insecurities about being classified as a quality teacher during observations or contract renewal seasons. The comments that mentioned student behavior outlined frustration at either ineffective ability to manage students, or a lack of support from administrators and parents when measures were taken to address misbehavior. These

concerns mentioned by participants could be reclassified as a lack of student accountability, as phrased in the TFS item.

Implications/Future Research

This study outlined a need for occupational support for music teachers suffering from burnout. The ability to manage all necessary work during contract hours and to pursue leisure activities outside of work can be addressed by adjusting workload and evening activities. It seems that music teachers would be more effectively retained by addressing prep time and off-contract work than by changing job attributes like salary. In addition to finding ways to support teachers' work-life balance, administrators and stakeholders wishing to increase retention in their district should be mindful of the increase in retention intentions with age and satisfaction with accountability measures and student behavior. By supporting the workload and emotional needs of teachers, administrators can help music teachers through their more challenging earlier years and promote longevity.

Participant demographics reflected a mostly white music teaching force, which mirrors national statistics for all teachers and regional studies focusing on music teachers (Guarino et al., 2006; Matthew & Koner, 2017; Shaw & Auletto, 2022; NCES, 2022a). Recruitment efforts need to target people from diverse populations and help students become interested in teaching and find accessible paths to licensure. In addition to finding methods for decreasing the cost of higher education and university-based licensure programs, removing barriers to access in licensure by rethinking what courses are offered to K–12 students and what types of materials and methods courses we offer to preservice licensure candidates could increase diversity in music teachers.

Right now, recruiting music teachers is a challenging task; most future music teachers choose this career during their high school years, but current enrollment in middle school and

high school ensembles reflects low student participation (Bergee et al., 2001; NAEP, 2016). If we are unable to interest a new generation of students in participating in music, it will in turn remain difficult to attract teacher candidates to a field of study that does not reflect their musical experiences and interests. More systemic barriers are evident when the audition requirements for music education majors are examined. Auditioning into a music degree program requires students to sing with the traditional Western bel canto technique or play piano, a concert band instrument, or an orchestral instrument in the classical Western style/tradition. This overlooks representative music-making in our diverse communities. There are tracks beyond band, choir, orchestra, and general music that could be offered in licensure programs. Changing the audition requirements for licensure candidates, and in turn, expanding the musical offerings available to K–12 students could revitalize the field of study and attract a more diverse teaching population.

Teacher licensure programs expanding course offerings and track focuses would give license candidates more autonomy over their training as well. Preservice teachers know what they want to teach, even in our current system of licensure. During their licensure program, they select a track specialty and additional electives they believe will supplement their required course and benefit them the most. They are also able to make their own decisions about career readiness. They may want a more widely marketable degree like licensure in new tracks (e.g., mariachi, secondary general music, music technology, music of indigenous peoples, etc.). Licensure programs should give the option for these endorsements and specialties, instead of forcing a new generation of music teachers to mimic teachers of the past. Adapting to the changing landscape of music is not a new concept. In the 20th century jazz education was academized and adapted for study in higher education, eventually becoming an ensemble offered in the K–12 classroom and covered in licensure programs today. Looking forward music

licensure programs should offer similar options with current musical interests to help the field adapt and endure.

Future research focusing on student behavior and attrition/migration intentions would be illuminating. The comment section of this study suggested that student behavior was a reason a lot of participants were feeling burnout in their current positions and considering migrating to a new job or quitting their careers. Compounding student behavior issues were concerns about lack of support from administration, colleagues, and family, which were similar to the TFS item regarding student, school, and teacher accountability (a negative predictor of retention in this study). Many participants cited a lack of administration and parent support for misbehavior consequences as a reason for their frustration. This concern has been shown to predict attrition and migration in other studies, suggesting more research examining administrator and parental support is an important next step to this study (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Madsen & Hancock, 2002; Matthew & Koner, 2017).

When describing their experiences, participants often cited a lack of funding or livable schedules as evidence of a lack of administrative support. Often, when colleagues were discussed in terms of support, participants would describe the other teachers in their building as belittling. The recurring terms in these comments were “babysitter” and “just prep coverage.” These were described as perceptions of the participants, rather than comments explicitly said by other colleagues. Finally, lack of community support manifested in very low concert attendance and parents who would not support behavior plans or consequences for misbehavior. Future research could examine the dimensions of support needs in music teachers (e.g., what additional support would you like to see from your administrators?) as well as perceptions of support (e.g., who in your community or building supports you the most? What does their support look like?). This

could outline the music teachers' perceptions of support vs. the actual support they receive with examples. Understanding the most effective types of support to offer teachers could maximize career satisfaction by helping stakeholders more effectively support teachers and help teachers themselves advocate for the type of support they would like to see increase in the profession.

Another possible future research topic would be an ethnographic study exploring the manifestations of burnout in music teachers. A study addressing this topic could triangulate perceptions of colleague support, self-reported burnout dimensions, family/partner-reported burnout dimensions, and any artifacts that could act as evidence of burnout pressures (e.g., parent emails, scheduling demands, administration emails, etc.). The results of this study could help pinpoint what signs of burnout are overlooked by teachers themselves and possibly help novice teachers notice the signs of burnout early.

Finally, research testing the efficacy of self-led treatment types in teachers with increasing burnout would help establish safe methods for self-care to address the high levels of burnout in the Oregon teaching population. The US Government's Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration provides generalized guidelines for addressing mental health crises when working in high burnout careers (SAMHSA, 2022). Under the supervision of a licensed therapist, participants in future research could attempt to utilize these self-led techniques to see how effective they are for teacher-specific burnout. This could help create plan for inservice teachers struggling with burnout and prep preservice teachers for how to prevent burnout when starting their new careers.

References

Allegretto, S. A., & Mishel, L. (2016). The teacher pay gap is wider than ever: Teachers' pay continues to fall further behind pay of comparable workers. *Economic Policy Institute*. Retrieved November 14, 2022, from http://epi.org/110964

Almack, J. C. (1920). History of Oregon normal schools. *The Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society*, *21*(2), 95–169.

Arviv Elyashiv, R., & Navon, Y. (2021). Teacher attrition: Human capital and terms of employment – Do they matter? *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *29*(January-July), 76. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.29.5965

Bales, B. L. (2006). Teacher education policies in the United States: The accountability shift since 1980. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *22*(4), 395–407. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.11.009

Ballantyne, J. (2007). Documenting praxis shock in early-career Australian music teachers: The impact of pre-service teacher education. *International Journal of Music Education*, *25*(3), 181–191. https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761407083573

Bates, V. C. B. (2019). Standing at the intersection of race and class in music education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, *18*(1), 117–160. https://doi.org/10.22176/act18.1.117

Bell-Robertson, C. G. (2014). "Staying on our feet": Novice music teachers' sharing of emotions and experiences within an online community. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *61*(4), 431–451. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429413508410

Bergee, M. J., Coffman, D., Demorest, S., Humphreys, J., & Thornton, L. (2001). Influences on collegiate students' decisions to become a music educator. *MENC–The National*

Association for Music Education. Retrieved from http://www.menc.org/resources/view/influences-on-collegiate-students-decision-to-become-a-music-educator

Borman, G. D., & Dowling, N. M. (2008). Teacher attrition and retention: A meta-analytic and narrative review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, *78*(3), 367–409.

Buchanan, J., Prescott, A., Schuck, S., Aubusson, P., Burke, P., & Louviere, J. (2013). Teacher retention and attrition: Views of early career teachers. *The Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *38*(3), 112–129. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2013v38n3.9

Bujang, M. A., Omar, E. D., & Baharum, N. A. (2018). A Review on sample size determination for Cronbach's Alpha test: A simple guide for researchers. *The Malaysian Journal of Medical Sciences : MJMS*, *25*(6), 85–99. https://doi.org/10.21315/mjms2018.25.6.9

Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2019). The trouble with teacher turnover: How teacher attrition affects students and schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *27*(36), 1-32. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.27.3699

Clinton White House Archives (2001). *The Clinton Presidency: Expanding Education Opportunity*. Retrieved March 15, 2024, from https://clintonwhitehouse5.archives.gov/WH/Accomplishments/eightyears-05.html

Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2023). *Common Core State Standards.* http://corestandards.org

Demerouti, E. (2008). The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory: A good alternative to measure burnout and engagement. *Handbook of Stress and Burnout in Health Care*.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Vardakou, I., and Kantas, A., (2003). The convergent Validity of two burnout instruments: A multitrait-multimethod analysis. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment 19*(1), 12–23. https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.19.1.12.

Denton, N. A. (1995). The Persistence of Segregation: Links between residential segregation and school segregation forum: In pursuit of a dream deferred: Linking housing and education. *Minnesota Law Review*, *80*(4), 795–824.

Donaldson, M. & Mavrogordato, M., (2018). Principals and teacher evaluation: The cognitive, relational, and organizational dimensions of working with low-performing teachers. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *56*(6), 586–601. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-08-2017-0100

Down, R. H. (1933). Oregon's century of education. *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, *34*(4), 304–313.

Flournoy, E. (2021). The rising of systemic racism and redlining in the United States of America. *Journal of Social Change*, *13*(1). https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/jsc/vol13/iss1/6

Fredrickson, W. E., & Hackworth, R. S. (2005). Analysis of first-year music teachers' advice to music education students. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, *23*(2), 4–11. https://doi.org/10.1177/87551233050230020102

Futernick, K. (2010). Incompetent teachers or dysfunctional systems? *Phi Delta Kappan*, *92*(2), 59–64. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171009200215

Gallo, D. J. (2018). Mentoring and first-year teacher supports: how do music educators measure up? *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, *217*, 7–26. https://doi.org/10.5406/bulcouresmusedu.217.0007

Garcia, C. M., Slate, J. R., & Delgado, C. T. (2009). Salary and ranking and teacher turnover: A statewide study. *International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership*, *4*(7), 1–8

García, E., Han, E. S., & Weiss, E. (2022). Determinants of teacher attrition: Evidence from district-teacher matched data. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *30*, (25)-(25). https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.30.6642

Gardner, R. D. (2010). Should I stay or should I go? Factors that influence the retention, turnover, and attrition of K–12 music teachers in the United States. *Arts Education Policy Review*, *111*(3), 112–121. https://doi.org/10.1080/10632910903458896

Gardner, D. P., Larson, Y. W., Baker, W. O., Campbell, A., Crosby, E. A., Foster, C. A., Francis, N. C., Giamatti, A. B., Gordon, S., Haderlein, R. V., Holton, G., Kirk, A. y., Marston, M. S., Quie, A. H., Sanchez, F. D., Seaborg, G. T., Sommer, J., Wallace, R., (1983). *A Nation At Risk.* National Commission on Educational Excellence. Retrieved from https://www.reaganfoundation.org/media/130020/a-nation-at-risk-report.pdf

Goldhaber, D., & Cowan, J. (2014). Excavating the teacher pipeline: Teacher preparation programs and teacher attrition. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *65*(5), 449–462. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114542516

Graham, S., Parmer, R., Chambers, L., Tourkin, S., & Lyter, D. M. (2011). *Documentation for the 2008-09 Teacher Follow-up Survey*. National Center for Education Statistics.

Griffin, G. (1997). Teaching as a gendered experience. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *48*(1), 7–19.

Guarino, C. M., Santibañez, L., & Daley, G. A. (2006). Teacher recruitment and retention: A review of the recent empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research*, *76*(2), 173–208. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543076002173

Guarino, C. M., Santibañez, L., & Daley, G. A. (2006). Teacher recruitment and retention: A review of the recent empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research*, *76*(2), 173–208. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543076002173

Hancock, C. B. (2009). National estimates of retention, migration, and attrition: A multiyear comparison of music and non-music teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *57*(2), 92–107. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429409337299

Haning, M. (2021). Identity formation in music teacher education: the role of the curriculum. *International Journal of Music Education*, *39*(1), 39–49. https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761420952215

Hanson, M. (2022), U.S. public education spending statistics: Per pupil + total. *Education Data Initiative*. Retrieved January 17, 2023, from https://educationdata.org/public-education-spending-statistics

Harris, D. R. (1999). "Property values drop when blacks move in, because...": Racial and socioeconomic determinants of neighborhood desirability. *American Sociological Review*, *64*(3), 461–49.

Henry, G. T., Bastian, K. C., & Fortner, C. K. (2011). Stayers and leavers: Early-career teacher effectiveness and attrition. *Educational Researcher*, *40*(6), 271–280. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X11419042

Holloway, J., & Brass, J. (2018). Making accountable teachers: The terrors and pleasures of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, *33*(3), 361–382. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2017.1372636

Howard, C. A. (1923). A History of high school legislation in Oregon to 1910. *The Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society*, *24*(3), 201–237.

Imazeki, J. (2005). Teacher salaries and teacher attrition. *Economics of Education Review*, *24*(4), 431–449. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2004.07.014

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, *38*(3), 499-534. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038003499

Ingersoll, R. M. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, *60*(8), 30– 33.

Jackson, B. A., & Reynolds, J. R. (2013). The price of opportunity: Race, student loan debt, and college achievement. *Sociological Inquiry*, *83*(3), 335–368. https://doi.org/10.1111/soin.12012

Jacob, B. A. (2011). Do principals fire the worst teachers? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *33*(4), 403–434. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373711414704

Jorgenson, L. P. (1968). The Oregon school law of 1922: Passage and sequel. *The Catholic Historical Review*, *54*(3), 455–466.

Kane, T. J., Rockoff, J. E., & Staiger, D. O. (2008). What does certification tell us about teacher effectiveness? Evidence from New York City. *Economics of Education Review*, *27*, 615-631.

Kelchtermans, G. (2017). 'Should I stay or should I go?': Unpacking teacher attrition/retention as an educational issue. *Teachers and Teaching*, *23*(8), 961–977. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2017.1379793

Maciag, M. (2015). Gentrification in America report. (2015, January 23). *Governing*. https://www.governing.com/archive/gentrification-in-cities-governing-report.html

Madsen, C. K. (Ed.) (2003). *Vision 2020: The Housewright symposium on the future of music education* Music Educators National Conference.

Madsen, C. K., & Hancock, C. B. (2002). Support for music education: A case study of issues concerning teacher retention and attrition. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 50*(1), 6–19. https://doi.org/10.2307/3345689

Mann, H. (1844/2013). Report on vocal music in schools. In M. L. Mark. (Ed.) *Music Education: Source readings from ancient Greece to today.* (4th ed.) Routledge. (Originally published in 1844).

Mark, M. L. (2003). "MENC: From Tanglewood to present." In C.K. Madsen (Ed) *Vision 2020: The Housewright symposium on the future of music education* Music Educators National Conference.

Mark, M. L. (2008). *A concise history of American music education.* Rowman and Littlefield Education.

Mark, M. L. (2013a). *Contemporary music education.* (4th ed.). Schirmer Books.

Mark, M. L., (2013b) *Music education: Source readings from ancient Greece to today*. (4th ed.) Routledge.

Mark, M. L., and Gary, C. L., (2007). *A history of American music education* (3rd ed.). Rowman and Littlefield Education.

Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). Maslach burnout inventory: Third edition. In *Evaluating stress: A book of resources* (pp. 191–218). Scarecrow Education.

Mason, L. (1834/2013). Manual on the Boston academy of music. In M. L. Mark. (Ed.) *Music Education: Source readings from ancient Greece to today.* (4th ed.) Routledge. (Originally published in 1834).

McCord, K. (2016). Why we must have diversity and equity in the arts: A response to the National Association for Music Education. Alternate Roots. https://alternateroots.org/why-we-must-have-inclusion-diversity-and-equity-in-the-arts-a-response-to-the-national-association-for-music-education/

Millner, D. (2021). Blacks in Oregon. *The Oregon Encyclopedia*. https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/black_studies_fac/91

Missouri Economic Research and Information Center (MERIC), (2022). *Cost of living data series*. Retrieved March 21, 2023, from https://meric.mo.gov/data/cost-living-data-series

Munroe, A. M. (2022). Novice and experienced music teacher resilience: A comparative case study. *Research Studies in Music Education*, *44*(1), 99–109. https://doi.org/10.1177/1321103X211023248

National Assessment of Educational Progress. (2016). Arts assessment: grade 8. *The Nation's Report Card. https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/arts_2016/#/music/overall-results*

National Association for Music Education. (2023). *"Vision 2020: Housewright declaration.* https://nafme.org/my-classroom/journals-magazines/nafme-online-publications/vision-2020-housewright-declaration/

National Association for Music Education. (2023). *2014 Music Standards.* https://nafme.org/my-classroom/standards/core-music-standards/

National Coalition for Core Arts Standards. (2015). *National Core Arts Standards.* https://www.nationalartsstandards.org/

National Education Association, (2020). *ESSA and Testing | NEA*. Retrieved February 1, 2023, from https://www.nea.org/resource-library/essa-and-testing

National Center for Education Statistics (2022a). Characteristics of public-school teachers.

National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS) (2022). Retrieved November 28, 2023, from https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ntps/tables_list.asp

National Center for Education Statistics (2022b). Racial/ethnic enrollment in public schools. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cge/racial-ethnic-enrollment

National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS) Dashboard. (2018). Retrieved March 21, 2023, from https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ntps/ntpsdashboard/Dashboard/OR

Nedea, D., (2020), Oldenburg burnout inventory (OLBI) calculator.). *MDApp.co.* Retrieved September 26, 2023, from https://www.mdapp.co/oldenburg-burnout-inventory-olbi-calculator-606/

Oregon Department of Education (2022). *The arts.* https://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/standards/arts/Pages/default.aspx

Orfield, G. (1983). *Public school desegregation in the United States, 1968—1980.* https://escholarship.org/uc/item/85w788b9

Reininger, M. (2012). Hometown disadvantage? It depends on where you're from: Teachers' location preferences and the implications for staffing schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 34*(2), 127-145.

Robison, T., & Russell, J. A. (2022). Factors impacting elementary general music teachers' career decisions: systemic issues of student race, teacher support, and family. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *69*(4), 425–443. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429421994898

Ronfeldt, M., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2013). How teacher turnover harms student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, *50*(1), 4-36.

Ryan, H. (2018). Research report: Were the HOLC residential security maps the origin of redlining? *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, *119*(4), 538–544.

Scheib, J. W. (2006). Policy implications for teacher retention: meeting the needs of the dual identities of arts educators. *Arts Education Policy Review*, *107*(6), 5–10. https://doi.org/10.3200/AEPR.107.6.5-10)

Shaw, R. D., & Auletto, A. (2022). Is music education in tune with the pursuit of equity? An examination of access to music education in Michigan's schools. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *69*(4), 364–381. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429421989961

Smith, G. (2018). "Congenial neighbors": Restrictive covenants and residential segregation in Portland, Oregon. *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, *119*(3), 358–364. https://doi.org/10.1353/ohq.2018.0006\

Spelling, M., (2008). *25 years after a nation at risk*. US Department of Education. Retrieved March 15, 2024, from https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/research/pubs/risk25.html

Steeves, K. A., Bernhardt, P. E., Burns, J. P., & Lombard, M. K. (2009). Transforming American educational identity after Sputnik. *American Educational History Journal*, *36*(1/2), 71–87.

Stone, J. E. (1999). The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education: Whose standards? *Better Teachers Better Schools.*

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration (SAMHA), (2022). *Addressing burnout in the behavioral health workforce through organizational strategies*.

Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education, 2,* 53–55. https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd

Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (2023) *First time license.* https://www.oregon.gov/tspc/LIC/Pages/First-Time-License.aspx

Thomas-Durrell, L. (2020). Being your "true self": the experiences of two gay music educators who teach in the Bible Belt. *Music Education Research, 22*(1), 29–41. Academic Search Premier.

Tyack, D. (1967). Bureaucracy and the common school: The example of Portland, Oregon, 1851-1913. *American Quarterly*, *19*(3), 475–498. https://doi.org/10.2307/2711068

US Census Bureau. *U.S. census bureau quickfacts: Oregon*. (2020). Retrieved February 6, 2024, from https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/OR/INC110222

U.S. Department of Education (2023b) *History of individuals with disabilities education act (IDEA).* https://sites.ed.gov/idea/IDEA-History#1950s-60s-70s

U.S. Department of Education. (2023). *Every student succeeds act (ESSA).* https://www.ed.gov/essa?src=rn

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2024.). *Industries at a glance.:* Retrieved February 20, 2024, from https://www.bls.gov/iag/home.htm

Walker, B. D. (1984). The local property tax for public schools: Some historical perspectives. *Journal of Education Finance*, *9*(3), 265–288.

Wang, K., Rathburn, A., & Musu, L. (2019). School choice in the United States: 2019. NCES 2019-106. In *National Center for Education Statistics*. National Center for Education Statistics. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED598472

Weishart, J. E. (2022). Right to teach. *UC Davis Law Review*, *56*, 817–886.

Wiggins, G. P. & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by Design (Expanded Second Edition).* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wong, K. K. (2020). Education policy Trump style: The administrative presidency and deference to states in ESSA implementation. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, *50*(3), 423–445. https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjaa016

Appendix A

You are being asked to participate in a research study. The box below highlights key information about this research for you to consider when deciding whether or not to participate. Carefully consider this information and the more detailed information provided below the box. Please ask questions about any of the information you do not understand before you decide whether to participate.

Key Information for You to Consider
● **Voluntary Consent**. You are being asked to volunteer for a research study. It is up to you whether you choose to participate or not. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled if you choose not to participate or discontinue participation. ● **Purpose**. The purpose of this research is to collect information about job attributes and music teachers' intentions to continue working in the profession. ● **Duration.** It is expected that your participation will last 5-10 minutes. ● **Procedures and Activities.** You will be asked to complete a brief online survey. ● **Risks.** There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts associated with your participation. ● **Benefits**. There are no direct benefits to participation benefit, but the researchers hope to learn about the relationship between job attributes and music teacher attrition rates. ● **Alternatives.** Participation is voluntary and the only alternative is to not participate.

What happens to the information collected for this research?

Your name will not be used in any way during this study. We may publish/present the results of this research. However, we will not collect your name and other identifying information.

How will my privacy and data confidentiality be protected?

We will take measures to protect your privacy including not collecting any identifiable information and keeping nonidentifiable information on a password-protected computer only.

Despite taking steps to protect your privacy, we can never fully guarantee your privacy will be protected.

Individuals and organizations that conduct or monitor this research may be permitted access to and inspect the research records. These individuals and organizations include the Institutional Review Board (IRB) that reviewed this research.

What if I want to stop participating in this research?

Taking part in this research study is your decision. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You do not have to take part in this study, but if you do, you can stop at any time. You have the right to choose not to participate in any study activity or completely withdraw from continued participation at any point in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your relationship with the researchers or the University of Oregon.

If you have questions, or concerns, or have experienced a research-related injury, contact the research team at:

[Olivia Salzman-Coon]
[541-232-0286]
[osalzma2@uoregon.edu]

An Institutional Review Board ("IRB") is overseeing this research. An IRB is a group of people who perform an independent review of research studies to ensure the rights and welfare of participants are protected. UO Research Compliance Services is the office that supports the IRB. If you have questions about your rights or wish to speak with someone other than the research team, you may contact:

Research Compliance Services
5237 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-5237
(541) 346-2510
ResearchCompliance@uoregon.edu

STATEMENT OF CONSENT

I have had the opportunity to read and consider the information in this form. I have asked any questions necessary to make a decision about my participation. I understand that I can ask additional questions throughout my participation. I understand that by clicking "I agree" below, I volunteer to participate in this research. I understand that I am not waiving any legal rights. I have been provided with a copy of this consent form. I understand that if my ability to consent or assent for myself changes, either I or my legal representative may be asked to re-consent prior to my continued participation in this study.

Appendix B

Hello,

My name is Olivia Salzman-Coon and I am a PhD student in music education at the University of Oregon. You are receiving this letter since you are a current music teacher in the state of Oregon. As part of my dissertation research at the UO, I am examining the relationship between job attributes and retention among Oregon music teachers. This study could inform retention practices for k–12 music teachers. The entire process takes five to ten minutes and can be completed using a smartphone or computer. I would really appreciate your participation!

If you are interested in participating in this research, please follow the link below to begin the survey. This survey was approved by the University of Oregon's Institutional Review Board and will begin with informed consent material.

The survey link can be found here:

The link will be here when the survey is published and shareable.

Please reach out any time with questions.

Thank you for your time,

Olivia

Appendix C

Hello,

My name is Olivia Salzman-Coon and I am a PhD student in music education at the University of Oregon. I'm contacting you today about a study I'm working on that may help inform retention practices for music teachers in the state. I this stage in my study, I'm working on getting in touch with as many music teachers in the state as possible to complete a brief 5-10 minute survey.

If possible, could you please forward the message below to music teachers in your district? I would appreciate the help very much! Please reach out at any time with questions or concerns.

Thank you for your time,

Olivia

Message for Music teachers in your district:

My name is Olivia Salzman-Coon and I am a PhD student in music education at the University of Oregon. You are receiving this letter because you are a current music teacher in the state of Oregon. As part of my dissertation research at the UO, I am examining the relationship between job attributes and retention among Oregon music teachers. This study could inform retention practices for k–12 music teachers. The entire process takes five to ten minutes and can be completed using a smartphone or computer. I would really appreciate your participation!

If you are interested in participating in this research, please follow the link below to begin the survey. This survey was approved by the University of Oregon's Institutional Review Board and will begin with informed consent material.

The survey link can be found here:

The link will be here when the survey is published and shareable.

Please reach out any time with questions.

Thank you for your time,

Olivia

Appendix D

Job Attribute Survey

Q1.2 Are you a K-12 music educator? Note: if "no" was the answer to Q1.2, the survey was automatically ended.

1. Yes
2. No

Q2.1 How many years have you been teaching K-12 music?

Q2.2 How many years have you been teaching at your current school?

Q2.3 Are you an itinerate (traveling) music teacher?

1. Yes
2. No

Q2.4 How many schools do you teach at?

Q2.5 What is the approximate distance between your schools (in miles)? Note: this question was only displayed if two or more schools were entered for Q2.4.

Q2.6 What in-school music classes do you teach (check all that apply)?

1. General Music
2. Band
3. Choir
4. Orchestra
5. Music Technology
6. Group Instrument classes (e.g., keyboarding, guitar, etc.)
7. AP Music Theory
8. Music History
9. Chamber or instrument-specific classes (e.g., quartet or percussion ensemble)

10. Other: please explain.

Q2.7 What in-school non-music classes do you teach (check all that apply)?

1. None
2. Math
3. PE
4. Science
5. Health
6. AVID
7. Language Arts
8. Theater
9. Year Book
10. Foreign Language
11. Other: please explain.

Q2.8 What grades do you teach?

1. K-5th grade
2. K-8th grade
3. 6th-8th grade
4. 6th-12th grade
5. 9th-12th grade
6. K-12th grade
7. Other: please explain.

Q2.9 How would you describe your school district?

1. Large city
2. Small city
3. Suburban

4. Small town
5. Multiple towns/incorporated district
6. Farming community
7. Other: please explain.

Q2.10 What is your full-time equivalency (FTE)?

1. Part-time (less than 1.0 FTE)
2. Full-time
3. Other: please explain.

Q2.11 How likely are you to continue teaching K-12 music for another five or more years?

1. Unlikely
2. Somewhat unlikely
3. Undecided
4. Somewhat likely
5. Likely

Q2.12 How likely are you to continue teaching at your current job for another five or more years?

1. Unlikely
2. Somewhat unlikely
3. Undecided
4. Somewhat likely
5. Likely

Q2.13 How much are certain job factors affecting your career decisions?

	Not Important at all	Slightly Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
I am going to retire.					
I am being laid off, involuntarily transferred, or my contract will not be renewed					
My school is going to be reorganized or closed.					
I am dissatisfied with changes in my job description or responsibilities.					
I wanted better salary or benefits.					
I decided to pursue a position other than that of a K–12 teacher.					
I decided to take courses to improve career opportunities WITHIN the field of education.					
I decided to take courses to improve career opportunities OUTSIDE the field of education.					
I am dissatisfied with teaching as a career.					
I am dissatisfied with workplace conditions (e.g., facilities, classroom resources, school safety) at my previous school.					
I am dissatisfied with the administrator(s) at my school (e.g., lack of communication with respect, encouragement to change teaching methods, working with staff to meet curriculum standards, and encouragement of professional collaboration).					
I do not have enough autonomy over my classroom.					
I am dissatisfied with opportunities for professional development.					
I feel job security should be higher					
I have an opportunity for a better work assignment.					
I am dissatisfied with how student assessments, school accountability, or teacher quality measures impact my teaching.					
I am dissatisfied with the number of students I teach.					

Q2.14 What conferences have you attended in the past five years?

1. OMEA/NAfME
2. ACDA
3. ASTA
4. WIBC
5. None
6. Other: please explain.

Q2.15 What affects your decision to attend conferences?

1. Sub availability
2. Administrator approval for leave time
3. District funding for the conference/travel expenses
4. Lack of interest
5. Other: please explain.

Q2.16 Below you find a series of statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the scale, please indicate the degree of your agreement by selecting the number that corresponds with each statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I always find new and interesting aspects in my work.				
There are days when I feel tired before I arrive at work.				
It happens more and more often that I talk about my work in a negative way.				
After work, I tend to need more time than in the past in order to relax and feel better.				
I can tolerate the pressure of my work very well.				
Lately, I tend to think less at work and do my job almost mechanically.				
I find my work to be a positive challenge.				
During my work, I often feel emotionally drained.				
Over time, one can become disconnected from this type of work.				
After working, I have enough energy for my leisure activities.				
Sometimes I feel sickened by my work tasks.				
After my work, I usually feel worn out and weary.				
This is the only type of work that I can imagine myself doing.				
Usually, I can manage the amount of my work well.				
I feel more and more engaged in my work.				
When I work, I usually feel energized.				

Q2.17 Is there any other information you would like me to know about your job attributes, perceived stress, or workload?

1. No
2. Yes: please explain.

Q3.1 What is your age (in years)?

Q3.2 How would you describe your gender (please choose only one)?

1. Male
2. Female

3. Transgender
4. Nonbinary/ Non Gender Conforming
5. Other: please explain.

Q3.3 Which race or ethnicity best describes you (please choose only one)?

1. American Indian or Alaska Native
2. Asian
3. Black or African American
4. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
5. White/Caucasian
6. Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin
7. Multiethnic/Other: please explain.

Q3.4 What is the highest level of education have you completed?

1. Bachelor's degree in music education
2. Master's degree in music education
3. Doctoral degree in music education
4. Bachelor's degree in other area: please explain.
5. Master's degree in other area: please explain.
6. Doctoral degree in other area: please explain.
7. Other: please explain.

Q3.5 What is your current licensure status in Oregon (check all that apply)?

1. Restricted teaching license
2. Preliminary teaching license with music specialization/endorsement
3. Professional teaching license with music specialization/endorsement
4. Reciprocal teaching license with music specialization/endorsement

5. Teacher leader license with music specialization/endorsement
6. National Board Certification with music certificate
7. Non-musical specialization/endorsement: please explain.

Q3.6 How long until you plan on obtaining full licensure (in years)? Note: this question was only displayed if "1. Restricted teaching license" was selected as an answer for Q3.5.

Q3.7 What additional certifications/ trainings have you completed?

1. Orff Schulwerk Training (Level I, II, or III)
2. Kodaly Certification (Level I, II, or III)
3. Dalcroze Certification
4. FAME Certification (First Steps or any level of Conversational Solfege)
5. ACDA/OMEA/OSAA Certified Adjudicator
6. OBDA/OSAA Certified Adjudicator
7. None
8. Other: please explain.

Q3.8 Did you attend school (at the K-12 level) in the state of Oregon?

1. Yes
2. No

Q3.9 How would you describe the school district you attended as a student?

1. Large city
2. Small city
3. Suburban
4. Small town
5. Multiple towns/incorporated district
6. Farming community
7. Other: please explain.

Appendix E

Question Series F (from *Documentation for the 2008-2009 Teacher Follow-Up Survey*)

Indicate the level of importance EACH of the following played in your decision to leave the position of a K–12 teacher.

(The following scale is used for the items below: 1) Not at all important, 2) Slightly important, 3) Somewhat important, 4) Very important, 5) Extremely important)

a. This year's job is closer to my home.

b. I (or my partner) was pregnant or needed more time for childrearing.

c. My health or the health of a loved one required that I leave the profession.

d. I decided to retire.

e. I was laid off, involuntarily transferred, or my contract was not renewed.

f. My previous school was reorganized or closed.

g. I was dissatisfied with changes in my job description or responsibilities at my previous school.

h. I wanted better salary or benefits that what I received at my previous school.

i. I decided to pursue a position other than that of a K–12 teacher.

j. I decided to take courses to improve career opportunities WITHIN the field of education.

k. I decided to take courses to improve career opportunities OUTSIDE the field of education.

l. I was dissatisfied with teaching as a career.

m. I was dissatisfied with work place conditions (e.g., facilities, classroom resources, school safety) at my previous school.

n. I was dissatisfied with the administrator(s) at my previous school (e.g., lack of: communicating respect, encouragement to change teaching methods, working with staff to meet curriculum standards, encouragement professional collaboration).

o. I did not have enough autonomy over my classroom at my previous school.

p. I was dissatisfied with opportunities for professional development at my previous school.

q. I felt job security would be higher at this year's job.

r. I had an opportunity for a better work assignment at this year's job.

s. I was dissatisfied with how student assessments, school accountability, or teacher quality measures impacted my teaching at my previous school.

t. I was dissatisfied with the large number of students I taught in my previous school. (Graham, et. al., 2011).

Appendix F

Oldenberg Burnout Inventory (OBLI)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I always find new and interesting aspects in my work.	1	2	3	4
There are days when I feel tired before I arrive at work.	1	2	3	4
It happens more and more often that I talk about my work in a negative way.	1	2	3	4
After work, I tend to need more time than in the past in order to relax and feel better.	1	2	3	4
I can tolerate the pressure of my work very well.	1	2	3	4
Lately, I tend to think less at work and do my job almost mechanically.	1	2	3	4
I find my work to be a positive challenge.	1	2	3	4
During my work, I often feel emotionally drained.	1	2	3	4
Over time, one can become disconnected from this type of work.	1	2	3	4
After working, I have enough energy for my leisure activities.	1	2	3	4
Sometimes I feel sickened by my work tasks.	1	2	3	4
After my work, I usually feel worn out and weary.	1	2	3	4
This is the only type of work that I can imagine myself doing.	1	2	3	4
Usually, I can manage the amount of my work well.	1	2	3	4
I feel more and more engaged in my work.	1	2	3	4
When I work, I usually feel energized.	1	2	3	4

(Nedea, 2020)

Appendix G

Table 1. *Linear Regression Analysis of Migration and Participant Demographics.*

R	Adjusted R^2	*SE*	*F* change	df 1	df 2	*p*
.284	.007	1.284	1.091	25	310	.351

Note: **p*<.05. Dependent variable: likelihood of staying at current job (higher value means more likely). Predictors: demographics (including license, certification, age, gender, race, and education level

Appendix H

Table 2. *Linear Regression Analysis of Attrition and Participant Demographics.*

R	Adjusted R^2	*SE*	*F* change	df 1	df 2	*p*
.377	.073	1.338	2.060	25	310	.003

*Note: *p*<.05. Dependent variable: likelihood of continuing to teach K–12 music (higher value means more likely). Predictors: demographics (including license, certification, age, gender, race, and education level.

Appendix I

Table 3. *Direction/Magnitude of Sig. Attrition and Participant Demographic Variables*

Variable	Beta	*SE*	95% CI Lower Bound	95% CI Upper Bound	*t*	ß	*p*
(Constant)	3.808	.896	2.045	5.571	4.250		<.001
Age	-.024	.010	-.045	-.004	-2.371	-.230	.018*
Gender	-.064	.121	-.302	.175	-.525	-.030	.600
Race/Ethnicity	.024	.119	-.211	.258	.200	.012	.841
Career Length	-.002	.101	-.045	-.004	-.116	-.012	.908
Attended K12 in OR as student	.058	.150	-.236	.352	.388	.022	.352
Preliminary teaching license (with music endorsement)	-.239	.430	-1.085	.606	-.557	-.087	.579
Professional teaching license (with music endorsement)	-.222	.444	-1.096	.652	-.499	-.085	.618
Teacher leader license with music specialization/endorsement	.271	.606	-.922	1.464	.448	.034	.655
National Board Certification (with music endorsement)	.091	.640	-1.167	1.350	1.43	.009	.887
Restricted teaching license	-.280	.561	-1.383	.823	-.499	-.039	.618
Non-musical specialization/endorsement	-.200	.440	-1.067	.666	-.455	-.035	.649
Bachelor's degree in music education (highest level of education)	.119	.277	2.045	5.571	.429	.039	.668
Master's degree in music education (highest level of education)	.449	.275	-.092	.991	1.633	.174	.103
PhD in music education (highest level of education)	1.301	.752	-.178	2.781	1.731	.110	.085
Bachelor's degree in other area of specialty (highest level of education)	.366	.306	-.236	.967	1.196	.081	.233
Master's degree in other area of specialty (highest level of education)	.322	.242	.154	.799	1.333	.115	.184
PhD in other area of specialty (highest level of education)	.534	.641	-.727	1.796	.834	.055	.405
Kodaly Certified	.047	.256	-.457	.551	.182	.013	.856

Orff Schulwerk Certified (any level)	.234	.257	-.272	.740	.910	.069	.364
Dalcroze Certified							
FAME Certified (any level)	-.211	.348	-.896	.474	-.606	-.037	.545
ACDA/OSAA/OMEA adjudicator certified	-.259	.480	-1.203	.686	-.539	-.034	.590
OBDA/OSAA/OMEA adjudicator certified							
Other certification/training	.157	.286	-.405	.719	.549	.038	.583
No additional certification/training	.110	.275	-.403	.651	.402	.042	.688

*Note: *p*<.05; Dependent variable is the likelihood of staying at current job for 5+ years.

Appendix J

Table 4. *Linear Regression Analysis of Migration and Job Attributes*

R	Adjusted R^2	*SE*	*F* change	df 1	df 2	*p*
.394	-.101	1.223	.606	17	56	.873

*Note: *p*<.05. Dependent Variable: likelihood of staying at current job (higher value means more likely). Predictors: job attributes (including itinerate status, courses taught, PD/conference attendance, and school tenure).

Appendix K

Table 5. *Linear Regression Analysis of Attrition and Job attributes*

R	Adjusted R^2	*SE*	*F* change	df 1	df 2	*p*
.488	.007	1.316	1.031	17	56	.442

*Note: *p*<.05. Dependent variable: likelihood of continuing to teach K–12 music (higher value means more likely). Predictors: job attributes (including itinerate status, courses taught, PD/conference attendance, and school tenure).

Appendix L

Table 6. *Linear Regression Analysis of Migration and Oldenburg Burnout Inventory*

R	Adjusted R^2	*SE*	*F* change	df 1	df 2	*p*
.375	.098	1.218	3.297	16	323	<.001

*Note: *p*<.05. Dependent variable: likelihood of staying at current job (higher value means more likely). Predictors: Oldenburg Burnout Inventory categories.

Appendix M

Table 7. *Direction/Magnitude of Significant Migration and OLBI Variables*

Variable	Beta	*SE*	95% CI Lower Bound	95% CI Upper Bound	*t*	ß	*p*
(Constant)	4.933	.789	3.382	6.485	6.256		<.001
There are days when I feel tired before I arrive at work.	-.216	.128	-.468	,036	-1.685	-.116	
It happens more and more often that I talk about my work in a negative way.	.212	.129	-.042	.467	1.645	.142	.101
After work, I tend to need more time than in the past in order to relax and feel better.	-.108	.110	-.325	.109	-.978	-.078	.329
I can tolerate the pressure of my work very well.	-.052	.125	-.297	.193	-.415	-.029	.679
Lately, I tend to think less at work and do my job almost mechanically.	-.113	.105	-.320	.094	-1.074	-.065	.284
I find my work to be a positive challenge.	.007	.143	-.274	.288	.050	.004	.960
During my work, I often feel emotionally drained.	-.217	.118	-.448	.015	-1.844	-1.48	.066
Over time, one can become disconnected from this type of work.	.081	.089	-.094	.255	.907	.055	.365
After working, I have enough energy for my leisure activities.	-.288	.106	-.497	-.080	-2.718	-.189	.007*
Sometimes I feel sickened by my work tasks.	-.052	.104	-.257	.154	-.496	-.035	.620
After my work, I usually feel worn out and weary.	.260	.131	.002	.518	1.983	.169	.048*
This is the only type of work that I can imagine myself doing.	-.234	.076	-.383	-.084	-3.077	-.178	.002*
Usually, I can manage the amount of my work well.	.370	.123	.128	.613	3.003	.189	.003*
I feel more and more engaged in my work.	-.170	.134	-.433	.093	-1.271	-.096	.205
When I work, I usually feel energized	-.090	.130	-.347	.166	-.691	-.050	.490

Note: **p*<.05; Dependent variable is the likelihood of staying at current job for 5+ years.

Appendix N

Table 8. *Linear Regression Analysis of Attrition and Oldenburg Burnout Inventory Items*

R	Adjusted R^2	*SE*	*F* change	df 1	df 2	*p*
.520	.234	1.210	7.470	16	323	<.001

Note: $*p<.05$. Dependent variable: likelihood of continuing to teach K–12 music (higher value means more likely). Predictors: Oldenburg Burnout Inventory categories.

Appendix O

Table 9. *Direction/Magnitude of Sig Attrition and OLBI*

Variable	Beta	*SE*	95% CI Lower Bound	95% CI Upper Bound	*t*	ß	*p*
(Constant)	-.353	.105	-.560	-.145	8.578		<.001
There are days when I feel tired before I arrive at work.	-.204	.127	-.454	.047	-1.598	-.101	.111
It happens more and more often that I talk about my work in a negative way.	.276	.128	.024	.529	2.154	.171	.034*
After work, I tend to need more time than in the past in order to relax and feel better.	-.005	.110	-.221	.210	-.047	-.003	.963
I can tolerate the pressure of my work very well.	-.029	.124	-.273	.214	-.235	-.015	.814
Lately, I tend to think less at work and do my job almost mechanically.	-.191	.105	-.396	.015	-1.824	-.101	.069
I find my work to be a positive challenge.	.008	.142	-.271	.287	.057	.004	.954
During my work, I often feel emotionally drained.	-.024	.117	-.254	.206	-.204	-.015	.838
Over time, one can become disconnected from this type of work.	-.007	.088	-.181	.166	-.082	-.005	.935
After working, I have enough energy for my leisure activities.	-.288	.106	-.497	-.080	-2.718	-.214	<.001*
Sometimes I feel sickened by my work tasks.	.109	.104	-.095	.313	1.051	.069	.294
After my work, I usually feel worn out and weary.	-.200	.130	-.456	.056	-1.534	-.121	.126
This is the only type of work that I can imagine myself doing.	-.356	.075	-.508	-.208	-4.721	-.251	<.001*
Usually, I can manage the amount of my work well.	.303	.123	.062	.544	2.474	.143	.014*
I feel more and more engaged in my work.	-.577	.133	-.818	-.296	-4.187	-.292	<.001*
When I work, I usually feel energized	-.076	.130	-.331	.179	-.587	-.039	.588

*Note: *p*<.05; Dependent variable is the likelihood of teaching K–12 music for 5+ years.

Appendix P

Table 10. *Linear Regression Analysis of Migration and Teacher-Follow Up Survey Items*

R	Adjusted R^2	*SE*	*F* change	df 1	df 2	*p*
.389	.111	1.211	3.731	16	335	<.001

*Note: *p*<.05. Dependent variable: likelihood of staying at current job (higher value means more likely). Predictors: Teacher Follow-Up Survey job attributes/career planning factors.

Appendix Q

Table 11. *Direction/Magnitude of Sig. Migration and Teacher Follow-Up Survey Variables*

Variable	Beta	*SE*	95% CI Lower Bound	95% CI Upper Bound	*t*	ß	*p*
(Constant)	3.551	-.217	3.124	3.978	16.370		<.001
Dissatisfied with changes in job description or responsibilities	.024	.217	-.114	.163	.348	.000	.728
Dissatisfied with student assessments, school accountability, or teacher quality measures	.000	.067	.000	-.131	.007	.000	.995
Dissatisfied with professional development	.117	.070	-.019	.254	1.689	.106	.092
Dissatisfied with teaching as a career	-.076	.078	-.229	.077	-.972	-.071	.332
Dissatisfied with admins at my school	-.124	.070	-.262	.014	-1.770	-.143	.078
Dissatisfied with the number of students in my class	.009	.062	-.112	.130	.144	.009	.885
Dissatisfied with work conditions	-.020	.068	-.153	.114	-.289	-.022	.773
Job security should be higher	-.031	.067	-.162	.101	-.456	-.031	.648
Laid off or transferred involuntarily	.179	.072	.037	.320	2.486	.158	.013*
Not enough autonomy	.144	.079	-.011	.299	1.827	.132	.069
Opportunity for a better assignment	-.072	.058	-.187	.043	-1.237	-.077	.217
Leaving K–12 education for other job	-.287	.066	-.417	-.157	-4.332	-.288	<.001*
Retiring soon	-.163	.043	-.248	-.078	-3.777	-.204	<.001*
Taking courses to improve career opportunities outside education	.043	.092	-1.39	-.224	.462	.029	.644
Taking courses to improve career opportunities within education	.075	.054	-.031	.181	1.398	.080	.163
Want better salary or benefits	.086	.058	-.027	.200	1.498	.094	.135

*Note: *p*<.05; Dependent variable is the likelihood of staying at current job for 5+ years.

Appendix R

Table 12. *Linear Regression Analysis of Attrition and Teacher Follow-Up Survey Items*

R	Adjusted R^2	*SE*	*F* change	df 1	df 2	*p*
.528	.244	1.199	8.083	16	335	<.001

Note: **p*<.05. Dependent variable: likelihood of continuing to teach K–12 music (higher value means more likely). Predictors: Teacher Follow-Up Survey job attributes and career planning factors.

Appendix S

Table 13. *Direction/Magnitude of Sig. Attrition and Teacher Follow-Up Survey Variables*

Variable	Beta	*SE*	95% CI Lower Bound	95% CI Upper Bound	*t*	ß	*p*
(Constant)	4.724	.215	4.302	5.147	21.991		<.001
Dissatisfied with changes in job description or responsibilities	.067	.070	-.069	.204	.969	.066	.728
Dissatisfied with student assessments, school accountability, or teacher quality measures	-.189	.066	-.319	-.059	-2.856	-.177	.055
Dissatisfied with professional development	.178	.069	.042	.313	2.578	.150	.010*
Dissatisfied with teaching as a career	-.202	.077	-.353	.-.050	-2.618	-.177	.009*
Dissatisfied with admins at my school	-.036	.069	-.173	.100	-.516	-.039	.600
Dissatisfied with the number of students in my class	-.046	.061	-.166	.074	-.753	-.043	.452
Dissatisfied with work conditions	.061	.067	-.072	.193	.905	.062	.366
Job security should be higher	-.009	.066	-.139	.122	-.129	-.008	.897
Laid off or transferred involuntarily	.130	.071	.010	.271	1.830	.107	.068
Not enough autonomy	.094	.078	-.059	.247	1.207	.081	.228
Opportunity for a better assignment	.007	.058	-.106	.121	.129	.007	.898
Leaving K–12 education for other job	-.379	.066	-.508	-.250	-5.780	-.354	<.001*
Retiring soon	-.225	.043	-.309	-.141	-5.254	-.262	<.001*
Taking courses to improve career opportunities outside education	.088	.091	-.092	.267	.963	.055	.336
Taking courses to improve career opportunities within education	.146	.053	-.041	.251	2.734	.145	.007*
Want better salary or benefits	.032	.057	-.080	.145	.568	.033	.571

Note: **p*<.05; Dependent variable is the likelihood of staying at current job for 5+ years.

Appendix T

Table 14. *Participant Migration/Attrition Intentions*

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	*N*
How likely are you to continue teaching K12- music for another five or more years?				
Unlikely	64	17.2%	17.7%	373
Somewhat unlikely	26	7%	7.2%	373
Undecided	84	22.5%	23.3%	373
Somewhat Likely	144	38.6%	39.9%	373
Likely	43	11.5%	11.9%	373
How likely are you to continue teaching at your current job for another five or more years?				
Unlikely	43	11.5%	11.9%	373
Somewhat unlikely	17	4.6%	4.7%	373
Undecided	29	7.8%	8%	373
Somewhat Likely	69	18.5%	19.1%	373
Likely	203	54.4%	56.2%	373

Appendix U

Table 15. *Participant Job Attribute Frequencies*

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	*N*
FTE				
Full time	326	81.7%	84.5%	399
Part time	52	13%	13.5%	399
Other	8	2%	2.1%	399
School District Type				
Large City	51	12.8%	13.2%	386
Small City	107	26.8%	27.7%	386
Suburban	71	17.8%	18.4%	386
Small Town	92	23.1%	23.8%	386
Multiple Towns/Incorporated District	26	6.5%	6.7%	386
Farming Community	25	6.3%	6.5%	386
Other	14	3.5%	3.6%	386
Itinerate Status				
Not Itinerate	311	77.9%	80.4%	387
Yes, Itinerate	76	19%	19.6%	387
Number of Schools (if itinerate)				
1	1	.3%	1.3%	76
2	62	15.5%	81.6%	76
3	9	2.3%	11.8%	76
4	1	.3%	1.3%	76
5	1	.3%	1.3%	76
6	2	.5%	2.6%	76
Grades Taught				
K-5th grades	141	35.3%	36.5%	386
K-8th grades	21	5.3%	5.4%	386
K-12th grades	17	4.3%	4.4%	386
6th-8th grades	74	18.5%	19.2%	386
6th-12th grades	32	8%	8.3%	386
9th-12th grades	44	11%	11.4%	386
Other	57	14.3%	14.8%	386
Music Classes Taught				
Chamber or Instrument-specific classes	20	2.6%	5.2%	399

Band	143	18.8%	37%	399
Choir	158	20.8%	40.9%	399
AP Music Theory	11	1.4%	3.8%	399
General Music	240	31.6%	62.2%	399
Music History	13	1.7%	3.4%	399
Music Technology	22	2.9%	5.7%	399
Orchestra	35	4.6%	9.1%	399
Group Instrument Classes	71	9.4%	18.4%	399
Other	46	6.1%	11.9%	399
Non-Music Classes Taught				
AVID	1	.3%	.3%	399
Health	2	.5%	.5%	399
Language Arts	6	1.5%	1.6%	399
Math	3	.8%	.8%	399
PE	6	1.5%	1.6%	399
Science	1	.3%	.3%	399
Theater Arts	14	3.5%	3.6%	399
No Non-Music Classes	304	76.2%	78.8%	399
Other Non-Music Classes	62	15.5%	16.1%	399
Conferences Attended in the Past 5 Years				
ACDA	49	10.6%	13.9%	399
ASTA	6	1.3%	1.7%	399
OMEA/NAfME	247	53.6%	70.2%	399
WIBC	27	5.9%	7.7%	399
Other Conferences Attended	62	13.4%	17.6%	399
No Conferences Attended	70	15.2%	19.9%	399
Reasons for Not Attending Conferences				
Admin Approval for Leave	109	17.7%	31.2%	399
District Funding	225	36.5%	64.5%	399
Lack of Interest	63	10.2%	18.1%	399
Sub Availability	144	23.3%	41.3%	399
Other Factors	76	12.3%	21.8%	399

Appendix V

Table 16. *Participant Demographics Frequencies*

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	*N*
Gender				
Female	179	44.9%	53%	399
Male	153	38.3%	45.3%	399
Nonbinary	5	1.3%	1.5%	399
Other	1	.3%	.3%	399
Race/Ethnicity				
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	.3%	.3%	338
Asian	8	2%	2.4%	338
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	3	.8%	.9%	338
White/Caucasian	307	76.9%	90.8%	338
Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin	11	2.8%	3.3%	338
Multiethnic or Other	8	2%	2.4%	338
Attended K12 in OR as student				
Yes	182	45.6%	54%	337
No	155	38.8%	46%	337
School District Type Attended as K12 Student				
Large City	63	15.8%	18.8%	399
Small City	85	21.3%	25.3%	399
Suburban	72	18%	21.4%	399
Small Town	77	19.3%	22.9%	399
Multiple towns/incorporated district	7	1.8%	22.9%	399
Farming community	14	3.5%	4.2%	399
Other	18	4.5%	5.4%	399
License Status				
Preliminary teaching license (with music endorsement)	108	30.5%	32%	354
Professional teaching license (with music endorsement)	190	53.7%	56.2%	354
Teacher leader license with music specialization/endorsement	9	2.5%	2.7%	354
Reciprocal teaching license (with music endorsement)	11	3.1%	3.3%	354

National Board Certification (with music endorsement)	5	1.4%	1.5%	354
Restricted teaching license	12	3.4%	3.6%	354
Non-musical specialization/endorsement	19	5.4%	5.6%	354
Highest Education Level				
Bachelor's degree in music education (highest level of education)	78	19.5%	23.1%	399
Master's degree in music education (highest level of education)	158	39.6%	46.7%	399
PhD in music education (highest level of education)	4	1	1.2%	399
Bachelor's degree in other area of specialty (highest level of education)	31	7.8%	9.2%	399
Master's degree in other area of specialty (highest level of education)	102	25.6%	30.2%	399
PhD in other area of specialty (highest level of education)	6	1.5%	1.8%	399
Certifications/trainings				
Kodaly Certified	54	14%	16%	385
Orff Schulwerk Certified (any level)	58	15.1%	17.2%	385
Dalcroze Certified	0	0%	0%	385
FAME Certified (any level)	18	4.7%	5.3%	385
ACDA/OSAA/OMEA adjudicator certified	10	2.6%	3%	385
OBDA/OSAA/OMEA adjudicator certified	10	2.6%	3%	385
Other certification/training	37	9.6%	11%	385
No additional certification/training	198	51.4%	58.8%-	385

Appendix W

Table 17. *Participant Demographic Averages*

Variable	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Age	338	41.69	12.130
Career Length	387	13.068	10.119
School Tenure	389	7.055	6.863

Appendix X

Table 18. *Frequency Table of OBLI Items (in Valid Percentages)*

Variables	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
There are days when I feel tired before I arrive at work.	46.2%	42.9%	10.3%	.6%
It happens more and more often that I talk about my work in a negative way.	11.8%	31.2%	44.4%	12.6%
After work, I tend to need more time than in the past in order to relax and feel better.	30.3%	33.8%	29.1%	6.8%
I can tolerate the pressure of my work very well.	17.6%	56.2%	22.6%	3.5%
Lately, I tend to think less at work and do my job almost mechanically.	3.2%	25%	54.1%	17.6%
I find my work to be a positive challenge.	25.3%	59.7%	12.9%	2.1%
During my work, I often feel emotionally drained.	30.6%	35.9%	29.1%	4.4%
Over time, one can become disconnected from this type of work.	15.3%	37.6%	36.2%	10.9%
After working, I have enough energy for my leisure activities.	5%	36.5%	37.9%	20.6%
Sometimes I feel sickened by my work tasks.	5.6%	20.3%	40.9%	33.2%
After my work, I usually feel worn out and weary.	32.1%	41.2%	23.2%	3.5%
This is the only type of work that I can imagine myself doing.	22.9%	29.1%	35.3%	12.6%
Usually, I can manage the amount of my work well.	22.9%	62.4%	12.9%	1.8%
I feel more and more engaged in my work.	11.8%	50%	34.4%	3.8%
When I work, I usually feel energized.	12.9%	58.2%	24.7%	4.1%
I find new and interesting aspects in my work.	36.2%	56.2%	7.1%	.3%

Note: N=399

Appendix Y

Table 19. *Mean OBLI Burnout Scores*

Variables	*M*	*SD*
There are days when I feel tired before I arrive at work. (R)	3.34	.69
It happens more and more often that I talk about my work in a negative way. (R)	2.42	.86
After work, I tend to need more time than in the past in order to relax and feel better. (R)	2.88	.92
I can tolerate the pressure of my work very well.	2.12	.73
Lately, I tend to think less at work and do my job almost mechanically. (R)	2.14	.73
I find my work to be a positive challenge.	1.92	.68
During my work, I often feel emotionally drained. (R)	2.93	.88
Over time, one can become disconnected from this type of work. (R)	2.57	.88
After working, I have enough energy for my leisure activities.	2.47	.84
Sometimes I feel sickened by my work tasks. (R)	1.98	.87
After my work, I usually feel worn out and weary. (R)	3.02	.83
This is the only type of work that I can imagine myself doing.	2.38	.97
Usually, I can manage the amount of my work well.	1.94	.65
I feel more and more engaged in my work.	2.30	.72
When I work, I usually feel energized.	2.20	.71

Note: "(R)" denotes scores that were reversed so all scores could be interpreted the same (i.e., higher scores indicate higher rates of burnout).

Appendix Z

Table 20. *Frequency Table of TFS Items (in Valid Percentages)*

	Not Important at all	Slightly Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
I am going to retire.	53%	6.3%	11.4%	11.4%	17.6%
I am being laid off, involuntarily transferred, or my contract will not be renewed	80.1%	4.8%	4.5%	5.4%	5.1%
My school is going to be reorganized or closed.	81.3%	4.5%	5.4%	5.1%	3.7%
I am dissatisfied with changes in my job description or responsibilities.	51.4%	13.1%	15.3%	12.5%	7.7%
I wanted better salary or benefits.	33.2%	14.2%	9.1%	2.8%	1.1%
I decided to pursue a position other than that of a K–12 teacher.	60.8%	11.1%	13.9%	7.1%	7.1%
I decided to take courses to improve career opportunities WITHIN the field of education.	56.5%	11.4%	12.5%	11.6%	8%
I decided to take courses to improve career opportunities OUTSIDE the field of education.	72.7%	14.2%	9.1%	2.8%	1.1%
I am dissatisfied with teaching as a career.	53.1%	16.5%	18.2%	7.1%	5.1%
I am dissatisfied with workplace conditions	39.2%	15.9%	19.9%	13.4%	11.6%
I am dissatisfied with the administrator(s) at my school	45.2%	16.8%	13.1%	11.%	13.9%
I do not have enough autonomy over my classroom.	65.9%	13.6%	7.7%	8.2%	4.5%
I am dissatisfied with opportunities for professional development.	46.3%	22.7%	18.5%	8.5%	4%
I feel job security should be higher	52.8%	16.8%	12.5%	11.1%	6.8%
I have an opportunity for a better work assignment.	54.8%	13.6%	13.1%	9.7%	8.8%

I am dissatisfied with how student assessments, school accountability, or teacher quality measures impact my teaching.	46.9%	21.3%	15.3%	8.5%	8%
I am dissatisfied with the number of students I teach.	47.4%	21%	14.5%	10.2%	6.8%

Note: N=399

Appendix AA

Raw Data part one: working conditions, career length, school tenure, and attrition/migration intentions.

Career Length	School Tenure	Itinerate Status	# of Schools	Itinerate Commute	MUE Classes	Non-MUE classes	Grades Taught	District Type	FTE	Retention Intention	Migration Intention
first year teacher	first year	2			1,2,6		2	1	2	5	5
8	7	2			3	9	6	3	2	4	1
8	8	2			2,10	11	2	4	2	5	4
3	6	2			1,3,10	11	1	7	2	3	2
19	9	2			2,3	11	3	2	2	5	4
23	2	2			2,4,10	11	3	2	1	5	4
8	5	2			2,3	9	2	2	2	5	4
3	1	1	2	1	1	11	4	4	2	4	3
3	3	2			1	11	1	4	2	5	1
16	6	2			1,3	11	1	4	1	5	4
23	22	2			1,9	11	1	3	2	5	4
2	2	2			1,6	11	1	3	2	2	2
12	11	2			1,2,3,6	11	4	4	2	2	2
32	6	1	3	6	1,2,3,6	11	4	3	1	5	4
1	1	1	5	6	3,4	11	2	1	2	5	3
11	5	2			3,6	11	3	5	2	5	4
3	2	2			1	11	4	4	2	5	4
5 years	5 years	2			1	11	4	2	2	5	4
13	1	2			1	2	1	2	1	1	1
15	13	2			1,2,3	11	4	3	2	5	3
2	2	2			1,3	11	1	3	1	5	5
26	6	2			1,3,4	9	1	2	2	5	4

19	11	2			1	11	1	3	2	5	4
8	8	2			3,6	11	3	2	2	5	4
2	2	1	2	1	2,3	11	6	5	2	4	3
36	15	2			1,2,3	11	7	4	2	5	2
6	6	1	2	0.5	2,3	11	6	4	2	5	4
11	6	2			1	11	1	3	2	3	5
11	5	1	2	5	1,4,6,10	11	1	2	2	4	1
32	27	2			2	9	4	2	2	5	4
5	2	1	2	1	1,3,9	11	5	4	2	5	3
2	2	2			1	11	4	4	2	5	1
3	3	2			3	7	2	3	2	2	1
18	10	2			3	11	6	4	2	5	3
2	2	2			2,3	9	3	4	2	5	4
22	5	2			2,6,9	11	7	6	2	1	1
7	1	2			1	11	1	2	2	5	4
17	6	2			1,4	11	1	2	2	5	4
10	1	2			3	11	3	4	2	5	4
5	5	1	2	.5	1,6	11	1	4	2	5	3
5	1	2			2,4	9	2	2	2	5	3
4	3	2			2	11	6	4	2	5	3
28	5	1	3	6	1,2	11	4	4	2	5	4
35	13	2			2	11	2	2	2	1	1
9	5	1	2	11	2,3	11	2	5	2	4	3
9	1	2			1,5	11	1	1	2	1	1
One	One	2			1,2,3,10	11	6	4	2	5	4
10	4.5	2			1	11	1	3	2	5	4
16	5	2			1,2,9	11	5	2	2	3	5
14.5	.5	2			1	11	1	3	1	2	2

26	2	2			1,3	11	4	5	2	3	5
46 years	4	2			1,2,3,6,9	11	7	6	2	5	4
9	3	2			1	2	1	1	2	3	5
3	3	2			2,3	9	2	4	2	5	3
15	1	2			1,4,6	9	1	2	2	4	4
17	2	2			2	11	2	1	2	5	3
13	2	2			1	11	4	3	2	5	4
7	1	2			1,6,8	11	1	6	2	3	1
20	10	2			1	11	1	2	2	1	1
14	11	1	2	0.25	1,2,10	11	4	4	2	5	4
6	2	2			1	11	1	2	2	5	1
12	5	1	2	2.5	1,5,6	11	4	2	2	4	3
20	15	2			1,3	9	5	1	1	5	4
3.5	1	2			1	11	1	6	2	4	3
3	2	2			1	11	1	3	1	1	1
11	8	2			2,3	11	2	6	2	4	1
2	2	2			1	11	1	5	2	3	5
9	1	2			1,3	11	1	5	2	5	3
12	12	1	3	2	2	11	2	2	2	5	4
20	11	2			1	11	1	4	2	2	2
22	20	1	3	2	2,6	9	4	2	2	5	4
8	8	2			1,2,10,9	9	6	2	2	2	1
16	15	1	2	7	2	9	2	5	2	4	3
4	2	2			3	11	2	1	1	1	1
1	1	2			1,2,4	9	2	2	2	4	5
7	4	2			1	11	1	2	2	4	2
19	13	2			2,3,5,6,9	11	3	1	3	5	4

25	19	1	2	1	2,3,9	11	6	4	2	4	5
19	2	1	2	1.5	3	11	6	2	2	5	4
29	23	2			1,2,4	11	7	4	2	3	5
27	21	1	2	3	1	11	1	3	2	5	4
12	3	2			3	9	3	2	2	4	3
8	2	2			2,9	11	2	4	2	4	3
2	2	2			2,6	11	2	3	2	4	1
6	4	2			1,2,3,9	6,7,9	6	4	2	4	4
30	11	2			1,2	11	5	5	2	1	1
4	4	2			1,2,3,9	11	2	1	2	5	2
22	18	2			3	11	2	5	2	3	2
15	2	2			1	11	1	5	2	5	4
10	8	2			1,9	11	1	4	2	5	4
39	12	2			1,2,3,6	7	2	2	2	1	1
2	2	1	2	1	3	11	6	2	2	5	4
15	2	2			1,3	11	4	2	2	5	2
8	1	2			1	11	1	2	2	4	1
25	17	2			3	7	6	2	1	5	4
1	1	1	2	5	1	11	1	3	2	5	1
24	24	2			2,3,5	11	2	2	2	5	3
27 years	16 years	1	2	1	1	9	4	5	2	5	4

17	17 at one and one year at another (1/2 time at each)	1	2	8	1,2	11	1	1	2	1	1
34	15	2			1,3	11	1	2	2	3	5
31	25	2			2,6	9	3	2	1	5	1
10	1	2			1,3,6,8	11	5	2	1	5	4
36 years	24 years	2			1	11	1	3	2	1	1
24	8	2			1	11	1	3	2	5	4
3	1	1	2	1	2,6	11	6	4	2	5	4
8	4	2			1	11	1	2	2	1	1
1	2	2			1	9	4	6	1	1	4
35	8	2			1,3	11	1	1	2	4	3
23	23	1	2	1	4,6,10	11	6	4	2	5	4
13	5	2			1,3,6	11	1	2	1	4	3
4	4	2			1	11	1	2	1	3	5
17	8	2			1,5,6,8	2	1	6	2	2	2
Just finishing year 1.	1	1	2	.5	1,3	11	4	7	2	5	3
1	1	1	2	1.5	1	11	1	3	2	5	4
13	2	2			1,3,6	11	5	7	1	4	3
30	30	2			3,6	9	3	3	3	1	1
10	3	2			1	11	4	2	1	4	3
12	2	2			1	11	1	3	2	4	1

7	2	2			1	11	1	4	2	5	4
15	15	1	2	3	3,4,9	11	4	4	2	5	4
15	15	2			1	9	4	2	1	5	4
1	1	2			1	11	1	2	1	5	4
2	2	1	2	3	1	11	1	2	2	5	3
9	22	2			1	11	1	4	2	1	1
17	17	2			2,8,10,9	6,9	3	2	2	2	2
27	15	2			1,3,9	9	2	3	2	4	3
15	8	2			2,3	7,9	4	4	2	5	3
15	9	2			2,6,7,9	11	3	4	2	4	3
9	6	2			1	11	4	4	2	4	3
8 years	8 years	2			1,3	11	1	1	2	4	3
25	8	2			1,3	11	1	2	2	5	4
41	10	2			2,5,6,7,10	11	3	2	2	1	1
12	9	1	2	.5	3	7	6	4	2	3	1
17	15	1	2	0.25	1,2,3	11	7	4	2	1	2
21	10	1	2	2	2	11	4	5	2	1	1
1	1	2			9	11	4	6	2	5	4
9	9	2			1,2,3,6	11	2	1	2	4	3
5	5	2			2,5,6,10	11	3	2	2	4	3
24	19	1	2	2.5	2	11	6	4	2	5	4
4	4	2			3	11	2	4	2	4	5
13	9	2			2,8	11	2	2	1	2	2
1	1	1	2	2	3	7	4	5	2	3	5
24	24	2			2,3,6,9	9	2	2	2	5	4
4	4	2			1	11,9	1	3	2	4	3
8	8	1	2	1.6	2	11	6	3	3	5	5

10	3	2			1,3,9	11	2	2	2	5	4
1	1	2			1,3	11	4	4	2	4	3
10	3	2			1	11	1	1	2	1	1
12	12	2			2	11	6	6	2	5	4
25	2	2			1	11,9	1	3	2	5	5
22	2	1	2	4	1,6	11	1	7	1	4	5
1	1	1	2	1.5	1,8	11	1	1	2	4	3
1	1	2			3	9	2	4	2	4	3
3	3	2			1,2,3	11	5	7	2	5	3
27	14	2			1	11	4	3	1	4	3
3	3	2			1,2,3,6,10	11	7	1	2	4	3
2	2	2			3	11	3	4	2	3	5
5	5	2			2	11	2	4	2	5	1
22	22	2			3	11	2	1	2	5	4
6	5	1	2	12	1	11	1	1	2	2	2
34	27	2			2,7	11	6	3	2	1	1
20	8	2			1,2,5,6,7, 10	9	7	4	2	5	4
24	13	2			1,3	11	1	4	2	5	4
10	1	1	3	5	3	11	6	2	2	5	4
12	10	2			1,3,6,8	4	3	1	1	3	5
3	3	1	1	0	1	11	1	4	2	5	1
3	3	2			1,2	11	2	2	2	5	3
17	m										
18	1										
5	5	2			1,2,3,5	11,9	7	7	2	3	4
7	7	2			1,9	9	1	3	2	4	3

16	1	2			1	11	1	3	2	5	3
7	2	2			1,2	11	4	5	3	5	4
26	20	2			2,9	11	3	1	2	5	4
11	11	2			3,9	11	3	1	2	5	4
x	x	2			1	11	1	4	2		
6	3	1	3	10	1,6	11	1	2	2	5	3
9	1	1	2	3	2,4	9	3	2	2	5	4
1	1	2			1	11	1	6	2	1	1
8	8	2			1,2	11	5	1	1	5	3
7	7	2			2,9	11	2	5	2	5	4
5	3	2			1,2	11	5	1	2	5	4
30	18	2			1	11	1	1	2	4	4
1	1	1	2	5	1,2,3	11	5	2	2	5	4
8	2	1	2	1.5	3,6	11	4	1	2	5	4
1	1	2			2,6,9	9	2	6	2	5	4
1	1	2			1,3,6	9	2	2	1	5	5
7.5	2	2			1	11	1	4	2	5	4
28	25	2			1,9	11	1	2	2	1	1
3.5	3.5	2			1	9	1	6	1	3	5
12	8	2			2,3,7	11	3	4	2	4	3
12	11	2			1	11	1	1	1	4	4
12	4	2			2	11	2	3	2	5	4
5	28	2			1	1,3,4,6	1	5	2	2	1
28	7	2			1,3	11	1	1	2	5	4
12	2	2			2,6,9	11	3	1	2	5	4
1	1	2			2,3,9	7,9	3	4	2	5	4

5	5	2			1,2,5,6	9	7	4	2	5	4
40	40	2			1	11	1	2	2	1	1
6	3	2			2,6	11	2	1	2	5	4
4	4	1	2	30	1,2,3,5,6,10	11	7	1	2	4	3
7	2	2			1	11	1	6	2	4	3
11	9	2			2	11	2	3	2	5	4
27	2	2			1	11	1	3	2	5	4
5	2	2			1	11	1	5	2	4	3
23	14	2			2,5,6,9	11	3	1	2	5	4
40+	20	2			1,2,3,4,5	9	1	1	1	1	1
9	9	2			2	11	2	3	2	5	4
17	6.1	2			1,3	11	1	4	2	1	1
14	4	2			3,9	11	3	6	2	4	4
2	2	2			2,3,10	11	6	4	2	5	3
18	2	2			1	11	1	1	2	3	1
8	5	2			2,3	9	2	2	1	5	4
2	2	2			1	11	1	3	2	5	3
27	16	1	2	1	1	9	4	4	2	2	2
23	18	2			2,8,9	9	6	6	2	4	3
2	2	2			3,5,6	11	6	7	2	5	5
29	6	1	3	5	1,2	11	4	4	2	5	4
20	9	2			2,3	9	3	2	2	5	4
13	6	2			1	11	1	2	1	5	3
2+	2+	2			1,2,3	7	5	3	2	5	4
20	2	1	2	1.5	3	11	6	2	2	5	4

5	4	2			3,6	11	4	2	2	5	5
4	4	2			1	11	1	6	2	4	1
3	1	1	2	1	1	11	4	2	2	5	4
23	6	2			1,4	11	1	2	2	5	4
15	5	1	2	5	4	11	4	3	1	5	4
3	3	2			1,3,5,9	11	5	4	2	5	3
3	2	2			1	11	4	4	2	5	4
11	8	2			2,3,6,7,9	7	3	4	2	2	1
7	4	2			2,5,6,10	9	3	2	2	4	3
5	2	2			2,3,8	11	2	2	2	5	3
5	5	2			1	11	1	4	2	5	4
5	0-1	2			1	11	4	6	2	5	5
40	8	2			1,2,3	11	4	4	2	1	1
2	1.	2			1	11	1	5	2	5	5
6	1	1	2	5	3,6	9	4	4	2	4	5
9	4	2			1	2	1	1	2	4	5
18	18	2			2,4,8,10,9	9	3	2	2	2	2
7	6	2			2,7,9	7	3	2	2	5	5
15	15	2			1	11	1	2	2	5	4
3	3	2			2,6	9	2	3	2	4	2
8	1	2			1	9	1	6	2	5	4
6	2	2			1,3,9	11	1	2	2	5	5
25	1	2			1,6	11	4	2	2	5	4
27	14	2			1	11	4	3	1	4	3
12	8	2			1	11	1	2	2	5	4
21	18	2			1,3	11	2	3	1	5	5
15	15	2			1,3,6,9	1	1	1	2	5	4

25	8	2			1	11	1	3	2	5	4
16	16	2			2,4,5,7,8	11	6	1	2	3	5
11	8	2			2,3	11	2	3	2	5	4
14	3	2			1,3	9	5	7	1	5	3
23	1	2			1	11	1	4	2	3	5
22	10	2			1	11	1	2	2	1	1
5	3	2			1	11	1	1	2	1	1
16	16	1	2	0.25	1,2,3	11	7	4	2	1	5
1	1	2			1,3,6,8	11	4	2	1	4	3
15	12	1	2	0.25	1,2	11	4	4	2	5	4
12	6	2			3,9	11	3	5	2	3	3
2	2	2			2,3	11	3	7	2	5	3
21	12	1	2	7	1,3	11	1	5	1	5	4
35	22	2			1,2,4	11	5	1	2	1	1
3	3	2			3	11	3	4	2	3	3
17	2	2			1	11	1	3	2	5	4
47	4.5	2			1,2,3,6	11	7	7	2	5	4
12	2	2			1	11	1	3	2	5	1
26	20	1	2	5	1	9	1	3	2	4	3
2	2	2			1	11	1	6	2	5	4
15	8	2			4	11	7	7	1	5	3
2	2	2			1,3	11	1	4	2	5	4
8	2	2			1	11	1	3	1	5	4
15	1	2			1,2	11	3	4	2	5	4
7	2	2			2,3,4	11	2	1	2	5	4
31	12	2			1,2	9	5	6	2	1	1
3	3	1	2	1	2,3	11	6	4	2	3	5
16	3	2			1	11	1	2	2	5	3

7	3	2			1,3	11	2	3	2	5	4
2	1	2			1,4	11	1	3	2	5	4
21	0	2			1,4	11	1	2	2	5	5
3	3	2			1	9	4	5	2	4	5
12	9	2			1,3	9	1	2	3	4	4
3	3	2			1,2,6	11	5	4	2	5	3
19	3	2			1,4	11	1	3	2	5	2
20	3	1	2	4	1	11	1	7	1	5	3
4	4	2			1,2,3	11	5	6	2	5	4
4	4	2			1	11	1	1	2	3	1
8	8	1	2	1.6	2	11	6	3	3		
2	2	2			2,6,9	9	2	6	2	5	4
4	4	2			1	11	1	3	2	4	3
3	3	2			1,6	11	1	3	2		
42	21	2			3	9	3	3	2	4	3
20	11	2			1	11	1	5	2	5	4
17	1	2			3	7	3	6	2	5	4
8	0	2			1,6	11	1	4	2	3	5
15	8	2			2,7,8	11	3	4	1	2	2
3	3	2			1,3	11	1	3	2	4	3
8	2	2			1,3	11	1	1	2	5	4
13	4	2			3,7	9	3	2	2	5	3
5	3	2			3	11	2	2	1	1	1
35	7	2			1	11	1	3	2	1	1
13	9	2			2	11	2	1	1	3	5

9	8	2			1	11	1	2	2	5	4
1	1	2			1	11	4	6	2	4	3
11.5	7	1	2	1	1	11	1	1	2	5	4
26	7	2			1	9	1	2	2	5	4
22	7	1	4	2	2	11	4	3	2	5	4
20	7	1	2	3	2	11	2	3	1	5	4
16	16	2			1,2	2,5	7	7	2	1	1
32	32	1	6	1.5	4,10	11	4	2	2	1	1
3	3	1	2	1	2,3	11	6	4	2	1	1
2	5	2			1,2,3,6	11,1	2	4	2	5	4
17	10	2			3,4,6	11	2	3	2	5	4
13	10	1	2	.7	3,9	7	6	4	2	1	1
9	6	2			2,4	11	2	3	2	3	2
40	12	2			1,3	11	4	2	2	1	1
25	12	2			1	11	1	4	2	1	1
35	25	2			3,7	11	3	2	2	1	1
22	18	2			3	11	2	2	2	3	2
19	15	2			2,6	11	2	3	2	1	1
16	16	2			2,3	11	4	2	2	5	4
24	10	2			3	9	2	2	2	4	4
9	4	2			2,3	11	2	3	2	5	4
7	5	2			1,2,3	6	2	4	2	1	2
13	8	2			1,6,9	11	4	2	2	4	3
21	11	2			1	11	1	3	2	5	4
21	6	2			2,9	11	3	1	2	5	4
2	2	2			1,3,5,9	7	2	5	3	5	5
2	2	1	2	9	1,3	11	5	4	2	5	4
2	2	2			2,3,9	9	3	4	2	5	3

11	4	2			3,9	11	2	2	2	5	4
9	6	1	2	3	1,3	11	4	2	1	4	3
25	18	2			2,4,10	11	3	5	2	5	4
17	16	2			1	11	1	2	2	5	3
3	3	2			1,3	11	1	3	2	5	3
33	1	2			2,3,6	6	2	4	2	5	4
7	6	2			3	11	6	1	3	5	4
7	7	2			1	11	1	2	2	5	4
12.5	10	2			1	11	1	3	2	4	5
26	0	2			1,2	9	7	7	2	5	3
25	20	2			2	11	2	3	2	5	3
18	7	1	2	1	1,3	11	1	4	2	5	4
11	4	2			1,3,9	11	5	4	1	5	3
20	3	2			2,3	11	2	1	2	5	4
3	3	1	2	0.25	1,3,5	11	5	4	2	5	3
24	1	2			1	11	1	2	1	5	4
24	23	2			1	9	1	2	2	5	4
10	2	2			1	11	1	2	2	4	5
5	5	2			1	6	4	4	2	5	4
17	3	2			1,3,4	11	1	5	2	4	2
25	25	1	3	2 to 7	1	11	1	3	2	1	1
3.5	3.5	2			1,2,3,5,6, 10	11	7	2	2	4	3
8	2	2			1	11	1	3	2	5	4
5	5	2			1,3	11	2	3	2	4	3
8	2	2			1,3,6	11	1	2	2	4	2
6	6	2			2	11	2	4	2	5	1
4	4	2			3	9	2	4	2	5	3

13	13	2			2	11	2	3	2	5	4
36	16	2			1,2,3	11	7	4	2	2	2
20	13	2			2,3	11	2	1	2	5	4
16	16	1	2	3	3,4	11	4	4	2	5	4
1.5	1.5	2			1,2	11	4	4	2	5	3
2	2	1	2	1.5	1	11	1	1	2	3	5
3	2	2			1,2,3	9	2	5	2	2	1
4	3	2			3,5,6	11	3	2	1	5	4
8	7	2			1,6	11	1	3	1	5	5

Appendix BB

Raw Data part two: Teacher Follow-up Survey items (first half).

Retiring	Laid off	Closing School	Job Changing	Salary/Benefits	Leaving K–12	New Edu. Job	New Non-Edu. job
4	5	4	3	3	2	1	3
5	4	5	5	4	5	5	5
4	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
4	1	1	4	4	4	1	3
5	3	1	2	3	1	1	1
5	5	5	5	2	1	1	1
5	5	5	4	3	1	1	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	2	4	5	5	3
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	5	1	5	1
1	1	1	3	5	4	1	1
4	1	1	3	2	1	1	1
3	1	2	3	4	2	3	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1
4	1	1	1	1	1	3	1
3	5	1	1	4	4	2	2
2	1	1	4	4	2	4	2
4	1	1	3	5	1	2	2
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

4	2	1	2	3	1	3	1
4	1	1	3	2	1	1	1
3	1	4	3	3	3	3	3
4	1	1	1	3	1	4	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1
1	1	1	3	2	2	4	2
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1
1	3	1	4	4	2	1	1
1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	2	1	3	1
5	1	1	3	2	3	1	1
1	1	1	1	3	1	2	2
1	1	1	1	5	3	4	1
3	1	1	1	4	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	4	1	2	1
2	1	1	1	4	3	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1
1	1	1	1	3	1	2	1
3	2	3	2	2	2	3	2
3	5	3	4	4	5	2	3
1	2	1	1	1	5	1	1

4	3	1	1	2	3	4	4
3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	5	4	4	4	3	4	2
1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1
3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	4	5	5	4	5	2	2
1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1
1	5	3	1	2	1	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	2	2	3	1	2	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	1	1	4	3	3	5	1

1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	2	4	4	4	1
1	1	1	1	3	5	1	1
1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1
1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1
3	1	1	1	3	1	5	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	4	4	1	4	1	5	1
1	1	1	4	3	3	1	1
3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	5	5	1	2
1	3	1	4	4	3	1	1
1	2	1	4	4	1	2	3
4	1	1	1	3	1	2	1

2	1	1	5	3	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	1	1	1	5	3	1	1
5	1	1	5	5	1	1	1
1	1	1	3	3	3	4	2
1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1
1	1	1	3	3	2	1	1
1	2	4	5	2	4	5	1
5	1	1	2	1	3	1	5
1	1	1	2	5	1	5	1

2	1	1	3	1	1	1	3
2	1	1	4	5	1	4	1
1	1	1	1	3	1	3	1
5	1	1	1	3	3	1	1
1	1	1	1	3	1	3	1
4	1	3	1	4	1	2	1
3	1	1	2	4	2	1	1
4	1	1	1	4	2	4	2
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1
5	1	1	5	5	1	1	1

3	1	1	5	5	1	3	3
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	4	2
5	1	1	3	5	1	1	1
4	4	2	2	2	1	1	1
4	4	4	5	4	1	3	2
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	5	1	4	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	2	1	4	4	5	4	4
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	3	4	5	1	1

1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	3	2
2	1	1	3	4	4	4	2
4	1	4	1	1	1	1	1
3	4	4	4	4	3	1	1
1	2	1	3	3	1	1	2
5	1	1	3	4	1	4	4

1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1
1	1	1	2	1	4	1	3
1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	4	4	1	2	1
1	1	1	5	5	5	4	2
3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	1	4	4	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	3	1	3
1	1	1	3	1	3	1	1
1	1	1	4	3	1	3	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	4	5	5	1	1
1	1	1	5	4	5	1	2
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	1	1	1	4	1	5	1
2	4	4	3	4	4	2	2
1	1	1	3	5	3	2	2
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	2	1	1	3	3
1	1	1	4	5	3	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	2	3	1
5	3	1	1	3	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	3	4	3	3
1	1	1	4	2	1	3	1
3	1	1	4	5	1	1	1

1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1
1	1	2	3	3	5	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	5	4	2	2	1
4	4	3	3	3	3	4	3
4	4	5	3	5	2	5	3
5	4	3	4	5	4	5	2
1	1	4	4	2	2	2	2
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	2	2	3	4	2	3	1
1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	5	5	1
4	1	1	1	4	1	1	1
1	1	1	4	4	1	4	4
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	1	1	3	2	2	4	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	3	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	2	1	1	1	1	2	1
1	4	4	4	4	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	1	3	3	3	3	2	4
5	1	1	2	3	3	3	3
1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1
1	1	1	4	5	1	1	1
2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	3	1	1	1	5	1
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
1	5	4	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	2	1	4	1	2	1
1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
1	1	3	4	5	3	1	2
1	1	1	3	4	1	1	1
5	5	5	5	2	3	1	1
4	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	4	5	3	2
1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
1	1	1	1	4	3	4	1
1	1	1	5	4	5	1	5
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	3	1	4	5	4	5	3
5	1	1	4	5	1	1	1
3	1	1	4	1	1	1	1
1	2	1	1	3	3	3	2
1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1
3	4	3	3	3	1	2	2
3	2	1	5	4	3	3	1
1	4	1	2	1	1	2	2
2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1

1	1	1	1	4	2	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	1	4	3	2	1	2
1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1
5	1	3	4	4	1	2	1
1	1	1	1	3	2	3	1
1	1	1	5	3	5	1	3
1	5	5	3	4	1	3	1
1	3	1	2	2	4	2	3
1	1	1	1	3	1	3	1
1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	1	1	2	4	2	2	1
1	1	1	5	5	4	1	1
1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1

3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	5	1	5	1
1	1	1	3	2	1	1	1
4	4	2	2	3	2	4	2
1	1	1	2	3	1	1	1
3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	1	1	2	4	2	4	2
1	1	1	1	1	4	4	1
2	1	1	1	4	1	1	1
4	1	1	1	3	3	1	1

4	3	1	3	4	1	4	1
1	1	1	4	4	3	1	1
2	1	2	2	3	2	2	2
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	4	4	1	4
1	1	1	4	4	5	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1
1	1	1	2	3	1	2	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	2	1	5	1
5	5	5	3	3	1	5	2
4	1	1	2	2	2	1	1
1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1
1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1
3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	3	3	5	3	3	1	3
5	1	2	4	3	1	1	1
5	1	1	1	5	1	5	1
1	1	1	2	5	3	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	3	4	3	3	2
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	3	3	1	4	1
5	1	1	3	1	3	1	4
5	5	5	4	4	3	4	3
2	1	3	1	3	1	4	1
1	1	1	1	2	3	1	1

1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1
1	1	1	4	3	2	4	2
5	1	1	2	4	4	1	5
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
1	3	1	5	3	1	1	1
3	4	4	3	2	3	4	3
1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	4	1	1
1	1	1	1	4	3	1	3
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	2	4	2	5	2
4	1	1	1	5	1	4	1
3	3	3	2	2	2	3	2
1	1	1	3	2	3	4	1
1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	2	2	2	5	4	1	3
1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1

3	1	1	1	3	4	4	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	1	3	2	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	1	1	1	1	4	4	1
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	3	3	5	3	5	4	3
1	1	1	1	5	3	1	1
2	1	1	1	2	1	3	1
1	1	1	2	4	5	1	1
1	1	1	1	4	5	2	1
5	1	1	1	1	5	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	3	3	3	1	1	1
1	1	1	2	3	3	2	1
1	1	1	1	2	2	5	1
1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1
5	1	1	5	5	1	1	1
2	1	1	1	2	1	3	1
3	2	1	5	5	4	2	1
2	1	1	2	2	3	4	2
3	3	3	2	3	1	4	1
2	1	1	4	2	3	3	2
1	1	1	2	3	1	1	1
4	1	1	1	4	1	5	1
1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	3	1	2	1

1	1	1	2	4	1	1	1
5	5	1	5	3	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	3	4	1	3	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	2	3	5	3	3	4
1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1
1	1	1	4	2	3	4	3
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	5	5	3	1	2	1
2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	1	1	2	2	1	1	1
1	4	4	2	3	3	3	3
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	1	1	1	3	2	1	1
1	4	4	3	4	1	3	2
1	1	1	3	2	4	3	2
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	2	2	2	3	2	3	2
3	1	1	1	2	1	5	1
3	5	5	5	5	2	2	2
1	1	1	2	3	1	3	2
1	1	1	1	1	5	5	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1
1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
1	5	2	4	2	1	1	1
3	3	4	4	4	2	4	2
1	1	1	3	3	4	1	3
5	1	1	1	3	1	3	2
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	1

Appendix CC

Raw Data part three: Teacher Follow-up Survey items (second half) and conference attendance in the past five years and conference attendance factors.

Career	Working Conditions	Admin	Autonomy	PDU	Job Security	Better Assignment	Testing	Class Size	Conference Attendance	Reasons for Conf. Attendance
1	4	5	2	1	1	3	5	3	1	3
5	5	5	2	3	2	5	1	4	1,2	3
1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2
5	5	4	4	4	3	5	2	3	1	1,2,3
1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1,2,4	4
5	5	5	5	1	3	5	3	3	1,6	1,2,4
4	5	5	5	2	2	2	3	1	1,4	1,2,3
1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	1,2
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1,2,3
2	2	1	1	2	2	5	2	2	1	1,2,3
1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	3
1	1	5	2	2	2	4	3	5	1	3
4	4	4	4	1	5	3	5	1	1	1,2,3
3	3	4	2	3	2	3	3	2	1	1,2,3
1	3	4	1	3	4	2	2	4	1,2	1,3
2	3	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1,2	3
3	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1,2,3
1	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	4	5	5
3	2	1	1	1	3	1	2	3	5	4
4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	6	5
3	3	5	1	5	5	3	5	3	1,2	3

3	3	3	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	2,3
1	4	4	5	4	3	3	2	3	1,6	3
1	2	3	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	4
2	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	4	1	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	5
1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1,4	5
3	3	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	6	3
4	3	4	4	5	2	5	2	2	1,6	1,3,5
1	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,4	5
1	3	1	1	4	1	1	1	2	5	1,3,5
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,2	3
4	5	5	1	1	3	3	1	3	1,2	1,3
1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	2,3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
2	3	2	1	2	1	4	2	1	1	3
2	1	3	3	3	1	1	2	1	6	3
1	3	3	4	3	2	3	2	2	1	3
1	3	3	1	4	1	1	2	5	1	4
2	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,3	2,3
1	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	5
1	3	3	4	2	2	5	3	2	1	5
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
3	5	4	3	3	1	1	1	3	1,4	2,3,4
5	5	3	1	1	1	1	5	5	1	2
1	3	2	1	1	4	3	1	1	1,2,4	1,2,3
3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	1,6	5
4	4	5	2	1	4	3	4	3	1	1,4,5

1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	3
3	1	1	1	2	2	1	4	4	1,2	1,2,3
1	1	1	5	3	1	1	1	1	6	2
3	3	5	4	4	4	4	3	4	1	1,2,3
3	1	3	1	3	2	2	3	3	1	1,3
3	4	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1
4	4	4	4	2	3	4	3	1	1	1,2
1	1	5	3	1	1	3	1	1	1,2,6	2,3
2	3	3	1	2	5	3	4	1	5	1,5
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,6	3
1	3	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1,6	1,3,5
1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	1,2
2	2	4	4	3	4	4	2	1	1,2,6	1,2,3
1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	2	1	1,3,4
3	3	1	2	4	1	1	2	1	5	1,3
5	5	5	3	3	2	1	4	5	1	3
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	5
2	2	3	2	1	2	1	5	1	1	1,2,3
1	2	4	1	1	4	1	3	1	5	1,2,3
1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	4	4	5	3	4	1	1	1	1,4	3
2	4	5	1	1	5	1	1	4	5	3,5
1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,2,3
1	4	1	1	1	5	1	2	1	1	1,3
2	3	1	1	1	3	1	2	1	1	3
2	4	3	1	4	4	2	2	1	1	3

1	3	2	1	1	4	4	1	5	1	4
3	5	5	5	3	3	3	5	2	1	4
1	1	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1,3,5
3	1	2	1	1	1	1	3	2	1	4
4	4	5	4	1	1	1	4	2	1	1
3	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	5
2	3	2	2	2	2	2	5	2	1	1,3
2	4	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	3
4	3	1	1	2	1	4	1	2	1	3,4
4	1	2	1	5	1	1	4	1	5	1,4
2	5	4	2	3	2	3	5	3	1	3,5

3	3	3	1	2	1	1	3	2	1	1,3
3	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	6	1,2,3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	5
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	2	1	3
1	2	3	1	2	1	1	2	3	5	1,3
1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	3
1	4	5	1	1	1	2	3	4	6	5
1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,2	3
1	4	5	1	1	1	5	1	3	1,2	2,4
1	1	1	1	2	1	4	1	1	1	4,5
5	5	5	3	1	5	1	1	5	5	3,5

3	5	5	4	1	3	3	3	4	5	2
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	6	1,2,3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
1	2	1	1	1	4	1	3	1	5	5
1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1,2,3
1	2	1	1	2	3	3	1	1	6	3
1	4	4	5	3	4	3	4	2	1	1,3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	4
1	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	5	4
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1,2
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,3	1,2,3
4	4	4	2	3	3	2	4	3	1,6	2,3
4	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	1,3
1	5	4	1	1	1	5	1	1	5	1,3

1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,2	1,3
1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1,3
3	2	2	2	3	1	3	2	1	2	3
1	1	5	1	1	1	1	3	2	1,2	3
2	4	4	4	2	3	2	2	2	5	4
3	2	4	2	4	4	4	2	5	5	4
1	5	1	3	4	3	1	2	1	1	1,2,3

1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,2,3
3	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	3
1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	5	3
3	5	5	2	2	3	2	1	1	6	2
4	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4
3	3	3	1	1	1	2	2	3	1,2	1,2,3
2	2	4	1	1	2	1	2	3	1	5
2	2	3	1	2	2	2	3	1	1	3
3	2	5	3	5	4	1	3	2	1,6	3
1	5	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	1,2	1,2,4,5
1	1	1	1	2	4	1	1	1	1	1,2

1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	1,4	4
4	5	3	1	2	5	1	5	4	1,6	1,5
3	4	5	1	1	1	5	2	3	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	4	5	5
2	3	4	4	1	3	5	4	4	5	4
2	4	3	2	4	2	3	4	3	1,4	1,2
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5
1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	6	3,4
5	5	4	3	5	5	4	5	5	1	1,2,3
3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,2	2,3
2	2	2	1	5	5	1	5	3	6	1,2,3
3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,2	5
3	5	5	3	3	4	5	3	4	1	3,4
2	4	2	1	3	2	1	4	1	1,2,6	3

1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	5	1,3
5	4	2	4	3	4	1	5	5	1	1,4
1	3	2	1	2	2	1	4	3	1	4
3	4	4	3	4	2	5	5	2	1,6	3
3	3	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	1,6	5
4	5	5	4	4	5	2	5	4	1	1,2,3
3	2	2	3	3	5	3	3	3	5	2,3
1	1	1	1	1	2	3	2	4	1,4	1,2,3
2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
2	3	3	3	2	4	4	3	3	5	1
2	1	1	1	4	4	1	2	2	1,2	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	2,4,5
2	3	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1,3
3	5	5	2	5	5	3	5	5	1	5
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	4
1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1,6	1,3
1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	5	3,5
2	3	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	5

1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1,2,3
1	1	1	1	3	1	2	2	2	1	5
1	2	3	2	2	4	3	2	2	1,3,4	
1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	1,2,3
1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1,3,5
1	4	3	1	4	4	4	4	3	2	5
3	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	5	5
3	4	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	5	1,2,3
1	3	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	3
1	2	2	1	1	1	1	4	4	1	1,2,3,4,5
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	4

1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	4	4	4	3	5	4	4	4	5	5
1	3	4	2	3	4	3	3	2	1,6	1,5
2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1,2,3,4
1	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	3	5	4
2	5	1	1	1	1	1	2	4	1,2	3
1	2	2	1	1	3	1	4	5	1	2,3,4,5
2	2	2	2	1	5	1	2	4	5	4
1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2,3
1	2	2	1	2	2	5	2	1	1	1,2,3,4
1	2	3	1	1	1	4	3	1	1	3,5
2	3	3	1	3	4	3	1	1	1,2,4	2,3
4	5	5	4	1	1	1	2	4	6	2,3,5
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,4	1,2,3
3	4	4	3	4	4	5	4	2	1	3
3	4	5	5	5	3	1	3	5	5	1,3,4
3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,2,3
3	1	1	1	3	1	4	2	2	1,2	2,3
1	1	3	3	1	2	4	2	2	1	1,2,5
1	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	4	1,2,3,4,6	5
1	3	5	4	4	4	2	3	2	1,2,6	1,2,3,5
5	4	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	5	4
2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	3	2	1,2,3
1	4	5	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	3,5

2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1,3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	3
2	1	3	1	3	1	1	2	2	6	3
1	1	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	1,6	5
1	5	3	1	5	4	1	2	4	5,6	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	3	1	1,3
3	4	5	2	1	1	5	5	1	1,4	3
1	4	3	1	1	5	3	1	1	1	3
2	2	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	1,2,3
1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	5	4
1	3	1	1	1	1	3	1	3	1	1,2,3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	3,4
2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1,2	3
5	5	5	5	4	3	5	4	4	1,2	1,2,3
3	4	4	3	3	2	2	1	4	1	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4,5
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	3
2	3	2	1	2	1	2	3	5	1	2,3
3	3	4	4	3	4	4	1	1	1	1,2,3
1	5	2	2	3	3	5	3	3	1,4	5
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	5	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4
4	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	5	1	3
3	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	2	1,2	1,2,3
3	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	3	5	1,3
1	2	3	1	1	1	5	2	2	6	3

4	1	5	1	3	4	1	5	3	1	1,3
3	3	5	4	2	2	2	3	1	1,4	1,3
1	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	1	1,2	3,5
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	4
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,2,3
5	5	3	3	2	2	2	5	5	6	4,5
3	2	5	4	3	1	3	2	4	1	5
1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	5	3
1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	1,6	1,2,3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,2	5
1	1	1	1	3	1	1	3	2	1	5
1	2	3	5	4	5	4	5	5	1	1,2,3
2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	3
2	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1,2	2,3
2	2	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	1,6	3,5
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	2
3	4	3	1	2	2	5	2	3	5	1,2,3,4
2	3	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	1	3
4	3	1	1	4	1	1	1	5	1	3
1	2	2	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
3	4	3	3	2	3	3	3	4	5	4
3	3	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	5,6	1,3
1	5	4	3	2	2	1	5	3	1,3	4,5
3	4	3	2	4	3	1	2	3	5	1,4,5
3	3	2	2	2	3	5	3	3	1	1,3
1	2	1	1	2	3	2	2	2	1	3
2	3	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	5

1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1,3
1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	4	1,3	3,5
2	1	5	3	5	2	2	2	1	1	2,3
3	3	1	1	2	2	2	5	5	1	1,2,3
2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1,6	1,2,3
4	5	5	4	4	3	1	3	1	1	1,2
3	3	4	2	4	4	2	4	2	1,6	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,4	1,2,3,4
2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	4
2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	4	5	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,2	5
1	3	2	1	3	3	2	1	2	1	1,2,3
1	2	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	5	
2	1	1	1	1	4	3	2	2	1,2	1
2	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	4,5
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1,2,3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
5	5	3	3	5	5	2	3	4	1	1,2,3
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1,2	1,2

1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	5	5
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	4	5
1	4	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
1	3	4	1	1	2	5	4	1	1,4,6	4
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
5	5	5	1	3	3	4	5	5	1	1,2,3
3	3	2	1	2	2	1	3	3	1	1,3
1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	3
5	4	3	2	3	5	1	5	3	1	5
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1,2,3
4	1	3	3	1	1	5	3	3	1,2	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1,2,3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	4
2	1	2	1	4	1	2	3	1	1	1,3,4
2	1	1	1	2	1	3	1	1	1,4	2,3
1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	1,3
3	5	5	3	3	1	1	5	5	1	1,2,3
1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,3
3	3	2	1	3	1	4	5	5	1	2,3
2	2	2	4	1	5	3	3	1	1	4
1	1	5	4	2	2	3	1	2	1	1,3
5	5	5	2	5	2	2	2	1	1,4,6	5
2	4	1	2	4	1	4	2	2	1	1,3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1,6	2,3
1	3	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	1,2	3
2	3	2	1	2	4	1	1	2	1,2,6	1,2,3

2	3	1	2	2	3	2	1	3	1	1,2,3
1	4	4	2	4	5	3	4	4	1,4	1,2,3,5
2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1,6	3
1	1	1	1	3	4	1	1	1	1,2	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	3,4
3	5	4	2	4	4	2	5	2	1,2	1,2,3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	2,3
1	3	1	1	3	1	1	5	3	1,4,6	1,3,4
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,4	4
1	5	5	5	3	5	5	4	3	6	5
1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1,6	5
1	1	1	1	2	1	3	1	2	2	3
1	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	3	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	5	3
1	3	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	6	1,2
1	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1
1	3	4	2	2	1	3	1	2	5	3
5	5	5	5	5	5	3	3	3	1	1
3	1	5	5	4	5	2	3	4	1	1,3,5
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	4

2	2	2	2	2	3	4	2	3	5	1
1	3	1	1	1	1	5	3	5	1	1,2,3
5	5	5	5	2	4	4	4	1	1,2	1,2,3
3	5	5	5	5	2	4	2	4	5	1,3
1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1,6	3,5
1	1	2	1	3	2	2	3	2	5	2,4
1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	2

1	1	1	1	3	1	1	4	1	5	5
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1,2
1	5	5	2	1	1	5	3	2	5	2,3
3	4	2	2	4	4	2	4	4	1	2
4	2	5	1	3	1	3	4	2	1,2	1,2,3
1	1	1	1	2	3	1	1	2	1,2	1,2,3
1	1	5	4	3	5	4	3	1	1	3

Appendix DD

Raw Data part four: Oldenberg Burnout Inventory (first half).

New/ Interesting Aspects	Tired Before Work	Negative Talk	More Time to Recoup	Tolerate Pressure Well	Mechanically Working	Positive Challenge	Emotionally Drained
1	1	2	1	2	2	2	3
2	1	1	1	3	3	1	1
2	2	3	3	1	2	3	3
2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	4	3	2	1	2	2
2	1	2	1	2	2	3	4
2	2	2	3	2	1	1	1
2	3	3	1	2	1	2	2
2	2	2	2	1	2	3	3
1	2	3	3	2	1	3	2
1	1	2	4	3	2	2	4
3	2	1	1	3	4	1	1
2	1	2	1	3	2	2	2
2	2	3	1	2	2	2	3
2	1	3	3	2	2	3	3
1	1	2	1	2	2	1	2
1	2	4	4	1	1	4	4
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
2	3	2	2	3	3	3	3

3	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
2	2	2	1	2	2	2	3
2	2	4	3	2	2	2	2
2	1	3	1	2	2	2	2
2	1	2	2	3	3	1	3
2	2	4	2	2	2	2	2
2	2	3	3	1	1	3	3
1	1	2	1	3	2	2	3
3	2	1	1	3	4	1	1
2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3
2	1	3	1	2	1	3	2
2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3
2	1	2	1	3	3	2	1
2	2	3	2	3	2	2	3
2	2	3	3	2	1	3	4
1	2	4	3	2	1	2	3
3	1	2	3	3	2	2	2
1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3
1	3	4	3	1	1	4	3
1	1	4	2	1	1	3	2
3	1	2	1	3	2	1	1
2	1	3	2	2	2	3	3
2	2	3	3	1	2	4	2
2	1	3	1	2	2	1	3
2	2	2	2	3	2	1	2
4	1	1	1	4	4	1	1
2	1	3	1	2	2	1	2
2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2

2	1	2	1	3	2	1	2
1	3	4	3	1	1	3	2
2	2	3	2	1	1	3	2
1	2	4	3	2	2	4	4
1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
2	2	3	2	3	2	2	3
2	2	3	1	3	2	2	2
2	2	3	3	2	2	2	3
1	3	3	3	2	1	3	3
2	1	2	1	3	2	2	3
2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3
2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3
2	2	3	3	1	2	2	3
1	1	3	1	2	1	2	3

2	2	4	3	2	2	3	3
2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3
2	1	1	1	3	3	1	1
2	1	2	2	2	3	1	1
2	1	3	2	3	3	1	2
1	1	3	3	2	1	2	4
1	2	3	3	1	1	2	3
1	2	4	4	1	1	3	3
1	1	3	1	2	1	1	3
3	1	2	1	3	3	1	2
2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2
1	1	3	2	2	1	3	1
2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2

2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
1	2	3	3	1	1	2	3
1	1	1	1	3	3	1	2
2	1	3	3	2	2	3	2
2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1
2	1	2	2	3	2	3	3
2	1	2	2	3	2	1	2
2	1	2	1	2	3	1	1
3	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
2	1	3	1	4	2	1	2
1	2	2	2	3	3	3	4
2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2

3	1	2	1	2	2	1	2
1	1	3	2	2	2	2	3
1	2	4	2	1	1	2	3
2	1	1	1	4	4	1	2
2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3
2	2	3	2	2	1	2	3
2	2	2	3	4	2	2	3
2	1	3	3	2	1	2	2
1	2	3	2	2	1	2	1
2	2	3	4	2	2	2	3
2	1	1	1	2	3	1	2

2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1
1	1	3	1	2	1	1	4
1	2	4	2	2	1	3	3
2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2
1	2	3	1	3	1	2	2
2	3	3	3	2	1	3	4
2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2
2	3	3	3	2	1	2	2
2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3
2	2	3	2	3	2	1	3
1	3	4	3	1	1	2	2
2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3
1	1	2	1	4	2	1	4
1	1	2	2	1	2	1	4

2	1	3	2	3	2	1	2
1	1	3	2	2	1	3	3
2	2	3	3	2	2	2	3
2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2
2	3	3	2	2	2	3	3
3	1	2	1	2	3	2	1
1	2	3	2	1	1	2	3

1	1	2	3	2	2	3	3
1	1	2	1	2	3	1	2
1	3	4	3	2	1	3	3
3	1	2	2	3	2	1	1
2	1	1	1	2	2	1	3
1	2	3	2	3	2	2	4
2	1	3	2	2	1	2	3
2	1	3	2	2	3	2	2
1	2	2	3	2	2	3	3
2	1	2	2	3	2	2	2
2	1	1	1	2	3	1	1
2	2	3	3	2	2	4	3

1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	1	1	1	4	3	1	1
3	1	1	1	3	3	1	2
2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2
2	2	3	2	2	1	2	2
1	2	3	3	2	2	3	1
2	1	1	2	2	2	1	2
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
2	1	3	1	3	2	1	2
2	1	1	1	3	2	1	2
3	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2
2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
1	1	2	3	3	2	1	1
1	2	3	2	2	1	2	3

2	1	3	1	3	2	2	3
2	1	1	2	3	3	2	1
3	1	3	3	2	2	1	3
2	3	2	1	3	2	1	3
2	3	3	3	2	2	3	1
1	1	3	2	2	2	2	2
2	1	2	1	3	3	1	1
2	1	3	3	1	2	2	3
2	2	4	3	2	2	3	3
1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1
3	1	1	1	3	4	1	1
1	2	4	4	2	1	4	2
2	1	2	1	2	2	1	1
2	2	2	1	3	3	2	4
2	3	2	3	2	2	3	3
2	3	3	3	1	2	3	3
2	3	3	3	1	2	3	3

1	2	3	2	2	2	2	3
1	3	3	4	1	2	3	2

1	3	4	4	2	1	2	3
2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3
2	2	2	1	2	2	1	3
1	3	3	3	1	2	2	3
2	1	2	2	2	3	2	2
1	1	2	2	2	2	1	4
1	3	4	3	1	1	3	2

1	2	3	3	1	2	3	2
1	2	3	3	2	2	3	3
1	1	2	1	3	2	1	2
1	1	2	1	3	2	2	4
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
2	3	3	3	1	2	3	2
1	3	2	2	2	2	1	1
1	2	4	3	1	1	3	3
1	3	2	3	2	2	2	3
2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2
2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
2	1	1	1	2	2	1	4
2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2
2	1	1	1	2	3	1	3
2	1	2	1	1	2	2	3
2	1	3	2	2	2	1	2
2	1	1	1	1	3	1	3
2	1	2	1	2	2	1	1
2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2
2	2	4	3	1	2	4	2
1	1	2	1	2	2	1	3
2	1	2	1	2	2	2	3
2	3	4	4	1	2	3	4
2	1	3	3	2	3	2	2
1	2	3	2	2	1	2	4

2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
1	1	2	1	2	1	2	2
2	1	1	1	3	1	1	3
1	2	3	3	2	1	1	2
3	1	2	1	2	3	1	3
2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1
1	2	3	3	2	1	2	3
1	3	4	4	1	1	4	4
2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3
2	2	3	4	2	2	3	3
2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2
2	1	2	1	3	2	1	1
1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2

1	2	3	3	3	1	3	4
1	4	4	4	1	1	4	4
1	1	3	3	2	1	2	3
3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2
2	1	3	2	2	2	2	4
2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2
1	1	3	3	1	2	2	3
1	2	4	3	1	2	3	4
2	1	2	1	3	2	1	1
1	1	3	1	2	2	2	2
1	1	2	2	3	3	2	1
1	1	3	2	2	2	2	2

2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2
2	2	3	3	2	1	2	2
1	2	3	3	2	2	3	3
2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2
2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3
2	1	1	1	4	4	1	1
3	1	1	1	3	3	1	1
1	2	3	3	2	2	2	2
2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3
1	1	3	3	1	1	3	2
2	3	3	1	2	1	1	3
1	2	3	2	1	1	3	2
2	1	2	1	3	2	1	4
2	1	2	2	3	2	2	2
2	3	3	4	1	3	3	2
2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3
3	1	2	1	3	3	1	2
2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3
1	1	1	1	3	3	1	4
1	3	4	3	2	1	4	4
1	2	3	3	1	1	3	4
2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2
1	1	2	1	2	1	2	4
1	1	3	1	2	1	1	1
2	1	2	2	3	3	2	1
2	1	3	3	4	3	1	3
2	1	3	1	2	1	3	2
3	1	3	3	2	2	2	2

1	2	3	3	2	1	3	3
1	2	4	4	2	1	3	4
1	2	3	2	2	2	1	1
1	1	3	1	3	2	1	3
1	2	3	3	2	2	2	2
2	2	2	1	3	2	1	2
3	3	3	3	2	2	3	1
2	1	3	3	1	2	1	3
2	2	3	3	2	2	3	1
2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3
2	2	3	3	2	2	2	3
2	1	1	1	2	3	1	2
1	1	4	2	2	1	4	4
1	1	4	2	1	1	2	4
2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3
2	1	2	2	3	2	2	2

2	2	3	1	2	1	3	1
1	2	4	4	2	1	3	2
1	2	3	2	2	1	3	3
2	2	3	3	2	2	2	3
1	1	3	1	2	1	2	4
1	3	3	2	2	2	2	3
2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3
3	1	1	1	4	3	1	2
2	1	2	2	2	3	1	2
2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3
2	1	1	1	3	4	1	2
3	2	2	2	3	2	2	3
2	1	1	1	4	2	1	2
1	2	4	4	1	2	3	3
2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2
3	1	2	1	3	3	1	1
1	2	4	4	1	1	4	2
2	2	4	4	1	2	4	2
1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1
2	1	2	2	3	2	2	2
2	1	1	1	3	2	1	1
2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2
1	2	4	3	1	2	3	2
1	1	1	4	4	2	1	1
3	1	1	1	3	3	1	2
1	4	4	3	1	1	3	3
2	1	3	2	2	2	2	3
1	1	3	2	2	2	2	2

2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2
1	1	2	1	3	2	2	4
2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2
1	1	3	3	2	1	2	2
1	2	4	3	1	1	3	3
2	1	2	2	2	2	1	2
2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2
2	1	3	1	2	2	1	1
1	2	3	2	2	2	2	4
1	2	2	2	2	1	3	2
1	2	3	3	2	1	3	3
1	3	3	3	2	2	3	3
2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3
2	1	2	2	2	2	1	2
1	1	4	4	4	1	3	4
1	2	4	2	2	1	3	3
2	2	3	2	3	2	2	3
1	3	4	3	1	1	4	4
1	1	2	1	3	2	1	2
1	3	4	3	1	1	3	2

1	1	2	1	3	2	1	1
1	1	3	2	2	1	2	3
2	1	2	2	3	2	1	2
2	1	1	1	3	3	2	2
1	2	4	4	1	1	3	4
2	2	3	3	3	2	1	1
2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3

2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3
2	2	3	3	2	1	1	3
2	1	1	2	3	2	3	2
2	1	2	4	1	3	1	3
1	1	3	1	2	3	1	1
2	1	1	1	1	2	1	2
2	1	3	2	2	2	3	2
1	2	3	2	2	2	2	3

Appendix EE

Raw Data part five: Oldenberg Burnout Inventory (second half).

Disconnected	Energy for Leisure	Sickened by Tasks	Worn Out	Only Imagined Career	Can Manage Amount of Work	Feel Cngaged	Feel Energized
4	4	1	2	1	1	3	1
3	2	1	3	3	3	4	1
3	4	3	3	2	3	2	1
4	3	1	3	2	3	2	2
1	1	1	1	4	3	3	1
2	3	1	1	2	1	1	1
3	2	1	3	2	3	2	1
1	3	3	1	1	1	2	1
3	4	1	1	1	1	1	2
2	4	3	3	1	2	2	2
2	4	3	3	2	2	2	2
1	3	2	2	2	3	3	2
4	3	1	3	3	4	4	2
3	3	1	1	1	2	2	1
3	4	1	2	2	2	2	1
3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2
4	4	1	1	1	2	2	2
1	4	4	1	1	1	1	2
3	4	2	3	2	2	2	1
3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
2	4	2	1	1	3	2	1

2	4	2	2	2	2	2	1
4	4	1	2	2	2	2	2
2	3	1	3	2	2	2	1
3	4	2	3	2	2	2	1
2	4	3	2	2	2	1	1
4	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
4	3	1	4	3	3	3	2
2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	2	1	1	2	2	2
2	4	3	2	2	2	2	1
3	2	1	3	3	3	3	1
3	3	2	3	2	2	2	1
2	4	3	2	2	2	2	1
2	3	3	1	1	2	1	1
4	3	1	3	2	3	2	1
2	3	2	2	2	2	2	1
2	4	3	1	1	1	1	1
3	4	2	1	1	2	3	1
3	1	1	3	2	3	2	1
3	3	3	3	2	2	2	1
2	4	3	2	1	3	2	1
3	3	1	2	2	2	2	1
3	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
4	1	1	3	1	4	4	2
4	2	1	3	2	2	3	2
2	4	3	3	2	3	2	2
3	3	1	3	3	3	2	2
3	4	4	3	1	2	2	1

2	4	2	4	2	2	2	2
2	4	3	3	2	2	1	1
2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2
3	4	2	2	2	3	2	1
3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2
2	3	2	3	2	2	2	1
2	3	3	1	1	1	2	2
4	2	1	2	2	3	2	2
3	3	2	4	2	3	2	2
3	3	2	1	2	2	3	1
2	4	2	3	2	2	2	1
2	3	2	3	2	2	2	1
2	4	3	3	2	3	2	1
3	3	1	1	2	2	2	2
4	1	1	3	3	3	4	1
4	1	1	1	2	3	3	1
3	3	2	2	2	3	3	1
3	4	2	1	2	2	2	1
2	3	2	1	1	1	1	1
2	4	3	2	1	2	2	1
3	3	2	1	1	2	2	1
4	3	1	2	3	3	4	1
3	3	2	1	2	3	2	2
4	4	3	4	2	2	2	2
4	3	1	1	2	3	3	2
3	3	2	2	2	2	2	1
3	4	2	1	1	2	1	1

3	2	1	1	2	3	2	1
3	3	2	1	2	2	2	1
3	2	1	4	2	3	2	2
3	3	2	2	2	3	3	1
3	2	1	3	2	2	2	2
4	3	1	1	1	3	2	2
3	3	2	3	2	3	3	1
4	3	1	2	3	2	2	1
3	2	1	4	2	3	3	2
3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2

4	4	1	3	2	4	2	1
2	3	2	2	2	2	2	1
1	3	3	2	1	2	1	1
3	1	1	3	2	4	4	2
3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
4	3	1	2	2	2	2	1
4	3	2	2	4	2	3	2
3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2
2	4	1	1	2	2	2	1
1	4	3	1	1	2	2	2
2	1	2	4	2	3	3	1

3	3	1	3	2	1	3	1
3	4	1	1	1	2	2	2
3	4	2	2	2	2	2	1
2	3	3	2	1	2	2	2
3	4	3	4	1	2	3	1
2	4	3	1	2	2	2	1
3	3	2	3	2	2	2	1
3	4	2	3	1	2	2	1
4	3	4	1	2	2	3	1
3	3	2	3	2	3	3	1
1	4	4	2	2	2	2	1
2	4	2	3	2	3	2	2
4	2	1	2	2	3	3	2
3	4	3	4	1	3	3	2

3	3	2	3	2	2	3	1
1	2	2	1	1	1	3	1
2	4	2	3	2	2	2	2
2	3	3	4	2	2	2	1
2	3	3	3	2	2	2	1
3	2	1	3	2	3	3	2
3	4	2	1	1	1	2	1

3	3	2	2	2	2	3	1
3	4	2	4	2	3	2	2
2	4	3	3	2	2	2	1
3	3	1	3	3	3	3	1
4	3	1	4	2	3	3	1
4	4	2	1	3	2	2	1
2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2
2	3	3	3	2	2	2	1
3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2
3	2	1	1	2	3	4	1
2	3	3	2	2	2	2	1
3	3	1	1	1	3	2	2
4	1	1	4	3	4	4	2
4	1	1	3	2	4	3	1
3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2
3	4	2	4	2	2	2	2
3	2	3	2	2	3	2	1
3	2	1	3	3	2	2	2
2	2	2	1	2	3	3	1
3	2	1	2	3	3	4	1
3	1	1	4	3	3	3	1
2	4	1	3	3	3	3	1
4	3	1	2	1	4	2	2
3	2	1	3	2	3	3	1
4	1	1	2	3	4	4	1
2	4	2	1	2	1	2	1

4	4	1	3	3	2	3	1
2	2	1	3	2	3	2	1
2	4	1	2	2	2	2	1
4	2	1	3	3	2	3	2
2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2
4	2	1	2	2	2	3	2
3	3	2	3	3	3	3	1
2	2	2	3	2	2	2	1
2	4	3	3	2	2	2	1
4	2	1	3	3	2	2	2
2	2	1	4	3	4	1	1
4	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	2	1	1	2	3	2	2
4	2	2	2	2	3	3	2
2	3	3	2	4	3	3	1
2	3	3	2	2	2	2	1
2	4	3	2	1	1	1	1

3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
1	4	4	3	1	2	2	2

2	4	3	3	1	2	2	2
2	3	2	3	2	2	2	1
4	4	1	1	1	3	1	1
2	4	3	2	2	2	2	1
3	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
4	3	1	1	2	1	2	1
1	4	3	3	1	1	2	1

2	3	3	3	1	3	2	1
2	4	3	2	2	2	2	2
2	2	1	2	2	2	2	1
3	4	1	2	2	3	2	1
2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2
2	4	3	1	1	3	2	1
3	3	1	1	2	2	2	1
3	4	3	1	1	1	1	1
3	2	2	4	2	3	2	1
2	3	3	3	2	3	2	1
3	3	3	4	2	2	2	1
3	3	1	3	3	3	3	2
1	3	1	4	2	3	3	1
4	2	1	3	1	3	3	2
3	4	1	3	1	2	2	1
3	2	2	1	1	2	2	1
3	2	1	2	2	3	3	1
3	2	1	2	2	3	2	2
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
2	3	4	1	1	2	1	1
4	2	1	1	2	2	2	1
3	2	1	2	2	2	2	2
2	4	3	1	1	1	2	1
2	3	2	2	2	2	3	1
2	4	2	3	3	2	1	2

4	4	1	2	2	2	1	2
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
2	4	2	3	2	2	2	1
4	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
4	1	1	1	2	2	3	2
3	3	2	2	2	2	2	1
4	2	1	4	2	3	3	2
2	3	2	3	2	2	2	1
2	3	2	4	1	1	2	1
2	4	4	1	1	1	1	1
2	3	2	2	2	3	2	1
2	4	3	3	2	3	2	2
2	2	3	3	3	2	2	1
4	1	1	3	2	2	3	1
3	2	2	3	2	3	3	1
3	4	3	1	1	2	2	1
1	4	4	2	1	1	1	1
1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
3	4	2	3	2	3	3	1
2	3	2	3	2	2	3	1
2	3	3	1	2	2	2	1
3	3	2	3	1	2	2	1
2	4	3	4	2	2	2	1
4	3	2	3	2	3	3	2
4	3	2	3	2	3	2	1
4	3	1	1	2	3	3	1
2	3	3	1	1	2	2	1

3	4	2	3	2	3	3	1
2	3	2	2	2	2	2	1
2	4	2	3	2	2	2	2
2	4	3	3	2	2	2	1
3	3	2	3	2	3	2	1
3	1	1	4	3	4	4	2
4	1	1	3	3	4	3	1
2	3	3	3	2	2	2	1
3	4	2	1	2	2	3	1
3	4	3	1	1	2	1	2
4	4	2	1	1	1	1	2
3	3	2	1	2	2	1	1
4	2	1	3	3	3	2	2
4	3	2	3	4	3	3	1
1	4	3	3	1	1	2	2
2	3	3	2	2	2	2	1
3	2	1	2	3	3	2	2
3	3	2	2	2	3	3	2
4	2	1	4	3	1	4	2
2	4	2	2	2	1	1	2
1	3	3	1	1	1	1	2
2	3	3	3	2	3	3	1
3	4	2	2	2	1	2	2
3	2	1	1	1	2	3	2
2	3	1	4	1	3	3	1
4	2	1	3	2	3	3	1
4	3	1	2	1	2	1	1
2	2	1	3	3	3	2	2

2	4	2	3	2	2	2	1
2	4	3	3	2	1	1	2
3	3	2	4	1	3	2	2
3	3	1	3	3	2	2	1
2	3	2	1	2	2	2	1
3	3	2	3	2	2	3	2
2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2
2	3	2	3	2	2	2	1
2	3	3	3	1	3	2	1
3	4	3	1	2	2	2	
2	3	2	3	2	2	2	1
4	2	1	2	3	3	2	1
4	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
3	4	2	4	1	2	1	1
3	2	2	4	4	2	2	1
3	2	2	1	2	2	3	1

2	4	2	4	2	2	2	1
3	4	3	2	1	1	1	1
2	4	3	3	1	2	2	1
2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2
3	4	1	1	2	1	1	1
2	3	3	3	2	2	2	1
3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
4	1	1	4	2	4	4	1
3	2	2	4	2	3	3	1
2	4	3	2	2	2	2	2
4	1	1	4	1	4	4	2
2	4	2	3	2	3	3	1
4	3	1	4	2	3	3	1
2	4	3	4	1	2	2	1
3	3	2	2	2	3	2	1
4	3	1	2	2	3	2	1
1	4	3	4	1	1	1	1
1	4	4	4	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	1	3	3	1	1
2	3	2	3	3	2	3	1
4	1	1	2	3	3	2	1
3	3	2	3	3	3	3	1
2	4	3	3	2	2	2	1
4	2	1	1	3	2	2	2
3	2	1	3	3	3	3	2
2	4	2	4	1	1	1	1
2	3	2	2	2	2	2	1
3	4	2	1	2	2	2	1

3	4	2	2	2	3	2	2
2	4	2	1	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	1	2	2	2	1
3	4	2	1	1	1	1	1
2	3	3	1	1	1	1	1
3	3	1	1	2	2	2	1
3	3	2	3	2	3	3	1
4	3	4	2	4	3	3	2
3	4	2	2	2	2	1	2
2	3	2	1	2	2	1	2
2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2
4	2	1	2	2	3	2	1
2	4	3	2	2	2	2	2
2	4	3	2	2	2	2	1
4	2	2	3	3	2	3	2
2	4	4	2	1	1	1	1
4	3	1	4	2	3	3	2
2	4	3	1	1	2	1	1
4	2	1	2	3	2	3	1
4	4	2	1	2	2	2	2
3	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
4	2	2	3	3	3	2	2
2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	3	2	3	2	2	3	1
3	3	2	2	2	2	2	1

3	3	2	4	2	3	3	1
2	4	2	4	2	2	2	1
3	3	1	2	2	3	3	1
3	4	2	4	2	3	3	1
4	2	1	2	3	3	3	2
3	3	1	4	2	2	2	2
3	3	2	2	2	2	1	1
3	2	2	4	2	3	2	1

Appendix FF

Raw Data part six: participant demographic answers.

Age	Gender	Gender (text)	Race	Edu Level	License status	Certifications	School Attended	District Attended
22	1		2	1	3	7	1	3
31	2		7	2	7	5,7	2	3
31	1		5	2	7	7	2	4
35	2		5	5	7	1,8	1	2
43	1		5	2	7	6	1	2
48	2		5	2	3,2	8	1	3
34	1		5	1	3	7	1	4
26	2		2	1	3	7	1	1
26	2		5	1	3	7	2	3
39	2		5	2,7	7	7	2	2
48	1		5	2	7	2	1	2
28	2		5	1	3	7	2	2
34	1		5	1	3	7	1	4
55	2		5	1,5	7	7	1	4
26	1		5	2	3	7	2	3
35	2		5	2	7	7	1	4
48	2		5	1,4	7	7	2	3
60	1		4	6	6	7	2	1
48	1		5	5	6	7	2	2
38	2		5	2	7	1,2,4	1	3
25	2		5	1	3	7	1	3
50	2		5	5	7	1,4	2	3

42	1	5	2	7,5	1,2	2	3
31	1	5	5	7	7	1	1
26	1	5	1	3	7	1	1
59	1	5	2	7	1	1	4
29	2	5	2,5	3	7	1	1
34	2	5	2	3	1	1	1
35	2	5	2	3	7	2	4
54	1	5	1	7	7	2	2
47	2	5	4	3	7	1	4
24	2	6	1	7	7	1	1
27	2	5	1	3	7	1	4
46	2	5	2	7	7	2	2
25	1	5	1,4	3	7	1	4
65	1	5	2,7	7	4	2	7
29	2	5	2	7	7	2	2
49	2	5	4,5	7,6	8	1	6
39	2	5	2,5	3	7	1	4
27	2	5	1	3	8	2	1
30	1	5	5	7	7	1	1
27	1	5	2	3	7	1	2
54	1	5	2	7	7	2	1
59	2	5	5	7	1,2	1	4
37	2	5	1	3	7	1	4
34	1	5	1	7	7	2	5
23	2	5	1	3	7	2	4
33	1	5	2	3	2,8	2	1
46	1	5	2,5	7	2	2	2
37	2	2	2	2	2,4	2	3

50	1	5	2,7	7	4	2	5
68	1	5	5	7	2,8	2	3
33	1	5	1	3	1,2	2	5
28	2	5	2	3	7	1	1
53	2	6	2	3	1,2	1	2
40	2	5	2	7	7	1	4
36	2	5	5	7	1	1	2
47	2	5	5	3	2	1	2
64	2	5	5	7	1	1	2
37	1	5	2	7	2	1	3
49	2	5	2	3	7	2	1
34	2	5	2	7	2,4,8	2	1
46	1	5	4	1	4	2	1
25	2	5	1	3,7	7,8	2	4
28	2	5	1	3	7	2	3
43	2	5	2	3	7	1	4
25	2	5	5	3	2	1	3
44	2	7	5	1	7	1	6
35	1	5	2	4	7	1	2
62	2	5	2	7	1,4,8	2	2
57	1	5	2,5	7	8	1	1
32	1	5	5	7	7	1	1
52	2	5	2	7	7	2	6
33	2	5	2	3	2	1	1
22	2	5	2	3	7	1	3
29	2	5	5	7	1	2	2
47	1	5	2	7	7	1	3

56	2		5	5	7	7	2	1
43	1		5	5	4	7	1	2
53	1		5	2	7	7	1	2
53	2		5	1,7	7	7	1	1
38	2		5	2	3	8	1	2
34	1		5	2	3	8	1	4
24	1		5	2	3	7	1	2
29	2		5	2	3	2	1	2
57	2		5	2	7	2	2	4
28	1		5	1	7	7	2	3
55	5	don't see the relevance	5	5	7	7	2	2
39	1		5	5	7	1	2	2
33	1		5	5	7	7	2	3
60	1		5	2	7	5	1	1
32	2		5	1,5	3	7	1	4
39	2		5	2	7,5	1,4	2	3
60	2		5	5	7	1	1	2
55	1		5	2	7	5	1	4
24	1		5	1	3	7	1	4
46	1		5	2	7,6	7	1	4
52	2		5	2	7	2,4	1	3

66	1	7	2	7	2	1	1
58	2	5	2	7	1	1	1
56	1	5	2	7	5	1	1
40	2	5	4	1	7	2	7
59	2	5	2	7	8	2	4
46	2	5	2	7	7	2	3
31	1	5	1	2	7	1	1
61	2	5	4,5	7	7	1	4
37	2	5	5	6	7	2	4
59	1	5	2	7	7	2	3
53	2	5	2	7	7	1	1
37	2	5	2	7	1,8	1	4
42	2	5	4,5,7	6	1	2	1
39	2	5	5	7	7	1	3
24	1	5	1,5	7	7	1	7
23	2	5	1	3	7	1	3
36	2	5	1,2	7	1,2	1	7
54	1	5	2	7	7,8	1	3
59 yrs.	2	5	2	6	8	1	2
33	1	5	1	3	1,2	2	3
32	2	5	1	3	7	1	4

41	2	5	5	4	7	1	4
44	2	5	5	6	7	2	4
46	2	5	1	2	7	2	3
30	2	5	2	3	7	1	2
44	2	5	4,7	7	7	1	4
68	1	5	5	7	7	2	2
50	1	2	2,7	7	7	1	4
39	2	5	7	3	7	2	4
38	1	5	2	7	7	2	1
32	2	5	2,5	7	1	2	2
31	2	6	1	7	7	1	3
50	1	5	2	7	1,2	1	2
61	1	5	2	7	6	2	2
44	2	5	5	7,6	8	1	7
47	1	5	1	3	7	1	4
67	1	5	2	7	6	1	6
53	2	5	5	6	8	2	6
41	1	5	5	3	7	2	6
33	1	5	5	3	7	1	3
48	1	5	1	7	7	1	4
24	2	5	1	7	7	1	3
35	1	5	2	7	7	2	4
29	1	5	1	3	7	1	4
49	1	5	5	7	7	2	3
27	1	6	2,5	3,7	2	1	3
31	1	5	2	3	6	1	3
34	2	5	2	3	7	1	1

35	2	5	5	1	7	2	2
33	2	5	1	7	1	1	6
35	2	5	2	7	7	1	3
45	2	2	2	7	8	2	3
52	1	5	2	7	1,2	2	1
31	2	5	2,5	1,3	8	2	4
34	2	5	5	3	2	2	7
27	1	6	2	3	7	1	1
56	2	5	2	7	1	2	4
38	1	5	1,4	1	7	2	2
25	2	5	2	7	7	1	2
34	1	5	2	7	7	2	4
50	2	5	5	7	7	2	2
64	1	5	1,5	3	2,4	1	2
57	1	5	5,7	7	7	1	1
72	1	5	6	2	7	2	7
46	1	5	2	7	1	1	2
60	2	5	4	6	7	1	4
40							

30	1	5	1	3,2	7	2	3
45	2	5	4	3	7	2	2
24	2	5	2	7	7	1	2
52	1	5	4	1			
53	1	5	4	6	4	1	5
26	2	5	2	3	7	1	
38	1	5	2	7	7	2	2

66	1	5	2	4	1	1	5
36	1	5	5	7	7	2	3
38	1	5	4	1	7	2	2
48	2	5	5	3	2	1	4
32	1	5	2,5	7	7	2	1
49	1	5	1,7	7,5	1,2	2	3
33	1	6	3	3	1	2	2
47	1	5	2	7	7	1	1
66	1	1	6	7	7	2	3
32	1	5	2	7	7	2	2
39	2	5	2	7	7	2	2
37	2	5	2	7	7	1	3
23	2	5	1	3	7	2	4
46	2	5	2	7	8	1	4
34	1	5	1,7	3	7	1	4
25	2	6	2	1	2	1	4
52	2	5	1,5	7	2,4	1	3
52	1	5	5	7	7	1	2
24	2	5	2	7	7	2	3
54	1	5	2	7	7	2	3
43	1	5	2	7	5,6	1	2
35	2	5	2	7	1,2,4	2	7
23	2	5	1	4	2	2	3
43	1	5	2	7	7	1	2
27	2	5	5	3	7	2	1

26	2	5	1	3	7	2	3
26	2	2	1	3	7	1	1
49	2	5	4,5	4,6	7	1	6
33	1	5	5	7	6	2	1
48	2	5	1	3	7	1	4
48	2	5	1	7	7	2	2
35	1	5	2	7	7	2	4
30	4	2	1	3	7	2	1
29	4	5	4	2	7	2	3
60	1	4	6	3	7	2	1
32	1	5	5	3	7	2	2
67	1	5	1	7	7	1	4
25	2	5	5	3	2	1	1
30	2	5	2	2	7	2	4
33	1	5	1	3	1,2	2	4
69	1	5	4,5,7	7	7	2	2
33	1	5	2	7	7	1	4
38	2	5	2,7	5	4	2	7
24	1	5	2	3	7	1	2
30	2	5	2	7	1,2	2	4
50	1	5	2	7	1,2,8	1	7
58	1	5	5,7	3	1,8	1	2
57	2	5	2	7	1	2	4
41	2	5	5	7	2	2	4
42	2	5	2	7	2,5	2	5
39	2	5	2	7	1	1	1
47	2	5	2	7	7	2	3

45	4	7	3	7	8	2	2
34	2	7	2	7	7	2	3
36	2	5	2	7	2	1	7
69	1	5	5	7	7	2	3
64	2	5	5	7	1	1	2
28	2	5	5	3	7	2	3
47	1	5	1	3	7	1	6
40	2	5	1,4	6	7	2	7
37	1	5	2	7	2	1	2
35	2	5	2	3	7	1	4
26	1	5	1,4	3	7	1	1
53 yrs	2	5	2	7	7	2	5
60	2	5	2	7	7	1	2
25	2	5	2	6	7	1	2
40	2	5	2	7	1	2	3
68	1	5	2,5	7	8	2	4
34	1	5	1	7	1,2	2	3
53	2	5	1,5	7	1	1	1
39	2	5	4,7	3	7	2	7
45	2	5	2	4	7	2	3
32	2	5	5	3	7	1	2
49	1	5	2,5	3,6	7	1	3
54	2	5	2	7	1	1	4
34	4	5	1	3	7	2	2
57	2	5	5	7	2	2	4
27	1	5	1	1	6,7	1	1
39	2	5	2	7,5	1,4	2	3
32	2	5	3	3	5	1	6

46	2	5	1	7	7	1	3
44	1	5	3	2	5,8	2	2
26	4	5	1,4	3	7	2	1
43	1	5	2	7	7	1	2
61	1	5	4,5	3	1	1	4
43	1	5	5	7	7	1	7
50+	1	5	2	7	1,2	2	1
27	1	6	5	3	7	1	6
27	2	5	1,5	3	2	1	1
35	1	5	2	3	5	1	4
38	2	5	2	3	7	1	2
33	2	5	5	3	2	1	1
68	2	5	2	7	2	1	2
41	1	5	2	7	7	2	4
32	2	6	1	7	7,8	1	1

53	2	5	5	6	8	2	6
47	2	5	1	7	1	1	7
50	2	5	5	7	1,4	2	3
52	1	5	1,7	7	8	1	3
49	1	5	5	7	2	1	3
44	1	5	5	7	7	2	2
61	1	5	5,7	7	6	1	2
27	1	5	1	1	7	1	1
33	1	5	4,5	7	7	2	4
40	2	5	5	7	8	1	4
45	2	5	2,5	7	7	1	4
34	1	5	1,5	7	7	2	3
62	1	5	2	7,6	5	1	1
62	2	5	2	7	1,8	2	2
62	1	5	2	7	7	2	4
55	1	5	5	7	7	2	4
45	2	5	6	7	8	1	3
48	1	5	4,5	7	7	1	2
46	2	5	5	4	7	1	6
32	2	5	2	3	7	1	2
29	2	5	5	3	2	1	2
44	1	5	2	7	2	1	4
46	1	5	2,5	7	1	2	4
43	2	5	2	7	8	1	1
27	1	5	2,5	3	7	1	3
37	1	6	1	3	1	1	1
24	1	5	4	3	7	1	2
34	2	5	2	3	7	1	1

35	2	6	2	3	7	2	2
48	1	5	2	7	6	1	2
41	2	5	2	7	1	1	2
25	2	7	1	3	7	2	3
57	1	5	2	7	6	1	1
33	1	5	2	7	7	2	1
49	2	5	4	3	2	2	4
36	1	7	2	7	4,8	1	3
57	2	5	5	7	7	2	1
53	1	5	1	7	7	2	6
50	2	5	5	7	1	2	4
45	2	5	2	7	2	2	7
43	1	5	4,5,7	7	7	2	7
48	2	5	4,7	3	7	1	2
68	2	5	2	7	1,2	2	2
48	1	5	2	7	2	1	3
61	2	5	5	3	1	1	2
60	1	4	6	3	7	2	1
54	2	5	5	7	8	2	1
67	1	5	2,5	7	7	2	1
38	1	5	4	6	7	2	2
47	2	7	1,4,5	7	1	2	4
27	2	5	2	7	7	1	3
33	2	5	1	3	8	2	3
35	1	5	2	7	7	2	2
25	2	5	1	7	7	1	2
36	1	5	2	7	7	1	3

59	1	5	2	7	1	1	4
48	1	5	2	7	7	1	1
42	2	5	5	4	7	1	4
39	1	5	1	1	7	1	2
31	2	5	5	3,7	7	2	4
26	1	2	2	3	7	1	4
53	1	5	2,5	3	7	2	2
32	2	5	2	7	7	1	1

Appendix GG

Raw Data part seven: participant comments.

Is there any other information you would like me to know about your job attributes, perceived stress, or workload? - Yes: please explain. (text answers below)
The workload is terrible, as a teacher who came into music from a gen ed classroom, the amount of classes we are expected to see, manage, and teach is too much for it to actually feel like I'm doing a quality job
I absolutely LOVE my job, my boss, and my students. My reason for leaving the school is life/family decisions - my boyfriend and I are moving states. I really believe your administration sets the tone for your entire working experience. If you feel trusted, supported, encouraged; it makes any challenge of the job workable. I am very fearful of leaving my amazing job to seek work elsewhere, but I know to look for admin that hold my same values.
Student behavior issues are one of the biggest drains.
I love my job, my building, my staff, my students, and my admin. I recognize I am extremely fortunate to have really found my place.
Umm... the solutions are simple. Pay teachers more. Smaller classes. More prep. Admins advocating for their teachers
I believe strongly that the cultural shifts we are experiencing post-COVID are killing the love of teaching for myself and others. Student apathy, extreme behaviors, apathetic or overbearing parents, clueless administrators, and the continual stresses of this job are becoming to much for many.
I have a lot of prep time. It really helps me to feel that I can complete my job and have the energy the job requires. I strongly believe if you teach multiple different classes you need more prep time.
Student behavior is the biggest challenge.
The reason I thoroughly enjoy my work is because of the artistic freedom I have; I use music as a tool to help students in their classroom attributes the best I can.
I feel kid apathy and lack of participation over the last 5 years has increased. I love my job, I think I'm good at it and I have a good school, good principal, good schedule, and good kids. Even with all of this, as the classes are big and classroom management is difficult I worry about being able to stay in the profession until retirement. I think we need good teacher trainer programs, good salaries/benifits to attract good people, and small class sizes so we can give the attention that each individual student needs. I each 520 students this year, but it's been as high as 750. I've also done jobs at 2 schools traveling back and forth...I disliked it and it was not a good situation.
Because the job of music teacher comes with additional responsiblities (after-school rehearsals or concerts, community meetings, etc.), the workload feels higher and I will often feel more tired because of those commitments.

There has been significant gaslighting around student concerns which sends the message that it's not an issue with the student themselves but that is a shortcoming on the educator. When teachers don't find their voice met with a genuine ear, we aren't encouraged to stay. There is overwhelming social pressure to go above and beyond the job requirements either by opening your own personal funds to buy gifts/prize boxes for students, feed them snacks, or sacrifice extra hours in a day. The job isn't a workload that's doable within the time restraints given. Teaching was never a profession that fit within a 40 hour week, but the social expectations to almost be a martyr are crippling.

I have a great job teaching great kids. The things that burn me out are the BS around the kids - meetings, staff development, new admin, computer work, etc...

This survey should not be sent out at the end of a school year. Teachers are extrememly exhausted and ready for a break. Maybe send this out between October & February.

I see about 250 kids a day. A lot of behavior issues and IEPs. I teach 9 classes a day, a lot of them back to back with no break in between. I find that I can hardly think or talk about anything besides my work. It's frustrating, especially as someone who values work/life balance. Sometimes I wonder if other music educators experience the same thing. This is a lonely job, especially as the only secondary music teacher in my district. I know I'm not the only music educator who feels overworked and under-rested, but it's hard to know if it's justified by my workload, or if I'm not the right fit for the job.

I also am an charge of our schools PBIS team

There is a disappointing homogeneity to music education, which is still heavily rooted in white European traditions (band orchestra choir), despite lots of talk about creating a more equitable, professionally relevant environment. Modern band, music technology, and media technology are really the keys to getting there imho but many teachers and administrators are reluctant to even allow classes like this. Music education can be more equitable with content at the k-5 level, but becomes rooted in the white European traditions very quickly thereafter

Thank for this work!

The four main challenges to me are: Student's mental health challenges, student's daily screen time/social media usage impacting behavior, large emphasis on testing, and schools safety issued are not being addressed.

I taught 11 years in Montana and then moved to Oregon 2 years ago. My experience in Oregon has been infinitely more enjoyable as an educator. I would say that my school environment is much more positive, the pay is higher, and the student behaviors at this school are less extreme. My admin is fantastic and the district as a whole is supportive of the arts and seems to be on a rebuilding trend. I am very happy here and can see myself working until retirement, which was not true in Montana.

Restructuring and seniority eliminated my job, AFTER I had signed my contract for next year. Unrelated, parents do not consider music an academic subject, so support for concerts and programs is low.

Lots of behaviors at my school so I take more days off than I have in the past. It's stressful.

One of the major factors that is keeping me at my current job is the fact that I have my own classroom that I do not have to share with any other teachers. This is huge for me, as my last job had me bouncing between four schools and sharing my spaces (not always a classroom) with several other people.
Dealing with an aging inventory, limited budget. and no plans to remedy the situation. I spend quite a bit of my own money to meet students' needs.

Before I was part time, my job was 100X harder than it is now. Being part time is the only reason that I still love my job, but I cannot afford to be part time for much longer. Which is why I don't see myself staying in education. When I was full time I was constantly exahusted/burnt out, had no time or energy for a life outside of school. Being part time has given me my life back.

Current student behavior is a factor in my work stress.
Public schools are holding society together. The job is getting harder and there are less people who are good at it. We need a serious societal shaft soon...

I'm very fortunate to have children, a supportive spouse, and family in town to help me. If I didn't have a supportive partner or family to help, I feel like my job responsibilities would overwhelm me to the point of needing to find a different career. This is especially true as a parent.

The majority of my energy being drained is dealing with student discipline and the rudeness in which students in class treat myself and other teachers and the way administrators almost seemingly do nothing to other than talk to the student, OR put the blam on the teacher by suggesting changes to how I run the class.

My location has lack of student accountability in behavior and consequences. Sometimes the workplace culture can display a less than optimal level of toxicity, which includes on location and other music teachers. I am often frustrated as I'm a newer teacher and I often recognize my own flaws too late to correct. It has been consistent that my students enter the 6th grade inspired me, and leave the 8th grade with a lack of respect due to my inconsistent teaching or how I manage my own stress in the classroom. I'm personally have a very hard year, but not a bad one as I've been correcting many previous flaws and mistakes I have consistently shown. This has been a year of learning for me. What makes this challenging is the ever-growing behavioral challenges at my school. It doesn't help my morale that when I try to discuss this with other, I'm often met with "it's middle school, what do you expect?". That all being said, I still love being a music teacher and learning how to grow my program, and teach/inspire students. I used to live for the "a-ha moment", but recently I've been inspired by learning how to navigate in the enigma that is middle school music education.

The change in student behavior since the pandemic has greatly affected the challenges of this job.

Numbers have been low since Covid - and administration understanding the content/work and supporting the arts is a struggle.

We are certified teachers, but the contracts of most districts do not recognize us this way; therefore, the administration does not provide adequate plan/prep break time and requires specialists to do extra duties that classroom teachers do not. I currently teach 25-30 consecutive classes without a planning period. We are also in portables, isolated from break room, bathrooms, office and work rooms. Sometimes, I am stuck for 4-5 hours without being able to leave my classroom to take care of my needs. Often spending my lunch time on classroom set up because there is not enough time to change things around for the next group of students, different levels and ages. Particularly tough because we are expected to offer the same level of differentiation, attentiveness to lessons / curriculum and behavior management as do classroom teachers, but with hundreds of students rather than just 25-30. The title "Specialist" has soured with me, as I feel like a second-class citizen employee, next to other teachers even though I have had the same amount of schooling, or more, requirements for certification, etc. Planning, instruction, assessment tasks are the same, for more students with more variables, and without adequate planning time we are actually face-to-face with students for more hours than classroom teachers. It is very discouraging to be so devalued.

The more work I do, the more work I get to do.
Some of my answers to the negative are due to the changes in climate after COVID, and some are due to a career pivot toward Music Technology (brought on by my experiences teaching during COVID). I'd be happy to talk more at length on this, if that is of interest to you and your study.

Some of our children with special needs aren't always getting the assistance they need until months or even years go by of data collecting and difficulty. I wish there were systems in place where children who are impacted could get help more quickly for the sake of those children in need, but especially for the classmates who are impacted by those who are struggling.

I love teaching music. I wish teachers from other fields respected the fact that I am a classroom professional like they are and not just a planning period babysitter. Their lack of respect towards music rubs off on the students and makes it harder to teach them.
I have young kids that need daycare paid for so my job is more than the paycheck it's contributing to joy and music lives that keep me coming back
I taught special ed and title for 15 years before teaching music. Music ed is by far the hardest teaching job I have ever had. High class sizes, no curriculum, and feeling disconnected at my school makes this job very difficult. Students behaviors have also been more extreme since COVID.
This is my first year working at one school and to do so I am teaching a 2nd class. Before this year they were having me teaching so many sessions and doubling up classes (over 40 kindergarten) in a class I had a quit date with no back up. In the eyes of my peers (other teacher in the building), Parent group and parents I am seem as "less than." It still takes a toll on my mental health. On paper I am a classroom teacher but I am not treated as that. I have also seen parent and student attitudes change over the years in a more negative way and that has added more stress and making me look for other jobs.

I am finding that kids between 3rd-6th grade are really struggling with empathy, listening skills, expectations in the classroom post COVID. This is the main source of my fatigue and stress after a day of teaching.

We have 2.5 music teachers at our school due to being a school diesignated for families who don't want their students receiving Spanish Two-Way Immersion instruction. It has cause our school to grow and grow. Because we need 2.5 Music teachers and P.E. teachers to satisfy our planning time, it creates a situation where the most fair way to split responsibilities is for the students to see two different Music teachers. It has created a mess with our schedule and there is less of a grasp on what the students are learning with the other teacher. We have by far the most K-5 classes in the district and nothing is being done to accommodate that.

The school is a PK-12 Private School, so there is a lot of autonomy

Yeah but I'm not going to type it all out. Feel free to reach out jmemusiced@gmail.com

My school will provide professional leave and pay for PE, Math, Counselor s professional development fee, hotel, gas, but never mind. I have to provide a written paper to explain why I should attend when others in my district do not have to and it is incredibly frustrating. Even the highschool teachers get theirs funded (all state, OMEA) without question but elementary gets denied. I have to get grants to be able to go. Also, curriculum. It took me six years of asking to actually get a new curriculum for elementary music.

With everything needing a physical copy and a digital copy, with more to do and less time to do it in, I am stretched beyond my bounds. The digital aspect of each class is a huge amount of work. Add to that, my district has had a terrible year with technology. Every teacher lost everything they had saved to the district server (years of work for many of us). The Wifi is out all the time. The INTERNET is out all the time. Printing is intermittent. We've had to go about a week without being able to email. Our attendance/grading program is broken. Yeah, it's been a challenging year. After the last two years being so challenging, I don't know that I have anything left to give. As much as I have loved teaching my specialties, I don't know that I want to do this anymore.
Well, I retire in one week after 21 years of teaching all levels of band. So how I responded to above questions may be different than if I were still working.

The daily schedule is crazy. 500 students, seen only once a week for 30 minutes. We are working on changing this, but if it does not change, then I will not be able to sustain the pace for too many years.

There is currently a large gap between self-imposed pressure to succeed (in a traditional sense) and externally-imposed pressure.

Throughout the last 24 years I have taught in 5 buildings, 3-4 different buildings a day. I have taught grades 5-12 in the same year. I have had to teach Adaptive Music for the Life Skills class. I regularly volunteer my time after school to tutor students in math. I also serve as an executive officer for my local Union and serve on the OEA Board of Directors. There is a lot more to the job than the assignment. You started to ask questions about that, but didn't provide opportunities to go "there". All of the "other" aspects of the job make a huge impact. It's not necessarily the job itself, but the other expectations to serve on committees, duty assignments, etc. that have a major impact on the stress load and burn out effect that you are looking for. Expectations to attend 4 hours of conferences after having taught a full day, pressures of standardized testing. These are the things that are making the job suck!

I am required to teach 25 classes, 2 times a week so there is no time for bathroom breaks in order to accomplish such a schedule and my classes are 30 minutes in length

It's not black and white. Teaching, in a school, is a dynamic field and we prepare and respond to multiple things all the time. There are small moments and factors that, if focused on, can seem horrible and are easy to blow up out of proportion. Is the good worth more than the bad? That's the question. Administrators, behavior management, colleagues, job demands, it all matters. I work in two schools, one with a great administrator but a very challenging student body and the other job with a mediocre administrator but very little problem with student behavior. I come home worn out from the first school but at the same time I am much happier at that school because my voice is heard and that administrator communicates with me, and the teachers of the school are a team. We are all in it together. At the school with good behavior, where it is easy to deliver lessons, sometimes the "boss" doesn't even say hello when walking by. Can I say that it's a good school? I don't know, but there isn't cohesion that is promoted from a spot of leadership. And that is upsetting because a principal needs to be a leader and not checked out or thinking that school is a business that you can show up late to and take sub days 'cause you're not feeling it. Essentially what I teach is the same in both situations - the work load is the same. I think maybe knowing that I might be walking into a storm any day and that there is a captain in charge, makes me prepare differently. Or my mind automatically reacts differently. Teaching music isn't always easy but it is full of joy, if you know how to experience it. That's a life skill. Probably the same for classroom teachers. I don't like switching classes every thirty minutes but I also wouldn't know what to do if I had to stay with the same kids day in, day out, all day long. Does this help? In a survey questions and choices need to be clearly understood. If there is some ambiguity in understanding then the results that you get might not be what you want. Be scientific.

Working at two schools in order to make full time is exhausting. I have 550 students to build relationships with and it is not realistic to expect music teachers to be at more than one school. If they want to serve the students the best, they need to be immersed in their school culture and be able to see the students every day.

My voice is going bad and maybe my hearing due to trying to speak loudly over students with instruments and singing all the time.

Student behavior and poor leadership at building and district levels. I honestly fell as if students AND teachers are being totally abused by our top down corporate "management" structure. Decision for funding schools should reflect the needs of students. Everything else flows from that context. State of Oregon needs to change the tax structure so the welthiest are paying into the school system, this has been a problem no one wants to address since they shoved Measure 5 into the system. We are so poorly funded it is amazing to hear administrators "explain" how difficult it is to solve the problem. They have had 30 years to keep their promise, maybe they could work a little harder?.

My weariness at the end of the day generally comes from giving everything I have to the kids...full energy...not from a place of dissatisfaction

Had I taken this survey last year this time (at my old school) I would have answered very differently. I was in a toxic work environment and was feeling lots of burnout symptoms. Being at a new school this year as helped so much with many of these things.

My current working conditions are the best out of any point in my career.

I get tired of colleagues trying to be very liberal and picking apart anything people say. I avoid talking to a number of colleagues, usually the ones who hang in the staff lounge, and tend to keep to myself and colleagues I know I can comfortably be myself around and make jokes. I find those same people also say equally thoughtless things, but pick apart others. It's probably my one main stress at work.

You should ask about what people are asked to do for their jobs outside of contract hours.

My work load has not changed much, but I am getting older. It is hard to keep up with the hours and emotional drainage in middle age than in early twenties.
As an elementary general music teacher, much of the additional stress comes from my building colleagues not treating me like an equal (I'm a singing baby sitter and provider of their prep), my administrators not being willing to support me or the music program (and having to constantly advocate/educate my administrators)), and even my music teacher colleagues not treating me like an equal (I'm just teaching "elementary music" and its "easy").

Unclear and/or unspoken expectations for how to interact with the public and community.
I love my school so so much, but my boyfriend and I are moving out of state. I will look for an elementary music job in another state, but I have huge concerns about re-testing for my license in another state. That might be what stops me from continuing teaching. That, and also the extreme mental and emotional load that teachers carry every day. It's hard for me to separate my thoughts and feelings about the day and enjoy the evening with my family.
Many more tasks are not being thought of by administrators. The number of hours required physical human beings needed to do various jobs in a school seem to be shrinking and many admins then as why something isn't being done or why things aren't working as they did before. There has been a great deal more assumption that teachers will simply "rise to the occasion" and help with other non-teaching tasks, instead of hiring more people to assist.
Shared staff means that I work at two schools. My schedule is tight and stressful with little time to transition. Communication between schools is nill, and I have to choose between staff meetings because they schedule them at the same time. I also have trouble building relationships because I'm split between two schools and rarely spend time w/ coworkers. I feel like an "extra" that isn't truly part of any group.
I was hired with the intent of building the music programs (band and choir) to merit the hiring of a second music teacher. With an administration change, arts was no longer a priority nor was my work-life balance. The answer, instead of hiring a second teacher, was to cut programs.
Band and choir classes are early-bird classes for which I receive no compensation. I do them tom give the students the opportunity to participate. during my career I have taught Algebra, Geometry, Religion, French, Theater, and coached football and basketball in the middle school

Teaching music can be very rewarding, but is often so challenging that the rewards secondary to the difficulties

The pressure of performances is my greatest stress.

My anxiety has gotten so bad at work in the past couple years that I am planning on how to leave education entirely. I've had multiple anxiety attacks during the teaching day, mostly due to behavior issues. I need to leave the profession for my health.

I feel like many women leave the profession to raise their children. That is the only reason I might leave is because of the price of childcare and that is a huge problem for teachers if they want us to continue to be able to work in this profession.
I have found myself having lots of anxiety before my work day starts. And the last two years have not felt that way at all. This is new to this year.

Teaching is getting harder and the requirements emotional and physical- are unsustainable.

This is my 2nd year at my current school and the particulars of THIS school have greatly influenced my answers. If I had taken this survey 3 years ago, I would have answered very differently as I was burnt out, thinking about leaving the profession and had to take a medical leave from the physical stress due to my toxic work environment.

I was at five schools my first four years in Beaverton. 10 of my 12 years have been in Title I. We have a decent amount of students fleeing countries in strife (Afghanistan, Venezuela), and many of those students carry lost of adverse experiences. My first non-Title I year was the best year of my career...then it got cut short due to COVID. I'm just exhausted all the time. I don't feel like my life has much balance. My main "hobby" outside of work is as a saxophonist in several ensembles. It's hard to find balance when Music is your profession and your leisure activity. I'm glad I've stuck with teaching for this long, as I usually get a decent pay bump every year. But, I'm at the point where even if I really wanted to get out of it, financially I can't.
We are teaching more students with severe behavior issues. These students are not being supported by special ed because of teacher shortages.

I teach 650 elementary students in a very small, rural town. It is absolutely exhausting and chaotic at best. I wish we had a cap on how many students teachers are allowed to teach. Half of this number would be fantastic.

Schools generally hire orchestra teachers at less than 0.5 and I find it hard to keep a job in regular public schools because they keep cutting my position and giving it to full time contracted band and choir teacher. Very disappointing.

I didn't understand this question: "How much are certain job factors effecting you career decisions?"

Students have changed. They are difficult, and the impact on education has been tremendous. It is much more difficult than ever before.

I finally found my dream job teaching middle school band, orchestra, and choir. However, I'm regularly drained, exhausted, frustrated, emotionally unstable, etc. as the year progresses. I get burnt out very quickly and very easily. I love this work and this year is amazing, but disrespectful students and families who don't seem to care, really drain me.

The music teachers at my school (I teach choir, and there is band and orchestra) are a large reason that I stay at my job. If we didn't get along, it would be very difficult to stay. The primary reasons I stay are that music is prioritized in scheduling (students must elect into choir and are not put in their against their will, like they are at many schools), and my administration largely gives me autonomy to teach and trusts that I know how to do our specialized work in education.

I am an experienced music teacher working outside of my primary concentration. The work is invigorating, but the new context is challenging, especially at this point in my career.

With the increase in student loan payments for private loans and the upcoming return of federal student loan payments and increase in cost of living in my rural community that is one of the main stressor and considerations for me staying/leaving my current teaching job

One of the biggest issues is seeing us as curricular. Our school broke up a grade level from 3 to 4 teachers due to behavior management and other student issues. They are recombined into three groups for PE/Music/Library, though. Also, this year feels very reactionary: so much has changed, and more is trickling down. "Oh, the students don't get a break, so now you need to pick up the students from our classroom so that we get enough prep minutes, and now you need to let the older students go to the bathroom." It disrespects our need to set up our classroom and get things started in an organized manner. Not every teacher wants students trickling in for 3-6 minutes as they go to the bathroom.

It's not always clear. Stress can be high some days and at the same time very rewarding moments might occur. Getting ready for performances is an example. The autonomy is often too much. There are standards for ES music but NO ONE checks to see if they are being met. Not having other music teachers in the building can be lonely and frustrating. It's a wonderful job but one that requires a lot of soul searching. I feel like I am the only one who holds myself accountable and this is perhaps the biggest emotional stress. It is easy to feel lazy.

I work .5 FTE but I definitely work more like .9 FTE because of all of the extra rehearsals, field trips, and concerts. Also, I can’t get my work done in 20 hours so I prep at home a lot before I go into work.

Sometimes administration doesn't understand our demands for a proper rehearsal space, and performance site. Our benefit to the district is very financial. We take a large number of students at one time for the same amount other teachers are limited .

In my experience, having a high degree of autonomy and trust from administrators has made the demands of teaching multiple levels at multiple sites manageable.

There have been times when I've been laid off, in positions I didn't want, teaching other subjects, and more. Now, my situation is improving, and looks promising that it will continue to grow into what I actually want to do.

Student/parent behavior is also strongly responsible for my decision to quit teaching. And what do you mean by "perceived" stress? If you do not believe that it is real, please do not go into teaching either.

My district constantly makes decisions at the district level that have a negative impact on my music program and teaching

Professional development activities and meetings about how to be a better teacher are far too often for teachers to actually have adequate time to implement anything in their classroom. If I could just focus on teaching and planning, I would feel much less burnt out in mid-October.

At one school, I have IA help in Kindergarten, while at the other school, I do not. I am not able to teach much content at the school where I do not have an aide. I still love both places I work though, but sometimes at the second school, I fell like music is perceived just as a prep for classroom teachers, and not seen as very important.

The changes in education over the last 10 years have been pretty dramatic, and have made teaching music more difficult. The biggest changes involve the mental well being of the majority of students is at an all time low. The job used to be about teaching the fundimentals of music, but today it is much more about teaching mental health awareness before you can even touch the music

My job looks very different than it did when I started and none of my music colleagues I started with still work with me. There has been a ton of turnover across the district and that has also made things more challenging. I don't know that I speak about my job more negatively, but showing up to work in and of itself can feel like a radical act of hope.

Some of these answers are skewed by a new position and new challenges. The absurd and very challenging admin turnover in Creswell was exhausting. Making the decision to leave was incredibly difficult... but, teaching music is the best job and I needed to get to a place that supported music. It is an extremely difficult job, without admin support it is too much.

My main stress is not being supported. Exhausted that every year is a threat that admin will change band to be every other day or my budget gets to the point i cannot get instruments repaired or cleaned.

In general, I feel great about my job and who I work with. THere is also a lot of autonomy around what and how I teach. Something I see that needs more attention moving forward is more of a shared vision around where we are going with our music program.

I teach at an Adventist Christian school. Part of the reason I answered so positively is that I do believe in the mission of our school, and also because I'm not teaching full-time, so it's less stressful. That doesn't mean I don't have ups & downs due to my own emotional cycles, and of course, the NW weather ☁. 😊 I enjoy living and teaching on the east side now. I was depressed during my student teaching while at plu & due to the chronically cloudy weather and low vitamin D of the west side. I love the autonomy I have over my classroom and honestly I had that in public school here also. Kodaly summer levels early on made all the difference in enjoying this profession. I could never get bored with elementary music 🎶

The poor facilities that I work in make my job much more difficult. The amount of requirements for taking a field trip have increased dramatically and make it very difficult to organize a trip.

Teaching music is important work, and society depends on our doing the job extremely well. Children deserve the very best, and how we teach and help them experience music will impact generations. We likely won't know the impacts we have made on the lives of children, and we need to be okay with that. Once in awhile we'll hear a story of how we impacted a particular student, that will keep us going for months and years. We need to keep doing the work, regardless. This work requires time, training, preparation, learning and sharing from and with colleagues. There are many circumstances swirling about us. Principals come and go, school boards change, policies change. I believe it's important to have a voice, and to have collective expectations. I also believe the thing over which we, as music educators have control, is who we are, how we prepare, present, and practice, how we continue to grow as musicians, how we show up every day, how we provide balance, playfulness, and joy in helping students find success as musicians. This is a job where you put in the hours needed for completing the job. I believe doing a job well requires time, and often more time than forty hours. Being a self starter with high self expectations is a required attribute. One needs to figure out personally how to manage stress. One needs to seek a circle of health and community to deal with one's personal realm. This is a fabulous career where one can have a large impact on hundreds of students, have much control over delivery of contact, have opportunity for creativity, work with colleagues sharing similar goals. It's important to do self care, and have perspective. Teaching elementary music has been, and continues to be, one of the greatest honors of my life. I have worked hard, attended certification courses, gotten degrees, continued to learn and grow. I have worked early and late, and on weekends. And yet, the burden is light, because music is at the core of the soul of our society.

We are certified teachers, but the contracts of most districts do not recognize us this way; therefore, the administration does not provide adequate plan/prep break time and requires specialists to do extra duties that classroom teachers do not. I currently teach 25-30 consecutive classes without a planning period. We are also in portables, isolated from break room, bathrooms, office and work rooms. Sometimes, I am stuck for 4-5 hours without being able to leave my classroom to take care of my needs. Often spending my lunch time on classroom set up because there is not enough time to change things around for the next group of students, different levels and ages. Particularly tough because we are expected to offer the same level of differentiation, attentiveness to lessons / curriculum and behavior management as do classroom teachers, but with hundreds of students rather than just 25-30. The title "Specialist" has soured with me, as I feel like a second-class citizen employee, next to other teachers even thoug

I’m being vetted for every communication to parents and colleagues a

unequitable music schedules and amount of students within the district

Working at two schools in order to make full time is exhausting. I have 550 students to build relationships with and it is not realistic to expect music teachers to be at more than one school. If they want to serve the students the best, they need to be immersed in their school culture and be able to see the students every day. It is also not realistic to expect specialist teachers to be "babysitters" for other teachers. We also need a FULL prep period in our day as well.

I have to self-advocate all the time to my administration, which should be supporting and not undermining me.

I have around 800 students and I only see them for around 30 minutes a week. Because of this huge student load and small amount of time with them, I am not expected to put on concerts. This allows me to teach them how to make music for their own enjoyment and use music that is more relevant to them. This takes a huge weight off both the students and me and makes my job easier and my classes more fun.