

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

FACTORS AFFECTING ELEMENTARY GENERAL MUSIC EDUCATORS'

WORK ENGAGEMENT

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

ELIZABETH MAUGHAN

Norman, Oklahoma

2013

FACTORS AFFECTING ELEMENTARY GENERAL MUSIC EDUCATORS'  
WORK ENGAGEMENT

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE  
SCHOOL OF MUSIC

BY

---

Dr. Charles Ciorba, Chair

---

Dr. Charlene Dell

---

Dr. Eugene Enrico

---

Dr. Ken Stephenson

---

Dr. Eric Day



## DEDICATION

The first educator in my family was my maternal grandmother, Lucy Edna (Swank) Brandyberry. She completed a bachelor's degree in education at the Kansas State Agricultural College (now Kansas State University) in the 1930s. It is with great admiration that I dedicate this dissertation to her memory.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my dissertation advisor, Dr. Charles Ciorba. This document would not have been possible without his direction, encouragement, and support.

I would also like to thank Dr. Joy Nelson. Though her name does not appear on this document, she initiated my studies at the University of Oklahoma and was an integral part of my Ph.D. journey.

Additional thanks to my committee members, Dr. Charlene Dell, Dr. Eric Day, Dr. Eugene Enrico, and Dr. Ken Stephenson. Their knowledge and guidance are greatly appreciated.

I would also like to thank the many friends I made while completing my studies at the University of Oklahoma, including Matt McCoy, Michael Ruybalid, Kathleen Taylor, Beth Mattingly, Chris Barber, Bryan Powell, Cheryl Taylor, and Tracey Gregg-Boothby. Thank you for sharing your advice, knowledge, and humor.

Finally, I would like to thank my family. I was blessed to grow up in a rural agriculture environment with parents who taught me how to work hard. I am forever grateful for my upbringing and the traits it has bestowed upon me. My new husband, Brandon, deserves special thanks. He is my best cheerleader and I cannot imagine life without him.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements .....	iv
List of Tables .....	viii
Abstract.....	ix
Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
Attrition .....	3
Stress.....	5
Burnout.....	7
Work Engagement .....	10
Support .....	13
Self-efficacy .....	14
Workload Satisfaction .....	15
Salary .....	16
Resources.....	16
Need for the Study.....	17
Purpose Statement .....	18
Research Questions .....	18
Definitions .....	19
Operational Definitions .....	21
Limitations.....	22
Chapter 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....	23
Teacher Attrition .....	23

Work Engagement .....	26
Support .....	29
Self-efficacy .....	36
Workload Satisfaction .....	41
Salary .....	46
Resources.....	48
Summary of Related Research .....	49
Chapter 3 METHOD .....	51
Instrumentation.....	51
The Pilot Study .....	53
Data Analysis of the Pilot Study .....	54
Main Study .....	55
Data Analysis of the Main Study.....	57
Chapter 4 RESULTS .....	58
Research Questions .....	58
Reliability Analysis .....	58
First Research Question.....	59
Second Research Question .....	64
Third Research Question .....	69
Fourth Research Question .....	71
Summary.....	72
Chapter 5 CONCLUSION.....	74
Summary of Results .....	75

First Research Question.....	75
Second Research Question .....	76
Third Research Question .....	78
Fourth Research Question .....	79
Implications .....	80
Recommendations .....	84
Conclusion .....	85
References .....	87
Appendix 1: Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES).....	95
Appendix 2: New General Self-Efficacy scale (NGSE) .....	98
Appendix 3: Maughan Elementary Music Educator Measure (MEMEM) .....	100
Appendix 4: Elementary Music Educator Demographic Questionnaire .....	104
Appendix 5: Institutional Review Board Approval.....	108
Appendix 6: Survey Invitation E-mail Message .....	110
Appendix 7: Informed Consent Form.....	112



## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
4.1 Reliability Coefficients.....	59
4.2 Participant Representation by State.....	60
4.3 Participants' Teaching Responsibilities .....	61
4.4 Participants' Years of Teaching Experience .....	62
4.5 Frequencies for Teaching Salary .....	63
4.6 Descriptive Statistics for the Composite Scores Representing Each Variable..	64
4.7 Descriptive Statistics for the MEMEM—Workload Satisfaction.....	65
4.8 Descriptive Statistics for the MEMEM—Resources .....	66
4.9 Descriptive Statistics for the MEMEM—Support .....	67
4.10 Descriptive Statistics for the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSE) .....	68
4.11 Descriptive Statistics for the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES).....	69
4.12 Intercorrelations between Work Engagement Variables .....	70
4.13 Summary of the Simultaneous Regression Analysis.....	72

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine which of the following variables best predict work engagement among elementary music educators: (a) support, (b) self-efficacy, (c) workload satisfaction, (d) salary, and (e) resources. Elementary music educators ( $N = 334$ ) employed in Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Iowa participated in the study. Correlations beyond the .01 level of significance were found between: (a) salary and resources, (b) support and resources, (c) support and workload satisfaction, (d) resources and workload satisfaction, (e) self-efficacy and work engagement, (f) support and work engagement, (g) workload satisfaction and work engagement. Correlations beyond the .05 level of significance were found between: (a) salary and support, (b) self-efficacy and support, (c) salary and work engagement, and (d) resources and work engagement. Results of the simultaneous multiple regression analysis revealed the five independent variables combined to account for 17.6% of the variance in work engagement. Accordingly, the overall multiple regression was statistically significant,  $R^2 = .176$ ,  $F(5, 328) = 14.02$ ,  $p < .001$ . Further results of the regression analysis indicated that support ( $p < .001$ ), workload satisfaction ( $p < .001$ ), self-efficacy ( $p < .001$ ), and salary ( $p < .005$ ) were statistically significant predictors of work engagement.

# Chapter I

## Introduction

Teachers typically experience a variety of complex and difficult situations within the workplace. These challenges can cause stress for teachers and can often diminish the enthusiasm they have for teaching. Music educators may face additional challenges as they often find themselves isolated from the rest of the staff while receiving little support for their programs. More specifically, an elementary music educator may be the only music specialist in the school building or possibly in an entire small school district. Given these difficulties, how can an elementary music educator maintain his or her enthusiasm and desire for teaching? If a music educator is not fully engaged in the teaching and learning process, leaving the profession (attrition) can become a viable option. However, if music educators are engaged in their work, they have the potential to maintain long and successful teaching careers.

*Work engagement* is defined as an “active, positive work-related state, characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption” (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002, p. 74). Certain variables can influence a teacher’s work-engagement levels. The following variables are typically included in research regarding the work engagement of general classroom teachers: (a) support, (b) self-efficacy, (c) salary, (d) workload, and (e) resources. However, no research has been conducted to determine if the aforementioned variables are significant predictors of work engagement among elementary general music educators.

Carlson (2004), Gardner (2010), and Melvin (2010) have suggested that administrative support has an influence on teacher retention. Recent research by

Maughan (2012) indicates support from multiple sources (e.g., colleagues, parents, students, community members) may help increase teacher work engagement. Previous research has also shown a strong positive correlation between work engagement and self-efficacy (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2007, 2009b). *Self-efficacy*, as used in organizational research, is an individual's perception of his or her ability to meet demands in any context (general self-efficacy or GSE; Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001).

Workload satisfaction, salary, and resources have also been examined as variables affecting work engagement. A teacher's *workload* (i.e., the work responsibilities expected of an individual) has been shown to have a direct influence on his or her ability to teach effectively (Johnson, 2006; McCann & Joahannessen, 2004; Scheib, 2003). Additionally, researchers found a heavy workload can negatively affect a teacher's attitude and, therefore, his or her work environment (Hamman, Daugherty, & Mills, 1987; Heston, Dedrick, Raschke, & Whitehead, 1996).

Salary may have an influence on teacher work engagement as it has been mentioned in various studies as a solution to teacher attrition and migration. Hancock (2008) reported that a \$10,000 salary increase might reduce the attrition and migration risk for arts educators by 40%. Additional data has indicated that 17% of educators have more than one job, and a salary increase may relieve the stress associated with managing multiple jobs (Krantz-Kent, 2008). Teacher resources have also been included as a variable in work engagement research. Johnson (2006) found that curricular support, adequate resources and materials, and suitable facilities have a strong influence on teacher job satisfaction.

An elementary music educator's lack of support and low self-efficacy, combined with a heavy workload, low salary, and few resources, may result in a lack of work engagement and possible attrition. The percentage of music educators who leave the workforce has been a general concern for the music education community (Hamman, Daughtry, & Mills, 1996; Heston, Dedrick, Raschke, & Whitehead, 1996; McLain, 2005; Scheib, 2004; Johnson & Birkeland, 2003; DeLorenzo, 1992; Gardner, 2010). Of course, music educators may leave the profession for many reasons, and attrition cannot be fully attributed to a lack of work engagement. However, more can be done to help music educators who leave (or are considering leaving) the profession because of a lack of work engagement. Determining what variables best predict work engagement among elementary music educators could help supervisors and administrators develop better work environments, promote positive work experiences, and alleviate attrition. In addition, educators may be able to address certain variables themselves to raise their level of work engagement.

### **Attrition**

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), a division of the U.S. Department of Education, conducts the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and Teacher Follow-Up Survey (TFS) every four years to create statistical data concerning teacher attrition and other education issues. The SASS asks teachers and administrators general education questions, such as (a) number of students who are eligible for free or reduced lunch, (b) number of teachers employed by the district, and (c) staff salary schedules. The TFS is conducted to determine why teachers stay at their job, move to

another job, or leave the field of education. From the data, these teachers are categorized as (a) stayers, (b) movers, or (c) leavers.

In 2004, the NCES reported that attrition rates in the fine arts were comparable to other teaching positions. During the 2000–2001 school year, on average, 8% of fine arts educators left their teaching positions and 11.4% migrated to a new position(compiled by Luekens, Lyter, & Fox, 2004). In comparison, 9% of math teachers, 7% of science teachers, and 8.7% of special educators left the profession that year. After the financial collapse in 2008, the TFS revealed surprising changes in attrition rates among fine arts educators. Data from the 2008 TFS (compiled by Keigher& Cross, 2010) revealed that 4.1% of arts educators left their jobs and 7.5% migrated to a new position. In contrast, 7.7% of math teachers, 9% of science teachers, and 12.3% of special educators left their positions. Because of the current reduced rates of attrition, there is no longer a shortage of fine arts teachers. However, in certain rural districts and high-poverty schools, teacher attrition remains a problem (Ingersoll, 2001). Furthermore, overall attrition rates of fine arts educators could return to higher levels as the economy recovers.

Attrition affects the U.S. education system in multiple ways. When teachers leave their schools, they take their experience and knowledge with them, and the school loses human and financial capital. As a result, the school has no choice but to invest in and train new teachers. In 2005, the Department of Labor estimated that attrition costs an employer 30% of the previous employee’s annual salary in addition to the salary of the new employee (as cited in Borman& Dowling, 2008).

## **Stress**

Teacher stress has been a concern in education since the early 20<sup>th</sup> century (Smith & Milstein, 1984) and provides the foundation for current work engagement research. In the 1930s, the National Education Association (NEA) published a series of articles pertaining to the selection and retention of public school teachers (National Education Association, 1932). Some school district leaders thought that a salary schedule, partially based on teaching effectiveness, would help teachers feel more satisfied and happy in their jobs. The NEA researchers concluded that pay could not be based on merit, as they believed there was no valid manner with which to measure teacher effectiveness. The researchers proposed school boards should keep teachers happy by providing job security through the development of tenure positions. However, the NEA also realized that other factors contributed to teacher health and happiness and recommended teachers should have (a) appropriate working conditions, (b) a balanced workload, and (c) intelligent and sympathetic administration (National Education Association, 1932).

In the 1940s and 1950s, researchers became more concerned with the mental health of teachers. Blos (1942) recommended that teachers should have lives outside their professional work. Rosey (1943) believed teachers needed to find ways to relax and seek sources of support. In 1945, the NEA published survey results in which teachers indicated a desire for numerous changes in their profession, including (a) understanding and cooperative principals, (b) helpful fellow teachers, (c) suitable equipment and building facilities, and (d) helpful supervisors (National Education Association, 1945).

Throughout the 1950s, research focused more on the expanding role of schools. Schools were dealing with a large influx of students and adjusting to the demands of the baby boom generation. Schools began providing health care and more athletic and extracurricular activities for students. With an exploding student population and new services to deliver, research dedicated to teacher stress declined dramatically (Smith & Milstein, 1984), although the debate soon returned in the 1960s and 1970s. Long and Newman (1969) found that various problems, such as overcrowding, low salaries, and lack of administrative support were contributing to teacher stress and poor mental health. In addition, Edgerton (1977) gave an example of the conversation an outside observer would hear at most teacher gatherings by stating, “teaching is the most frustrating, narrowing futile job this side of purgatory” (p. 120). Once again, teacher stress had returned to the forefront of education concerns.

To combat teacher stress in the 1970s, (a) smaller class sizes were created, (b) teacher aides were added, and (c) curriculum was improved (Edgerton, 1977). However, even with these improvements, researchers found that teachers had too many different responsibilities (role overload), some of which conflicted with each other (role conflict). *Role conflict* occurs when a teacher is asked to assume two conflicting roles (for example, the contradictory roles of disciplinarian and mentor). These multiple responsibilities resulted in confusion and stress for educators. Youngs (1978) conducted a study that examined teacher anxiety and stress and found that teachers had four basic needs: (a) being recognized as unique, (b) being part of a group, (c) being able to set goals for themselves, and (d) feeling their lives are meaningful. Youngs recommended that principal leadership could help teachers meet these needs.



With increasing public interest in teacher stress, Smith and Milstein (1984) published their history of the subject. The researchers found that “declining enrollments, school closings, budget crises, disciplinary breakdowns, and the sense that schools are not performing up to expectations” were causing more stress in the teaching profession (p. 45). Also, the changing demands on teachers and influence of outside groups (e.g., communities, legislatures, and interest groups) were negatively affecting the profession. However, these issues were no longer causing stress among teachers; they were causing teachers to burnout.

### **Burnout**

The phenomenon of occupational burnout was identified in the 1970s, but the term *burnout* was first used to describe drug addicts who had reached bottom (Schaufeli, Leiter, & Maslach, 2009). Freudenberger (1974), a psychologist who worked at a drug addiction clinic, borrowed the term to describe the volunteers at the clinic. The volunteers would reach a certain point in their employment and then suffer from a “gradual emotional depletion, loss of motivation, and reduced commitment” (Schaufeli et al., 2009, p. 205).

By the mid-1970s, other social service occupations began to describe employees as burned out. The nation’s War on Poverty had encouraged many young, idealistic people to take jobs in the human services sector to help change U.S. society for the better. However, those employees came to the realization that there were factors affecting poverty outside their control, and they would never be able to counteract those factors. According to Schaufeli et al. (2009), the employees became frustrated idealists

who were burned out. Maslach and Schaufeli (1993) also encountered burnout when studying human-service workers (e.g., social workers, teachers, and nurses). Many of these workers developed a negative view of their workload, felt emotionally drained, and were sometimes incompetent because of their emotional state.

By the late 1980s, researchers realized employees in most career fields were experiencing burnout (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996). Maslach (1982) first defined burnout as “a state of exhaustion in which one is cynical about the value of one’s occupation and doubtful of one’s capacity to perform” (p. 2). Maslach identified certain conditions that could lead to burnout. These conditions included (a) work overload; (b) lack of control; (c) negative peer relations; (d) lack of supervisor support; and (e) lack of workplace rules, regulations, and procedures. Maslach also suggested that those in educational and service institutions have the added burden of community approval and after-hours work duties resulting in job spillover (Maslach, 1982).

Various factors affect burnout. However, an often-cited burnout trigger is an imbalance between demands and resources at work. Also, conflicts between the employee’s personal values and those of the organization, or between the officially stated organizational values and the values in action at work, could elicit burnout (Schaufeli, Leiter, & Maslach, 2009).

Maslach and Jackson (1981) initially developed the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) for assessing burnout in social service careers. Since then, they have expanded the measure to include many fields. The MBI has been used in the majority of journal articles and dissertations that address the topic of burnout (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998).

In the mid-1990s, Maslach and Leiter (1997) revised their definition of burnout to “an erosion of engagement” (p. 23). In 2000, the idea of work engagement became more popular in the field of psychology as it was an outgrowth of positive psychology. An entire issue of the *American Psychologist* focused on the new research field of positive psychology. In the introductory section of this issue, Seligmann and Csikszentmihalyi stated: “The aim of positive psychology is to begin to catalyze a change in the focus of psychology from preoccupation only with repairing the worst things in life to also building positive qualities” (Seligmann&Csikszentmihalyi, 2000, p. 5). This particular issue contained 15 positive psychology articles on three main topics: (a) the positive experience; (b) optimism, happiness, and self-determination; and (c) the relationship between positive emotions and physical health.

The general impetus of positive psychology came from Csikszentmihalyi’s theory of *flow*. Csikszentmihalyi developed his theory of flow when he attempted to discover what elements were necessary for a happy life. Using Aristotle’s idea of *eudaimonia*, he discovered that happiness is not a matter of chance (Csikszentmihalyi, M., &Csikszentmihalyi, I., 2006). Rather, it is created when optimal experience is combined with a sense of mastery, or flow. Also, “flow is the way people describe their state of mind when consciousness is harmoniously ordered, and they want to pursue whatever they are doing for its own sake” (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990, p. 4). Positive psychology is based on the research of flow, recognizing that happiness, hope, courage, gratitude, and enjoyment are concepts that need to be studied(Csikszentmihalyi, M., &Csikszentmihalyi, I., 2006). At this point, research in the fields of positive

psychology and employee satisfaction/well-being have combined to focus on work engagement.

### **Work Engagement**

According to Bakker (2011), work engagement occurs when employees invest themselves in their work and positively respond to job challenges while taking advantage of job resources. Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, and Bakker (2002) established the most universal definition for work engagement, which is “a positive, fulfilling work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption” (p. 74). Work engagement differs from job satisfaction, work-related flow, and motivation in that it combines dedication with high vigor and absorption. Work engagement levels can also vary during the day as an employee completes different tasks (Bakker, 2011).

Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, and Bakker (2002) administered the MBI and a new engagement survey to a sample of university students and employees in Spain to determine if a correlation existed between burnout and work engagement. The researchers found that the two scales were negatively correlated ( $p < .001$ ). Two years later, Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) used the MBI and the new engagement measure (now titled the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale or UWES) in their research. They used data collected from employees representing four different Dutch service organizations to compare the measures. Results indicated that the MBI and UWES were measuring the same variable (burnout/work engagement), but once again, the data representing each measure were negatively correlated ( $p < .001$ ).

The UWES was created to measure vigor, dedication, and absorption—all of which contribute to work engagement (Schaufeli et al., 2002)—and has been used in numerous studies internationally. In fact, it is the most often used measure in the area of work engagement research (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010). From an educational perspective, researchers in Finland and the Netherlands have used the measure in research addressing teacher work engagement (Bakker & Bal, 2010; Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007; Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006). The UWES is an effective tool that identifies whether or not employees are engaged in their work.

Bakker (2011) believes job resources and personal resources affect work engagement. Job resources include collegial support, performance feedback, skill variety, autonomy, and learning opportunities. Job resources can also include any “physical, social, or organizational aspects of the job that may (a) reduce job demands and the associated physiological and psychological costs; (b) be functional in achieving work goals; or (c) stimulate personal growth, learning, and development” (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004, p. 296).

Additionally, an individual possesses personal resources that affect work engagement. These resources can include the following: (a) self-esteem, (b) self-efficacy, (c) locus of control, and (d) regulation of emotions. Also, positive self-evaluations can be linked to resiliency and help individuals influence and control their environment (Bakker, 2011). Previous research has shown that individuals with high personal resources exhibit high levels of work engagement.

According to Bakker and Xanthopoulou (2009), four factors enable engaged workers to perform job tasks in an efficient manner. First, engaged employees often

have positive emotions, which broaden their ability to think and respond within the job environment. Second, they have better health so they can direct all their skills and energy to their jobs. Third, engaged employees will work to create their own job resources and personal resources. Fourth, engaged employees can transfer their engagement to others in their workplace, thus elevating the performance level of the whole group.

Engaged employees are likely to be involved in the process of *job crafting*. This term is used to describe “the actions employees use to shape, mold, and redefine their jobs” (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001, p. 180). Through job crafting, the employee is creating a better job fit and experiencing additional meaning from his or her work. Teachers who are highly engaged in their work are able to align their strengths with the job at hand.

A commonly used model for work engagement research is the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model created by Bakker and Demerouti (2007). In this model, job resources and personal resources interact with job demands to influence work engagement and overall job performance. Also, while employees are engaged and performing, they are job crafting to positively affect their job and personal resources to further elevate their work engagement. The JD-R has been cited in multiple studies as the basic framework for work engagement research (Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007; Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006; Jackson, Rothmann, & Van de Vijver, 2006). Furthermore, the JD-R has been used as a theoretical framework for work engagement more often than any other model (Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Taris, 2008; Hakanen & Roodt, 2010).

## **Variables Affecting Teacher Work Engagement**

Work engagement in the field of education may be influenced by many variables. Research shows that support, self-efficacy, workload satisfaction, salary, and resources influence a teacher's work engagement and future employment decisions (Gardner, 2010; Johnson, 2006; Xanthopoulou et al., 2007). The following section will explore these variables and their affect on teacher work engagement.

### **Support.**

Support is crucial to a teacher's work engagement, and this support may take many forms. Within a school environment, teachers may or may not receive support from students, colleagues, administrators, and members of the community. Most burnout or work engagement research focuses on administrative support, as it seems to have the most influence on a teacher's job satisfaction.

Researchers have found that educators who were supported by their administrators are more likely to stay in their jobs, while those who believe they are not supported experience higher levels of stress (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Gardner, 2010; McLain, 2005). Johnson and Birkeland (2003) conducted a longitudinal interview study with novice teachers ( $N = 50$ ) and found that those who have collegial interaction, growth opportunities, appropriate workloads, and structured school support were more likely to stay in their jobs. Heston, Dedrick, Raschke, and Whitehead (1996) surveyed band directors and discovered that support from students, parents, administrators, and colleagues could raise levels of job satisfaction. Conversely, McLain (2005) found that

teachers who experienced negative feelings toward administrators, colleagues, parents, and the community were highly burned out.

Gardner's (2010) examination of the 1999–2000 SASS and the 2000–2001 TFS revealed that a lack of administrative support is the primary reason fine arts educators change jobs or leave the profession. Tye and O'Brien (2002) found that the two main reasons teachers leave education are accountability and increased paperwork (workload); however, the next three reasons (no parent support, unresponsive administration, and low status of the profession) are all evidence of a lack of support. In addition, Borman and Dowling (2008) found that risk of attrition might increase if a teacher experiences a lack of collegial collaboration and administrative support.

### **Self-Efficacy.**

Self-efficacy, an individual's perception of his or her ability to meet demands (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001), was first studied by Bandura (1977). Bandura theorized that a person with high self-efficacy would be able to shape his or her own thoughts and actions to reach specific goals. As goals are attained, a person's sense of self-efficacy is strengthened. Eventually, even failure at a task will not affect a person with high self-efficacy. Workers with high self-efficacy will also be highly motivated and persistent (Schunk, 1995).

Self-efficacy has been included as a variable in many work engagement studies. It is logical to assume that employees with high self-efficacy would also have high levels of work engagement because they are motivated, persistent, and optimistic. Furthermore, previous research supports this hypothesis. In a literature review, Bakker,



Schaufeli, Leiter, and Taris (2008) found that multiple studies linked high self-efficacy with high levels of work engagement. Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, and Schaufeli (2009a) examined Dutch engineers' and electricians' work engagement levels and found that those employees with high self-efficacy were also more engaged in their work. One year later, Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, and Schaufeli (2009b) expanded their study to include fast-food employees in the Netherlands. Once again, they discovered that employees with high self-efficacy exhibited high levels of work engagement.

### **Workload Satisfaction.**

Workload includes a teacher's class size, paperwork, and other classroom responsibilities. But, while most educators anticipate a heavy workload in their own classrooms, they may not anticipate the extra duties outside the classroom. Meetings, curriculum development, and various extra duties may add to a teacher's classroom responsibilities and create an untenable situation. A teacher's satisfaction with his or her workload varies according to subject area and abilities. Some teachers are able to handle a heavy workload with ease, while others find the same workload impossible to manage (McCann & Joahannessen, 2004).

A heavy workload is mentioned in multiple studies as an impediment to work engagement. Hamman, Daugherty, and Mills (1987) found teachers with too much work and not enough time (work overload) were susceptible to teacher burnout. Heston, Dedrick, Raschke, and Whitehead (1996) found that both excessive teaching and nonteaching duties were stressors for band directors. Additionally, Scheib (2003)

found music teachers exacerbate their workload by setting very high expectations for themselves and their students. Steg (1955) discovered that music teachers are more likely to have heavier workloads, less planning time, and more out-of-school duties than other teachers. Unfortunately, Steg's thorough research concerning music teacher workload has not been replicated.

### **Salary.**

Salary increases are often discussed as a solution to teacher attrition. Data from the Economic Policy Institute (Allegretto, Corcoran, & Mishel, 2004) estimated that teachers are paid 23.4% less than other professionals who possess the same education level (e.g., accountants, reporters, counselors, registered nurses). This difference in compensation may lead many to believe that teachers could be leaving their jobs because of their modest salaries.

In a recently published analysis of the 1999–2000 Schools and Staffing Survey, Hancock (2008) found that among fine arts educators, a \$10,000 salary increase reduced the attrition and migration risk by 40%. Though salary may not solve all matters of teacher attrition, it is interesting that 51.2% of teachers who left the profession in 2008 were dissatisfied with their salary (U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics, 2008–2009).

### **Resources.**

Resources may also affect a teacher's work engagement. Resources include not only items such as textbooks, desks, and chairs, but also money for classroom expenses. Researchers have found that adequate resources can influence a teacher's job

satisfaction and teaching effectiveness (Johnson, 2006). Regardless of subject area, all educators need adequate resources to be able to teach effectively. Unfortunately, the current economic climate has severely limited many teachers' resources. The U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics (2007–2008a) reported that 92.4% of educators spend their own money to purchase classroom resources. A lack of resources could seriously impede teachers' ability to engage in their work because they may feel insignificant or unimportant.

### **Need for the Study**

Researchers have found the following variables may influence a teacher's work engagement levels: (a) support, (b) self-efficacy, (c) workload satisfaction, (d) salary, and (e) resources. Various forms of support have a great impact on teacher work engagement (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Gardner, 2010; Heston et al., 1996; Johnson & Birkeland, 2003; McLain, 2005; Tye & O'Brien, 2002). Self-efficacy is another variable that has been shown to affect work engagement (Bakker et al., 2008; Xanthopoulou et al., 2009a, 2009b). A teacher's workload satisfaction may affect his or her work engagement (McCann & Joahannessen, 2004; Hamman, et al., 1987; Heston et al., 1996; Scheib, 2003; Steg, 1955). Salary, though not shown to have a direct influence on work engagement, is an important factor in a teacher's career decisions (Allegretto, et al., 2004; Hancock, 2008; U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics, 2008–2009). Lack of resources is another variable that can hinder a teacher's work engagement (Johnson, 2006; U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics, 2007–2008a).

Previous research has also shown that teachers have higher levels of work engagement if these factors are positive (Bakker & Bal, 2010; Bakker et al., 2007; Hakanen et al., 2006). However, these studies have mostly been conducted in countries outside the United States (e.g., Finland, the Netherlands). In the United States, limited research has been conducted with work engagement in the field of music education. Therefore, a need exists to determine which of these variables best predict elementary music educators' work engagement.

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this study was to determine which of the following variables best predict work engagement among elementary music educators: (a) support, (b) self-efficacy, (c) workload satisfaction, (d) salary, and (e) resources. By determining what variables affect the work engagement levels of music teachers, appropriate solutions may be developed to help these music educators attain job satisfaction.

### **Research Questions**

1. What are the demographic characteristics of elementary music educators as represented by the sample?
2. What are the descriptive statistics of the sample as represented by the following measures: (a) the Maughan Elementary Music Educator Measure (MEMEM), (b) the New General Self-Efficacy scale (NGSE), and (c) the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES)?

3. What are the interrelationships among the following variables: (a) support, (b) self-efficacy, (c) workload satisfaction, (d) salary, (e) resources, and (f) work engagement?
4. Which of the following variables best predict elementary music educators' work engagement: (a) support, (b) self-efficacy, (c) workload satisfaction, (d) salary, and (e) resources?

### **Definitions**

- **Attrition:** Term used to describe the exit of teachers from the teaching profession.
- **Burnout:** “A syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work with people in some capacity” (Maslach et al., 1996, p. 4).
- **Migration:** Term used to describe teachers who leave employment in one school for another.
- **Nonparticipation:** Occurs when a teacher is not included in decisions that affect his or her job (Scheib, 2003).
- **Positive psychology:** The study of positive life qualities such as optimism, happiness, and self-determination.
- **Resources:** The physical environment needed to have a successful work experience.
- **Resource inadequacy:** Occurs when an individual has inadequate resources to perform their job effectively.

- **Role ambiguity:** Occurs when contradictory role messages are sent to an individual (Scheib, 2003).
- **Role conflict:** The psychological conflict that can occur when two or more contradictory roles are demanded of one individual (Scheib, 2002).
- **Role overload:** Often defined as too much to do with not enough time or resources (Maslach, 1997). Overload can also occur when an individual is asked to fulfill too many roles and none can be performed adequately (Scheib, 2003).
- **Salary:** The fixed financial compensation for an educator.
- **Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS):** Conducted by the U.S. Department of Education National Center for Educational Statistics every 4 years to create statistical data about teacher attrition and other education issues. The SASS contains questions about education in general, such as (a) number of students on free or reduced lunch, (b) number of teachers employed by school or district, and (c) staff salary schedules.
- **Self-efficacy:** “Beliefs in one’s capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to meet given situational demands” (Wood & Bandura, 1989, p. 408).
- **Support:** The various supports a teacher has within his or her work environment. This support may come from colleagues, students, parents, administrators, and community members.
- **Teacher Follow-Up Survey (TFS):** Conducted by the U.S. Department of Education National Center for Educational Statistics every 4 years (following the SASS) to discover why teachers stay at their job, move to another job, or

leave the field of education. Within the data, these teachers are categorized as stayers, movers, or leavers.

- **Underutilization of skills:** Occurs when an individual has a set of skills that are not used in his or her current employment situation.
- **Vigor:** An individual's vitality and ability to grow and develop.
- **Work engagement:** "An active, positive work-related state that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption" (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002 (p.74). Work engagement is different from job satisfaction, work-related flow, and motivation in that it combines dedication with high vigor and absorption. Work engagement can also vary during the day for an employee as they complete different tasks (Bakker, 2011).
- **Workload satisfaction:** A teacher's feelings about the amount of work they need to complete.

### **Operational Definitions**

- Workload, resources, and support are operationally defined by the Maughan Elementary Music Educator Measure (MEMEM), which I created (Maughan, 2012).
- Self-efficacy is operationally defined by the New General Self-Efficacy scale (NGSE) created by Chen, Gully, and Eden (2001).
- Work engagement is operationally defined by the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES;Schaufeli et al., 2002).

## **Limitations**

The study has certain limitations. The respondents were contacted through e-mail, which may prove unreliable in districts that have outdated Internet sites or sophisticated firewalls. As a result, some teachers may never have received the survey. Also, job responsibilities can often overwhelm teachers (DeLorenzo, 1992) and work overload may have caused certain teachers to ignore the e-mail.



## **Chapter II**

### **Review of Literature**

Research has shown that support, self-efficacy, workload satisfaction, salary, and resources affect work engagement levels in a variety of occupations. However, no one has measured these variables to predict elementary music teacher work engagement. The following review of literature explores the history of teacher attrition, in addition to the aforementioned variables.

#### **Teacher Attrition**

In 2012, the MetLife Survey of the American Teacher found that only 44% of educators were satisfied with their jobs, 15% lower than in 2009. Additionally, 29% of educators intended to leave the profession in 5 years, up 19% from 2009 (Heitin, 2012). Novice teachers were the most at risk for attrition. Henke, Chen, Geis, and Knepper (2000) found more than 23% of beginning general educators left the profession within the first 3 years of service, and Ingersoll (2003) discovered that 40% to 50% left within the first 5 years of service (Ingersoll, 2003). In 1998, teachers (active or inactive) were 4% of the U.S. population. Furthermore, there were twice as many teachers as there were nurses and four times as many teachers as lawyers and professors combined (Ingersoll, 2001). These statistics demonstrate the size and fluidity of the general teaching population from year to year.

Research examining music educators' attrition rates revealed that novice teachers are at high risk for attrition (Madsen & Hancock, 2002). Beginning in 1995, Madsen and Hancock conducted a longitudinal study of recent music education

graduates ( $N = 137$ ). Results indicated that 17.5% ( $N = 24$ ) were not teaching during the 1995–1996 school year. In 2001, the researchers were able to contact 122 of the original respondents and found that 34.4% ( $N = 42$ ) were not teaching. Respondents indicated that a lack of support was the main reason for their leaving the profession.

More recently, Hancock (2009) found that 6% of music educators leave the profession every year. This percentage is approximately the same for general educators. Of that 6%, 33% planned on returning to the profession within 5 years and 25% planned on returning after 5 years. However, whether the educators actually returned to the profession is not known.

What factors could be contributing to music teacher attrition? Scheib (2004) studied eight instrumental music teachers who were leaving their jobs to determine what led them to their decision. Scheib concluded all eight teachers shared the following concerns: (a) difficult working conditions, (b) low salary, (c) negative public perceptions of teaching, and (d) low priority of music education within the school curriculum.

Music teachers are often isolated from other classrooms and teachers. This isolation (physical or by discipline) could have an effect on music teachers' feelings of collegial support. Physically, the isolation of music educators may be due to the school building layout. A music educator may also feel isolated if he or she is the only music teacher in the building or one of the few music teachers in the district. Sindberg and Lipscomb (2005) found that music teachers ( $N = 36$ ) who possessed strong feelings of isolation were at risk for attrition, as they did not feel integral to the district. The researchers collected responses to seven statements using a five-point Likert-type scale

ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). The teachers were also given an opportunity to express their feelings through open-ended statements. The sense of isolation exhibited by these teachers varied with experience. Teachers with 1 to 10 years of experience felt isolated, teachers with 10 to 25 years felt less isolated, and teachers with 25 to 40 years of experience felt more isolated. The researchers did not ask teachers to give their opinions on their isolation, but they theorized that teachers with 10 to 25 years of experience may be more confident and immersed in their work or they have full lives outside the classroom. The means of beginning teachers (less than 10 years) and very experienced teachers (24 to 40 years) were not equal on all statements; however, the means representing three statements were similar:

- I believe professional isolation is related to the subject I teach (less than 10 years  $M = 4.00$ ; 25 to 40 years  $M = 4.00$ ).
- Scheduling has an impact on my level of professional isolation (less than 10 years  $M = 3.83$ ; 25 to 40 years  $M = 3.92$ ).
- I believe lack of administrative support contributes to causing professional isolation (less than 10 years  $M = 3.08$ ; 24 to 40 years  $M = 3.08$ ).

Hancock (2008) published an analysis of the 1999–2000 Schools and Staffing Survey from the U.S. Department of Education. Music teacher responses ( $N = 1,931$ ) were analyzed using sequential multiple regression to determine if certain variables were significant predictors of attrition. The analysis revealed some interesting predictors, including (a) extracurricular duties, (b) school-wide concerns (e.g., cutting class, physical conflicts, and theft), and (c) limited support from administrators and parents. Hancock also discovered that female music teachers are one-and-a-half times

more likely to leave the profession than males, and a \$10,000 salary increase reduced the attrition and migration risk by 40%. Furthermore, Hancock found that music teachers under the age of 30 are three times more likely to leave the profession than their peers. Teachers from age 30 to 39 are almost two times more likely to leave their positions. These results reiterate the influence of a teacher's work experience on his or her attrition risk.

Gardner (2010) also utilized the data from the 1999–2000 Schools and Staffing Survey to develop a model for retention, turnover, and attrition. Gardner discovered that music teachers were more likely to hold part-time positions and receive less support for working with special needs students. Gardner also found music teachers changed jobs because of inadequate working conditions or for better assignments. Some positions were deserted for better salaries or benefits, but administrative support had the most influence on teacher retention. In Gardner's study, as in the previously mentioned studies, the variables of salary, workload, work environment, and support were found to have an influence in the teachers' employment decisions.

### **Work Engagement**

Research has shown that employees who are engaged in their work are less likely to leave their jobs (Bakker, 2011; Bakker & Xanthopoulou, 2009; Hakanen et al., 2006). According to Bakker (2011), work engagement occurs when employees put themselves into their work, manage their job challenges, and mobilize resources. The most often used definition for work engagement is “an active, positive work-related

state that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption” (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonazalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002, p. 74).

Bakker (2011) shows that job resources and personal resources affect work engagement. Job resources include collegial support, performance feedback, skill variety, autonomy, and learning opportunities. Job resources can also include any “physical, social, or organizational aspects of the job that may (a) reduce job demands and the associated physiological and psychological costs; (b) be functional in achieving work goals; or (c) stimulate personal growth, learning, and development” (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004, p. 296). Personal resources may also affect work engagement. These resources can include self-esteem, self-efficacy, locus of control, and regulation of emotions (Albrecht, 2010). Individuals with locus of control believe they have power over events in their lives. Positive self-evaluations can also be linked to resiliency in the workplace. This resiliency could help individuals maintain better control of their work environment (Bakker, 2011).

According to Bakker and Xanthopoulou (2009), engaged workers have four variables that enable them to work better than nonengaged workers. First, engaged employees often have positive emotions that broaden their thought–action repertoire. Second, they have better health, which enables them to direct all their skills and energy to their jobs. Third, engaged employees will also work to create their own job resources and personal resources. This process is known as job crafting. Through job crafting, the employee creates a better job fit and experiences additional meaning from his or her work (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Fourth, engaged employees can transfer their

engagement to others in their workplace, thus elevating the performance level of the whole group (Bakker & Xanthopoulou, 2009).

In countries outside the United States, the theory of work engagement has had an immense impact in occupational research. Studies have shown that engaged employees work better than non-engaged employees as they have positive emotions, better health, create their own job resources, and transfer their engagement to others (Bakker, 2011; Bakker & Xanthopoulou, 2009; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). These outcomes are positive for educators and the schools in which they work (Bakker, 2010). In 2006, Hakanen, Bakker, and Schaufeli (2006) conducted a study with a large sample of Finnish teachers ( $N = 2,038$ ). Results indicated that teachers who had control over their duties, good supervisory support, and opportunities for creativity in their jobs were more engaged in their work. These positive factors led to higher levels of work engagement, which in turn provided better work environments and improved teacher retention.

In another study conducted in Finland, Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, and Xanthopoulou (2007) found that teachers ( $N = 805$ ) who worked in elementary, secondary, and vocational schools had more effective classroom management and were able to engage in their work when appropriate job resources were present. The specific resources included supervisor support, freedom to innovate, appreciation, and positive organizational climate. When these resources were present, teachers were able to maintain their work engagement even while dealing with discipline issues.

A more recent study was conducted with novice Dutch educators ( $N = 54$ ) to examine weekly work engagement levels and a possible relationship with job resources

(Bakker & Bal, 2010). The educators, who worked in elementary, secondary, and vocational schools, were measured every Friday for 5 consecutive weeks. Within the study, the educators' job resources included (a) autonomy, (b) social support, (c) performance feedback, (d) supervisory coaching, and (e) learning opportunities. Researchers found that educators were able to engage in their work if they had autonomy, supervisory coaching, and opportunities for development. Interestingly, social support was unrelated to work engagement. Determining what variables predict the work engagement of successful elementary music educators can benefit the teaching profession. This study will focus on work engagement in order to help educators find new ways to connect with their work instead of focusing on negative aspects of the education profession in the 21st century.

## **Support**

Numerous research studies pertaining to teacher attrition and teacher work engagement include the variable of support (administrative, collegial, community, parental, and student). Maughan (2012) found that support was the strongest predictor of work engagement among a sample of elementary music educators ( $N = 105$ ). The independent variables of workload, resources, and support combined to account for 26.6% of the variance in work engagement. Accordingly, the overall multiple regression was statistically significant,  $R^2 = .266$ ,  $F(3, 101) = 12.206$ ,  $p < .001$ . Results of the analysis further revealed that support was the only statistically significant predictor of work engagement ( $p < .001$ ). On average, for each standard deviation ( $SD$ )

unit change in support, work engagement increased by .423 of a *SD* unit, once the other variables were taken into account.

Other studies have found that support and leadership were integral to teacher engagement. Carlson (2004) sought to determine if a principal's behaviors influenced a teacher's decision to remain in the same school or move to another school. Carlson did not include teachers who had left the profession, as their exit could be attributed to many other factors. Wisconsin high school teachers ( $N = 214$ ) participated in the study. From this sample, 143 teachers had moved from another school within the past 5 years, and 71 had been employed at their current school for more than 5 years. The participants completed a two-part survey, which was sent to them through the U.S. mail. Part 1 consisted of 10 factors that might influence their decision to stay or leave, and Part 2 asked participants to answer 11 questions dealing with their overall job satisfaction. Participants could also answer a third section of the survey, which asked them to list the top three factors that might affect their decision to leave or remain in their job.

Carlson found that administrative support was the most influential variable pertaining to a teacher's decision to stay at a school or move to a different position. Teachers also felt that school environment, work assignment, teacher collaboration time, and work rewards were variables that affected their decision to stay in the school or move to a different position. Carlson recommended that administrators should (a) be approachable and available to the staff, (b) be honest and straightforward with the staff, (c) demonstrate an appreciation for the work teachers do, (d) assist teachers in solving problems as they occur, and (e) demonstrate a personal interest in teachers' lives.



Additionally, Carlson suggested that administrators should work on communication throughout the school, treat all staff fairly, and give the staff a chance to share ideas and have input on decisions.

Kellermeyer (2009) found that overall, elementary music teacher job satisfaction was closely linked to relationships with the principal (i.e., support) and the school environment. Kellermeyer examined whether job satisfaction, personal beliefs, and professional relationships were the cause of job related stressors, role conflict, role ambiguity, and burnout among a sample of Illinois music educators ( $N = 272$ ). Participants were asked to complete a Likert-type survey, which was composed of 86 modified statements taken from the Rice Teacher Survey (Rice, 2003).

The results revealed that participants were satisfied with their jobs when asked about their classroom methods and responsibilities but were dissatisfied with school politics and repetition of lessons for multiple classes. Participants stated administrative support should be in the form of professional respect and personal support. Positive collegial collaboration for the participants mostly consisted of meeting with the other special-subject teachers (e.g., art, physical education). Though 54% of the participants felt they had adequate administrative and collegial support, Kellermeyer reported that many of the music educators felt belittled by the other staff members. These negative attitudes resulted in a type of psychological exhaustion for music educators.

Kellermeyer suggested that elementary music educators would be better satisfied with their positions if they worked to build relationships with their colleagues and their principals.

Support is an important variable in burnout research as well as work engagement research. McLain (2005) administered the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach & Jackson, 1981) to music educators ( $N = 514$ ) from 42 states to determine their burnout levels and the possible factors that contribute to burnout. McLain found that teachers who were highly burned out exhibited negative feelings toward administrators, colleagues, parents, and the community. The study also revealed that teachers with 1 to 5 years of experience were the largest response group to experience burnout. Teachers who could not properly handle stress or classroom management issues also had high burnout scores. Only 3% of the teachers received negative evaluations, but this significantly impacted their burnout levels. Lastly, teachers who stated they probably or definitely would not teach until retirement exhibited high levels of burnout.

Novice teachers are at high risk of attrition, and this cohort is often studied in teacher attrition research. Grantham (2006) examined the effect of administrative support on a sample of teachers ( $N = 25$ ) who possessed different experience levels. The researcher found novice teachers required more support from (a) the district, (b) administrators, (c) veteran teachers, (d) mentors, and (e) other first-year teachers. Through an analysis of participant interviews, Grantham developed a better understanding of what types of support could keep novice teachers in the profession. For example, first-year teachers ( $N = 5$ ) felt their induction training was inadequate and simple survival knowledge was not communicated. One novice teacher never understood the layout of the school building until the end of the year, while other participants wished they had been told the procedures regarding office referrals, copy machine protocol, substitute requests, and so forth. After the first year, however,

teachers at all levels of experience felt that support was not as necessary, although occasional administrator visits and encouragement from administrators were welcomed.

Hicks (2011) collected data from K–12 teachers ( $N = 736$ ) and administrators ( $N = 38$ ) in Georgia to discover what specific supports are most important to teachers. Participants completed an online version of either the Survey of Teachers' Perceptions of Administrative Support or the Survey of Administrators' Perceptions of Administrative Support. The survey instruments were created by Hicks and were based upon previous research (Weiss, 2001). Statements concerning administrative support were aligned with a 4-point Likert-type scale (1 *not important at all* to 4 *extremely important*). Overall, the K–12 teachers felt their administrator's first priority should be to provide support with student discipline ( $M = 3.67$ ,  $SD = .51$ ) and the second priority should be to support teachers with parent interaction ( $M = 3.63$ ,  $SD = .61$ ). The third priority that teachers considered important was trust between the administrator and the teacher ( $M = 3.50$ ,  $SD = .58$ ). The top two priorities were equally ranked for administrators: student discipline ( $M = 3.59$ ,  $SD = .51$ ) and teacher recognition ( $M = 3.59$ ,  $SD = .51$ ). Supporting teachers during interactions with parents was ranked fifth ( $M = 3.41$ ,  $SD = .51$ ). Interestingly, elementary teachers felt adequately supported by both the head principal and the assistant principal while middle and high school teachers felt much more support from the assistant principal. Hicks also examined the Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement (GLISI), which is part of administrator training in the state of Georgia. Hicks found the leadership modules placed little, if any, attention on teacher support. To help reduce teacher attrition, Hicks

recommended that administrators modify their own professional development to find ways to improve teacher satisfaction through support.

Other studies have investigated administrator leadership, which is closely related to administrative support. Byrum (2008) conducted research with teachers in North Carolina to determine if principal leadership could influence teacher attrition. Participants ( $N = 271$ ) were asked to complete the Teacher Perception and Intent Survey (TPIS), which was created through an examination of previous surveys. Teachers with less than 10 years of experience were the largest response group ( $N = 138$ ). Using correlation analysis, Byrum found that a teacher's perception of school leadership had a statistically significant correlation with teacher attrition ( $r = .31, p < .01$ ). Other variables that shared statistically significant correlations with teacher attrition included (a) lack of classroom supplies, materials, and resources ( $r = .26, p < .01$ ); (b) time issues ( $r = .26, p < .01$ ); (c) student discipline ( $r = .24, p < .01$ ); and (d) inadequate professional growth and development ( $r = .24, p < .01$ ).

Melvin (2010) sought to determine if a teacher's perception of administrative leadership could affect teacher retention. Participants were K–12 educators ( $N = 114$ ) with 5 or more years of experience in Atlanta, Georgia. The researcher used the Atlanta Federation of Teachers 2008 survey instrument, the *Teacher's Perception of Principal Leadership*. Participants responded to 36 statements, which were aligned with following Likert-type response anchors: (a) *always*, (b) *often*, (c) *sometimes*, and (d) *never*. Results indicated that 63.7% of the participants were contemplating leaving the profession. Also, teachers who intended to stay in the profession ranked their principal's leadership skills higher than teachers who intended to leave. Furthermore,

results of the logistic regression model indicated that for every 1-point increase in the overall leadership score, teachers are five times more likely to remain in the profession.

Administrative support is important to teachers, but some novice educators find support through mentor teachers. Conway (2003) interviewed beginning music teachers ( $N = 13$ ) in Michigan who were assigned a music education or general education mentor for support in their first year of teaching. The mentees felt their mentors were helpful, but that music mentors were the best fit. Conway made the following suggestions to improve mentoring: (a) assign mentors early so mentees can meet them during the summer, (b) schedule time for the mentors to be in the mentees' classroom, and (c) provide opportunities for the mentors and mentees to get to know one another. Conway also stated that while undergraduate music education programs often receive criticism for inadequate preparation, it is the administrative duties (paperwork, grades, etc.), classroom management, and collegial relationships that a first-year teacher finds difficult. Conway thought these lessons could not be learned in undergraduate classes. Instead, they must be navigated by teachers throughout their first year of teaching with the help of a mentor.

Teacher attrition can be attributed to many sources. However, multiple studies point to a lack of administrative support as the main barrier to teacher work engagement and the gateway to possible attrition (Byrum, 2008; Carlson, 2004; Conway, 2003; Grantham, 2006; Hicks, 2011; Kellermeyer, 2009; McLain, 2005; Melvin, 2010). Support, even when studied with other variables, had a powerful influence on educators and their ability to engage in their work.

## **Self-efficacy**

Researchers in the Netherlands have used self-efficacy in their work engagement models as a factor pertaining to personal resources (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2007). Self-efficacy, as used in organizational research, does not simply pertain to the controlling of one's thoughts or behaviors to reach certain goals (specific self-efficacy; Bandura, 1977). Rather, it can be considered a general variable that indicates an individual's perception of their ability to meet demands in any context (general self-efficacy; Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). Individuals who possess strong self-efficacy are able to manage and recover from negative experiences in an efficient manner (Bandura, 1997).

Bandura first investigated self-efficacy in the late 1970s. Bandura explored changes in behavior with different treatment practices. The theory of self-efficacy was "based on the principal assumption that psychological procedures, whatever their form, serve as a means of creating and strengthening expectations of personal efficacy" (Bandura, 1977, p. 193). According to Bandura, perceived self-efficacy first influences an individual's initial choices, and if success follows, self-efficacy will influence an individual's persistence and effort in future tasks.

Bandura (1977) postulated that a person's self-efficacy was based on four information sources. The first information source is previous accomplishments, which includes an individual's previous successes. If an individual previously mastered a task, he or she is more likely to try again or attempt something similar. The second information source is vicarious experience, or the observation of others. Through observation, an individual can examine another's success or failure and then compare

that scenario to his or her own situation. The third information source is verbal persuasion, which includes suggestions and encouragement from others. The fourth information source involves a person's physiological state. Individuals who exhibit high levels of stress and anxiety toward a task will have lowered levels of self-efficacy.

Self-efficacy, when used as a variable in organizational research, is somewhat diversified. Specific self-efficacy (SSE) is described as a motivational state, while general self-efficacy (GSE) is described as a motivational trait (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). SSE and GSE have similar frameworks, as both represent an individual's beliefs about his or her ability to accomplish desired outcomes, but they differ in terms of measurement. GSE includes a person's entire life experiences, while SSE involves a person's perceived ability to carry out a specific task as it pertains to his or her current psychological state.

GSE has been criticized because of flawed measurement (Bandura, 1997). Critics believe measurement of general self-efficacy may impact relationships with other variables and influence outcomes, thus affecting reliability. However, by using item response theory (IRT), Scherbaum, Cohen-Charash, and Kern (2006) compared GSE scores of three different measures and found this criticism to be misguided. Participants ( $N = 606$ ) completed three different GSE measures for item analysis. Researchers found the GSE measures had exhibited adequate reliability, and the difference between the three measures was small. Furthermore, it was determined that Chen et al.'s (2001) general self-efficacy measure (New General Self-Efficacy scale or NGSE) had the best overall performance of the three measures.

In the field of work engagement research, general self-efficacy has been found to have a positive effect on work engagement. Researchers in the Netherlands worked with a group of Dutch engineers and electricians ( $N = 714$ ) to determine if general self-efficacy, organizational-based self-esteem, and optimism were predictors of work engagement. Organizational-based self-esteem is the extent to which employees believe that they can meet their needs by working in an organization. Results indicated that personal resources, in which self-efficacy was a factor, had a direct effect on work engagement ( $\beta = .45, p < .001$ ; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2007). Job resources were also found to have a large direct effect on work engagement ( $\beta = .43$ ).

Xanthopoulou et al. (2009a) returned to the same population to study the long-term relationships among job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. A sample of engineers and electricians ( $N = 163$ ) was studied and observed for 18 months on average as part of their employee psychosocial risk evaluation. Throughout this period, the employees were surveyed twice to determine their levels of work engagement, the effect of job resources, and the effect of personal resources. Self-efficacy, which was included as a factor for personal resources, was measured with the 10-item Generalized Self-Efficacy scale (Chen et al., 2001). Work engagement was measured with the 9-item version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002). Analysis of the structural equation model indicated an adequate fit as all fit indices were higher than .95, and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) was lower than .05. Employees with adequate job resources (autonomy, support, training, etc.) are more likely to be



engaged with their work over time. Also, personal resources exhibited a strong direct effect on an employee's work engagement levels in both surveys ( $\beta = .38$  and  $\beta = .54$ ). However, both of the Xanthopoulou et al. studies included self-efficacy as a factor within personal resources. Because of this, a need exists to measure self-efficacy as a separate variable when determining what variables best predict elementary music teacher's work engagement.

A year after Xanthopoulou et al.'s 2009 study, the same group of researchers studied a new sample of employees to confirm the results of the previous study (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009b). The new study examined Greek participants who were employed in fast-food restaurants ( $N = 42$ ). The researchers investigated the extent to which multiple variables influence job resources and work engagement. Results indicated that self-efficacy, optimism, and organizational-based self-esteem contribute to the overall variance of work engagement. Also, self-efficacy may affect the relationship between job resources and work engagement.

Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, and Taris (2008) found that job resources and personal resources both affect work engagement. Also, they discovered that self-efficacy levels differed between engaged employees and unengaged employees. The researchers examined multiple studies in this literature review and concluded that personal resources, including self-efficacy, positively affect work engagement.

Collins (2009) examined the effects of personalized feedback on work engagement and the possible mediating effects of self-efficacy with employees of various professions ( $N = 68$ ). In this study, employees were assigned to one of three

groups: (a) control group, (b) generalized feedback group, and (c) personalized feedback group. Both feedback groups completed the Strengths Self-Efficacy (SSE; Flores, 2008) and UWES measures. The Strengths Self-Efficacy measure consisted of 34 items aligned with a 10-point semantic differential scale. The 17-item UWES measure was also administered. Cronbach's alpha indicated that the internal reliabilities for each measure were internally consistent ( $r = .98$ , SSE;  $r = .95$ , UWES). The correlation between self-efficacy and work engagement was statistically significant ( $r = .46$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Collins found that personalized feedback does not affect work engagement; however, the link between high self-efficacy and work engagement was quite strong within the binary logistic regression model. The study once again confirmed the existence of a positive relationship between self-efficacy and work engagement.

Bresó, Schaufeli, and Salanova (2012) studied the relationship between self-efficacy and burnout. They examined university students in Spain ( $N = 71$ ) in an attempt to understand their reasons for final examination anxiety. Students were separated into the following groups: (a) the intervention group, (b) the stressed control group, and (c) the healthy control group. The students were divided into groups based on their responses gathered at an anxiety management workshop. Students' work engagement, self-efficacy, burnout levels, and performance were measured at the beginning of the study and again six months later. During the six-month period, the intervention group was given coping strategies for their anxiety through four additional workshops. ANOVA results indicated the intervention group presented significantly higher levels of self-efficacy and work engagement at the end of the six-month period

than the other two groups. Additionally, Bresó, Schaufeli, and Salanova found that low self-efficacy corresponded with higher burnout levels within the stressed control group.

### **Workload Satisfaction**

Though new educators may have been advised about the workload they will be expected to shoulder, the reality can often be surprising. Teacher workload includes regular classroom duties in addition to extra duties (e.g., meetings, lunchroom supervision, grading). In a study conducted by McCann and Johannessen (2004), novice English teachers ( $N = 11$ ) were interviewed over a 2-year period to determine their workload and resulting stress levels. At the beginning of the 2-year period, teachers indicated the number of papers they had to grade was overwhelming. When the teachers sought advice from experienced colleagues, they were told not to expect a lighter workload later in their careers. The English teachers either gave up their weeknights to grade endless stacks of essays or found another profession. By the end of the study, 6 of the original 11 teachers were interviewed, and 2 were planning to leave the profession as an overwhelming workload had negatively affected their attitudes toward the profession.

Some teachers take another job to supplement their teaching income, resulting in an increased overall workload. Krantz-Kent (2008) discovered that 17% of U.S. teachers were employed outside school during the school year. Only 12% of other professionals (e.g., health care professionals, business and financial operations professionals, architects and engineers, community and social services professionals,

managers) have multiple jobs. For some teachers, working more than one job may increase their workload to unbearable levels.

Class size is a key component of a teacher's workload satisfaction. Johnson (2006) claimed that class sizes have decreased in response to educator complaints. However, finding data to back up this claim is difficult. Data from the U.S. Department of Education National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) indicate that student-teacher ratios have been decreasing since 1955, when the average student-teacher ratio was 27.4 to 1. In the latest reports from 2007–2008, the average student-teacher ratio was 15 to 1 (U.S. Department of Education NCES, 2009). This decrease in class size represents an improved situation for teachers; however, this decrease in class size should be closely scrutinized, as the NCES divided the total number of students in a building by the total number of professional school staff members. As additional support and special education staff has been added in the past 60 years, it is difficult to judge whether class sizes have actually decreased or if the increase in staff has improved student-teacher ratios.

The Center for Public Education, which is an initiative for the National School Boards Association, promotes small class sizes as being the most effective indicator for improving student learning. Its website recommends that elementary class sizes should be between 15 and 18 students for optimal learning to occur (Ehrenberg, Brewer, Gamoran, & Willms, 2001). While such class size reduction has been shown to improve student learning, specific data on the average U.S. class size and its benefits are limited.

Teachers have typically found that teaching challenges increase with the number of students under their tutelage (Johnson, 2006). Music teachers face the same

problems as classroom teachers with regard to class size. A general music classroom of 40 students can present a challenge with movement activities, instrument use, and general classroom management. On the other hand, teachers who work with ensembles (band, choir, and orchestra) expect to have large class sizes. Based on these considerations, no ideal class size can be defined for music education instruction.

In the field of music education, multiple studies have been conducted to discover what factors contribute to a music teacher's workload satisfaction. Steg (1955) conducted an in-depth study of high school music teachers in Michigan to determine their workload levels. The respondents ( $N = 345$ ) consisted of instrumental teachers (41%), vocal teachers (25%), and teachers who taught both subjects (34%). When the teachers were asked to indicate the amount of strain they felt resulted from their work, 51% reported considerable feelings of strain. The teachers were also asked to give their average teaching load per week in hours and indicate how they felt about their workloads. Results indicated (a) 1% of respondents believed their teaching load was light, (b) 41% believed their teaching load was reasonable, (c) 39% believed their teaching load was heavy, and (d) 19% believed their teaching load was extremely heavy. When the teaching loads were divided by teaching area, it was found that 27% of vocal teachers, 40% of instrumental teachers, and 44% of vocal-instrumental teachers reported heavy teaching loads. Working hours, reported by the teachers as "reasonable," averaged 43 hours per week. Hours reported as "heavy" averaged 45 hours per week, and working hours reported as "extremely heavy" averaged 50 hours per week. Interestingly, 53% of those with "extremely heavy" workloads reported that they enjoyed their jobs very much (Steg, 1955). It was also discovered that many

teachers worked in other buildings or with other various grade levels. Within the sample, 80% of the vocal teachers, 85% of the instrumental teachers, and 95% of the vocal-instrumental teachers had assignments at more than one level in their schools.

Steg also investigated teachers' additional workloads. Results indicated that 33% of instrumental teachers reported an average of 7.2 hours per week of nonmusic assignments such as study hall or other subject areas while 38% of vocal teachers reported working 6.8 hours per week in other subject areas. Furthermore, 42% of the vocal-instrumental teachers reported teaching another subject for an average of 5 hours per week. It is interesting to note that teachers, who already had complex workloads in their own subject area, were likely to be teaching another subject.

Teachers also reported using their planning time for lessons or additional ensemble work. In fact, Steg found that 84% of instrumental teachers, 55% of vocal teachers, and 81% of vocal-instrumental teachers reported having no free time during the day. It was recommended that music educators take the time to explain their workload to their administrators so possible solutions could be identified. Additionally, it was recommended that the Music Educators National Conference (now the National Association for Music Education) should work closely with state associations and administrators to help alleviate the teaching loads of music educators.

While Steg's (1955) study has not been duplicated over the past several decades, many researchers have investigated music educators' workload by examining burnout. Scheib (2003) found that the six areas of role conflict, role ambiguity, role overload, underutilization of skills, resource inadequacy, and nonparticipation could result in stress that might lead to burnout. It was discovered that participants ( $N = 4$ ) in this case

study had experienced stress in all six defined areas. However, they did not blame others for their stress. The participants blamed themselves for high standards, which resulted in role overload stress or workload stress.

Hamman, Daugherty, and Mills (1987) measured burnout levels of music teachers ( $N = 101$ ) using the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI; Maslach & Jackson, 1981). The researchers found the following areas to be contributors to burnout: (a) unclear administrative direction, (b) uncooperative faculty members, (c) no recognition by students, and (d) too much work with not enough time. Accordingly, music educators who have a high workload with limited administrative, faculty, and student support are vulnerable to burnout and may leave the profession in search of a less stressful job environment.

Heston, Dedrick, Raschke, and Whitehead (1996) indicated that educators who received adequate support had better job satisfaction and lowered levels of stress. The researchers administered a four-part questionnaire to a sample of band directors ( $N = 120$ ). The researchers found that positive relationships between the band directors and their students, administrators, and spouses corresponded to an increase in job satisfaction and lower stress levels. Respondents also indicated several areas of personal concern: (a) lack of support from parents, administration, and community; (b) workload; (c) lack of student commitment; and (d) excessive busywork or nonteaching duties. Workload was measured in two different forms (teaching and nonteaching duties) as a stressor. Participants who had been teaching for more than 6 years (87.5%) noted that student recruitment and the expansion of their music programs (i.e., supportive relationships) contributed to their professional stress.

Recent data from the state of Kansas shows that music educators were taking on increased workloads with minimal assistance and compensation (Burrack& Payne, 2011). Between 2007 and 2010, 185 music education positions had been cut within the state. The majority of the cuts (26.4% or 49 positions) were elementary music positions. A total of 20% of the respondents reported that they had been asked to take on additional job responsibilities without additional compensation (Burrack and Payne, 2011).

### **Salary**

Salary increases are often proposed as a solution for teacher attrition, lack of support, and a heavy workload. Data from the Economic Policy Institute (Allegretto, Corcoran, & Mishel, 2004) estimated that teachers are paid 23.4% less compared to other professionals (e.g., accountants, reporters, counselors, registered nurses) of the same education level. Hancock (2008) found that a \$10,000 salary increase would reduce the attrition and migration risk for fine arts educators by 40%. Hancock also recommended that as salary is extremely influential, preservice teachers should be made more aware of their future earnings potential so they will not be surprised by their salary. Stinebrickner (1998) found that beginning educators base their attrition decisions more on salary than other variables, such as class size or improved working conditions. However, according to Ingersoll (2001), salary is a secondary factor in a teacher's decision to leave his or her teaching job. Primary factors include personal reasons (e.g., pregnancy) or lack of support.



National data from the U.S. Department of Education indicated that one of the main reasons teachers move to a new job is for a better teaching assignment rather than a better salary (as cited in Luekens, Lyter, & Fox, 2004). A better teaching assignment was given as a reason for migration by 40% of the teachers surveyed while 38% switched jobs because of a lack of administrative support. Only 19% of teachers reported moving to a new job to obtain a better salary or benefits, and 14.9% of fine arts educators changed jobs to obtain a better salary.

In the 2007–2008 School and Staffing Survey (SASS), data from the U.S. Department of Education National Center for Educational Statistics revealed that 48.5% of teachers who stayed in their jobs were dissatisfied with their salary while 53.7% of teachers who moved to a new job were dissatisfied with the salary of their former job. Teachers who left the profession were also dissatisfied with their salary (51.2%). In addition, the following reasons were given for leaving the teaching profession: (a) interference of routine duties and paperwork (66.9%), (b) lack of parental support (40.8%), and (c) colleagues who do not address student discipline issues (27.3%; U.S. Department of Education NCEES, 2008–2009b). According to the aforementioned data, teachers leave the profession for many different reasons, but salary dissatisfaction affects approximately half of the teachers working today.

## **Resources**

In many of the studies concerning teacher stress and burnout, poor resources have been mentioned as an obstacle to effective teaching (Byrum, 2008; Gardner, 2010; Scheib, 2003). For the general classroom teacher, these resources can include a suitable classroom, visual aids (chalkboard, whiteboard, SMART Board), textbooks, supplemental materials, and computers. Music educators also need appropriate resources to teach effectively. Depending on the curriculum, an elementary general music educator may require a keyboard, stereo, textbook series, supplemental texts, instruments, visual aids, and classroom space.

A positive teaching environment with appropriate resources may have a strong influence on teacher work engagement. In a recent literature review, Johnson (2006) found that multiple variables affect teachers' job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness. These variables included (a) teaching assignments, (b) working relationships among teachers, (c) support for new teachers, (d) support for students, (e) curricular support, (f) resources and materials, (g) assessment, (h) professional development, (i) professional influence and career growth, (j) facilities, and (k) administrative leadership. Facilities and resources are probably not the only reason a music teacher leaves the profession, but they may contribute to a teacher's job satisfaction.

When resources are not available, many teachers choose to purchase supplies with their own money. A study by the George Lucas Educational Foundation (2010) found that the majority of teachers surveyed ( $N = 1,505$ ) used their own money to purchase school supplies and resources each year. Furthermore, 56% of respondents indicated that, even though it's not their responsibility, they purchase items to keep their classroom stocked. Some respondents (37%) believed they would feel guilty if they did

not purchase supplies not covered by the school budget. Only 6% of respondents did not purchase supplies and felt it was the school's responsibility to do so (Edutopia, 2010).

The U.S. Department of Education National Center for Educational Statistics (2007–2008a) found that 92.4% of educators spent their own money on supplies and resources for their classroom. On average, teachers spent \$450 per year. Teachers who worked in city schools spent more on supplies ( $M = \$514$ ), as did elementary teachers ( $M = \$479$ ). Teachers who worked in schools in which 75% of students were approved for free or reduced school lunch spent, on average, \$556 each year on supplies. Teachers who worked in town schools (\$397), secondary schools (\$399), or schools without free or reduced school lunch (\$364) spent the least on supplies (U.S. Department of Education NCES, 2007–2008a).

The reduction of classroom budgets has left many teachers with little choice but to purchase supplies with their own money. Students must have a certain resources to learn effectively, and teachers must have resources to teach effectively. Using personal funds to purchase classroom resources may leave teachers feeling underappreciated and undervalued.

### **Summary of Related Research**

A review of previous research has determined that support, self-efficacy, workload satisfaction, salary, and resources have an impact on teacher work engagement. Maughan (2012) found that support was a statistically significant predictor of work engagement among a sample of elementary music teachers. Other

studies have found a teacher's high self-efficacy may result in high levels of work engagement (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2007, 2009b). Work engagement may also be affected by workload (McCann & Joahannessen, 2004; Scheib, 2003). Also, work engagement may be indirectly affected by salary (Hancock, 2008; Krantz-Kent, 2008). Johnson (2006) found curricular support, adequate resources and materials, and adequate facilities had a strong influence on teacher job satisfaction.

While previous research has produced a variety of results, no research exists in which all of these variables were employed to predict elementary music teachers' work engagement. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine which of the following variables best predict work engagement among elementary music educators: (a) support, (b) self-efficacy, (c) workload satisfaction, (d) salary, and (e) resources.

## Chapter III

### Method

The purpose of this study was to determine which of the following variables best predict work engagement among elementary music educators: (a) support, (b) self-efficacy, (c) workload satisfaction, (d) salary, and (e) resources. This chapter will address the instrumentation, procedures, and analysis needed to carry out the pilot study and main study. The pilot study was conducted during the spring of 2011 to examine the following variables as predictors of elementary music educators' work engagement: (a) support, (b) workload satisfaction, and (c) resources. The variables of salary and self-efficacy were added to the main study, which took place in February 2012.

#### Instrumentation

Work engagement levels were measured with the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002). The UWES (see Appendix 1) measures vigor, dedication, and absorption, all of which contribute to a person's overall work engagement levels (Schaufeli et al., 2002). The UWES has been used internationally, and it is the most often used measure in the area of work engagement research (Bakker & Bal, 2010; Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007; Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006).

The UWES is composed of 17 items, which include statements such as "My job inspires me" and "I am immersed in my work." Participants responded to each statement using the following 7-point Likert-type scale: (1) *never*, (2) *almost never*, (3) *rarely*, (4) *sometimes*, (5) *often*, (6) *very often*, and (7) *always*. According to

previous research, the three factors representing the UWES (vigor, dedication, and absorption) are highly correlated, ranging from .80 to .90. For this reason, Bakker and Leiter (2010) recommended use of the composite UWES score as an overall indicator of work engagement. Previous studies (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010) have shown that estimates of reliability consistently exceeded .90, indicating the items comprising the UWES were internally consistent.

For the main study, the variable of self-efficacy was measured using the New General Self-Efficacy scale (NGSE; see Appendix 2; Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). Participants responded to statements using the following 5-point Likert-type scale: (1) *strongly agree*, (2) *agree*, (3) *neutral*, (4) *disagree*, and (5) *strongly disagree*. Some examples of the statements included in the NGSE scale are, “Even when things are tough at my job, I can perform quite well” and “I will be able to achieve most of the goals that I have set for myself at my job.” According to Scherbaum, Cohen-Charash, and Kern (2006), Cronbach’s alpha for the NGSE ranged from .85 to .90.

The Maughan Elementary Music Educator Measure (MEMEM; see Appendix 3), designed by the researcher, was used to measure the variables of workload satisfaction, resources, and support. Items representing each variable were aligned with the following 7-point Likert-type scale: (1) *never true*, (2) *rarely true*, (3) *sometimes but infrequently true*, (4) *neutral*, (5) *sometimes true*, (6) *usually true*, (7) *always true*. This measure was created based on the researcher’s personal experience, previous research, and input from teaching colleagues.

To establish content validity for the MEMEM, the original statements were shared with a group of colleagues consisting of five elementary general music educators

and university faculty members. All suggested changes pertained to statements within the workload variable. For example, an original question asked, “How many students do you see each week?” The group consensus suggested that a response to this question did not necessarily imply an elementary general music educator is overworked or underworked, as teachers handle their workloads in unique ways. Thus, the original question was replaced with the following statement, “The number of students that I teach is manageable.”

In order to delineate specific information regarding the sample, participants were also asked to complete a short demographic questionnaire (see Appendix 4). This questionnaire was designed to collect the following information: (a) gender, (b) years of teaching experience; (c) age; (d) state in which participants reside; (e) area(s) of teaching expertise; and (f) school location (i.e., rural, suburban, urban).

### **The Pilot Study**

A pilot study was conducted to determine if the independent variables of workload satisfaction, resources, and support were statistically significant predictors of work engagement. Participants ( $N = 105$ ) were representative of the elementary music teacher population in Kansas and Oklahoma. Teachers’ e-mail addresses were selected from the alphabetical school listings made available on each respective state’s department of education website. The survey was administered through Survey Monkey, a widely used online survey tool. The survey consisted of three parts: (a) the MEMEM, (b) the UWES, and (c) the demographic questionnaire.

An e-mail message was sent to 269 elementary music educators over a period of 8 weeks. A description of the study and a survey link were sent to each potential participant. Recipients were given 2 weeks to respond. If they had not responded after the initial 2-week period, a reminder e-mail message was sent at the start of the third week. A final reminder e-mail was sent one week later, 4 weeks after initial contact. At the end of the 8-week data collection period, 105 participants completed the measure for a 39% response rate.

### **Data Analysis of the Pilot Study**

Data were uploaded to the Statistical Software Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) 19 software for analysis. Frequency distributions indicated that 52.4% of respondents were elementary general music educators. Another 1% were elementary instrumental educators, and 6.7% taught elementary general and instrumental music. Thus, participants who taught only elementary students constituted 60.1% of the sample. The remaining 39.9% taught elementary general music in addition to upper levels of music (i.e., high school choir, music theory) or other subjects (e.g., English, gifted and talented classes).

Teaching experience, as represented by the sample, was as follows:

- (a) 10 participants (9.5%) taught 1 year,
- (b) 34 participants (32.4%) taught 1–10 years,
- (c) 24 participants (22.9%) taught 11–20 years,
- (d) 24 participants (22.9%) taught 21–30 years, and
- (e) 13 participants (12.4%) taught 31–40 years.



One respondent reported having 40 years of teaching experience. Teaching location, as reported by participants, revealed that 42.9% of the sample taught in rural areas while 38.1% of the sample taught in suburban school settings. Urban teachers (16.2%) represented the smallest portion of the sample. Three teachers (2.9%) indicated they taught in both rural and suburban areas.

A reliability analysis using Cronbach's alpha indicated the items representing the independent and dependent variables were internally consistent (workload  $\alpha = .83$ , resources  $\alpha = .81$ , support  $\alpha = .85$ , work engagement  $\alpha = .94$ ). Results of a simultaneous multiple regression analysis indicated the three independent variables combined to account for 26.6% of the variance in work engagement. Accordingly, the overall multiple regression was statistically significant,  $R^2 = .266$ ,  $F(3, 101) = 12.206$ ,  $p < .001$ . Results further showed that support was the only statistically significant predictor of work engagement ( $p < .001$ ). On average, for each standard deviation (*SD*) unit change in support, work engagement increased by .423 of a *SD* unit, once the other variables were taken into account. Tests for tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF) were conducted to check for the existence of multicollinearity. It was found that tolerance values were safely independent from each other and that the values for VIF were below the levels that indicate any existence of multicollinearity.

### **Main Study**

The main study was conducted with current elementary general music educators representing the following U.S. states: (a) Missouri, (b) Iowa, (c) Nebraska, and (d) Kansas. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, these states are part of the Midwest

West North Central region of the United States. Procedures approved by the University of Oklahoma's Institutional Review Board were followed (see Appendix 5). Teachers' e-mail addresses were selected as per their availability on school websites. These websites were drawn from the alphabetical school listings made available on each state's department of education website. As music educators from Kansas were also included in the pilot study, an effort was made not to include any participants who had been previously contacted. The survey was administered through Survey Monkey. No paper surveys were used in the study. The survey consisted of four parts: (a) the MEMEM, (b) the UWES, (c) the NGSE, and (d) the demographic questionnaire.

While the pilot study measured the independent variables of workload satisfaction, resources, and support, the main study was expanded to include the independent variables of self-efficacy and salary. In previous work engagement research, self-efficacy, and salary have often been included (Bakker et al., 2008; Hancock, 2008; Stinebrickner, 1998; Xanthopoulou et al., 2007) as independent variables. Salary was measured in \$5,000 increments as part of the demographic questionnaire ("My salary is between: (a) \$25,000–\$30,000, (b) \$30,000–\$35,000," etc.).

In February 2013, a survey request was sent via e-mail to 1,000 elementary music educators in Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas (250 per state). A description of the study and a survey link were sent to each potential participant (see Appendix 6). A conscious effort was made to include teachers from schools and districts representing urban, suburban, and rural areas. It was determined that 71 of the original e-mail addresses were undeliverable. In response, the researcher collected an additional 85 e-

mail addresses from the four states (14 extra addresses were collected in case of delivery error). One week later, a follow-up e-mail was sent to any of the original participants who had not responded. In addition, an initial request was sent to the 85 new email addresses(three were undeliverable). One week later, a follow-up e-mail was sent to all those who had not responded. The subject title for this e-mail was “Final Week: Elementary Music Educators and Work Engagement.” The survey was closed at the end of the 3-week period. Altogether, 1,011 valid e-mail requests were solicited. By the end of the data collection period, 334 participants completed the measures, resulting in a 32.9% response rate.

### **Data Analysis of the Main Study**

To answer the first research question, participants’ demographic information was analyzed using frequency distributions. To answer the second research question, descriptive statistics were calculated for each of the following measures: (a) MEMEM, (b) NGSE, and (c) UWES. In order to answer the third research question, Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated to determine the interrelationships between the independent and dependent variables. To address the fourth research question, a simultaneous multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine which variables (support, self-efficacy, workload satisfaction, salary, and resources) best predict teacher work engagement.

## **Chapter IV**

### **Results**

The purpose of this study was to determine which of the following variables best predict work engagement among a sample of elementary music educators: (a) support, (b) self-efficacy, (c) workload satisfaction, (d) salary, and (e) resources. Data were collected and analyzed based on the following research questions.

#### **Research Questions**

1. What are the demographic characteristics of elementary music educators as represented by the sample?
2. What are the descriptive statistics of the sample as represented by the following measures: (a) the Maughan Elementary Music Educator Measure (MEMEM), (b) the New General Self-Efficacy scale (NGSE), and (c) the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES)?
3. What are the interrelationships among the following variables: (a) support, (b) self-efficacy, (c) workload satisfaction, (d) salary, (e) resources, and (f) work engagement?
4. Which of the following variables best predict elementary music educators' work engagement: (a) support, (b) self-efficacy, (c) workload satisfaction, (d) salary, and (e) resources?

#### **Reliability Analysis**

Cronbach's alpha was used to calculate the internal reliability for each measure (see Table 1). The internal reliability for the variables representing the Maughan

Elementary Music Educator Measure (MEMEM) ranged from .85 to .89. In addition, the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) had a reliability coefficient of .93 and the New General Self-Efficacy scale (NGSE) had a reliability coefficient of .94. These results indicate the items for each measure were internally consistent.

Table 1

*Reliability Coefficients*

Measure	Reliability
Maughan Elementary Music Educator Measure (MEMEM)	
Support	.86
Workload Satisfaction	.89
Resources	.85
New General Self-Efficacy (NGSE)	.94
Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES)	.93

*Note.*  $N = 334$

**First Research Question**

Participants' demographic information was analyzed to answer the first research question. A sample of elementary music teachers (see Table 2) was solicited from the following states: (a) Kansas ( $n = 94, 28.1\%$ ); (b) Missouri ( $n = 90, 26.9\%$ ); (c) Iowa ( $n = 82, 24.6\%$ ); and (d) Nebraska ( $n = 68, 20.4\%$ ). The overall sample ( $N = 334$ ) was composed of 270 female and 57 male participants. Seven participants included in the sample chose not to identify their gender.

Table 2

*Participant Representation by State*

	<i>n</i>	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Kansas	94	28.1	28.1
Missouri	90	26.9	55.1
Iowa	82	24.6	79.7
Nebraska	68	20.4	100.0

*Note.*  $N = 334$

Results indicated 166 (49.7%) participants taught general music classes exclusively (see Table 3). A large portion of the sample ( $n = 157, 47%$ ) taught elementary general music in addition to other music classes. Participants representing this subgroup taught a variety of music subjects, including, but not limited to, elementary choir, high school choir, middle school instrumental music, show choir, and music appreciation. The remaining portion of the sample ( $n = 11, 2.7%$ ) did not teach elementary general music. Instead, they taught a variety of music subjects at various grade levels. It is interesting to note that ten participants taught classroom guitar and seven participants (2%) taught non-music classes as part of their teaching responsibilities.

Table 3

*Participants' Teaching Responsibilities*

Variable	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Elementary General Music	166	49.7	49.7
Elementary General & 1 other subject area	58	17.4	67.1
Elementary General & 2 other subject areas	30	9.0	76.0
Elementary General & 3 other subject areas	27	8.1	84.1
Elementary General & 4 other subject areas	13	3.9	88.0
Elementary General & 5 other subject areas	13	3.9	91.9
Elementary General & 6 other subject areas	9	2.7	94.6
Elementary General & 7 other subject areas	1	0.3	94.9
Elementary General & 8 other subject areas	3	0.9	95.8
Elementary General & 9 other subject areas	3	0.9	96.7
Elementary Orchestra	2	0.6	97.3
Elementary Instrumental & MS Instrumental	1	0.3	97.6
Elem Inst/MS Inst/HS Inst	3	0.9	98.5
Elem Inst& 4 other subjects	1	0.3	98.8
Elementary Orchestra & MS Orchestra	1	0.3	99.1
Middle School Choral	1	0.3	99.4
Elementary Inst. & Elem Orchestra	1	0.3	99.7
Elem Inst. & 7 other subjects	1	0.3	100.0

*Note.*  $N = 334$ .

Table 4 shows teaching experience as reported by participants. Data indicated that half the sample ( $n = 167, 50.0\%$ ) had 1–15 years of teaching experience and 12.9% of the sample ( $n = 43$ ) had more than 30 years of teaching experience. Participants

were also asked to indicate their teaching location. Rural ( $n = 167$ ) teachers represented 50.0% of the sample, and suburban teachers ( $n = 101$ ) represented 30.2% of the sample. Urban teachers ( $n = 52$ , 15.6%) represented the smallest portion of the sample. The remaining teachers ( $n = 14$ , 4.2%) indicated they taught in a combination of rural, suburban, or urban areas.

Table 4

*Participants' Years of Teaching Experience*

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1–5 years teaching experience	64	19.2	19.2
6–10 years teaching experience	55	16.5	35.6
11–15 years teaching experience	48	14.4	50.0
16–20 years teaching experience	43	12.9	62.9
21–25 years teaching experience	36	10.8	73.7
26–30 years teaching experience	45	13.5	87.1
31–35 years teaching experience	26	7.8	94.9
36–40 years teaching experience	15	4.5	99.4
40 plus years teaching experience	2	0.6	100.0

*Note.*  $N = 334$

Participants were also asked to report their annual teaching salary. Salary was divided into \$5,000 increments and participants selected the appropriate salary range



(see Table 5). The majority of participants ( $n = 237$ , 71%) reported salaries between \$30,000 and \$55,000. One respondent reported a salary in the range of \$80,000–\$85,000.

Table 5

*Frequencies for Teacher Salary*

Variable	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
\$25,000–\$30,000	22	6.6	6.6
\$30,000–\$35,000	44	13.2	19.8
\$35,000–\$40,000	51	15.3	35.0
\$40,000–\$45,000	43	12.9	47.9
\$45,000–\$50,000	48	14.4	62.3
\$50,000–\$55,000	51	15.3	77.5
\$55,000–\$60,000	20	6.0	83.5
\$60,000–\$65,000	18	5.4	88.9
\$65,000–\$70,000	22	6.6	95.5
\$70,000–\$75,000	0	0.0	95.5
\$75,000–\$80,000	6	1.8	97.3
\$80,000–\$85,000	1	0.3	97.6
No Response	8	2.4	100.0

*Note.*  $N = 334$

## Second Research Question

Descriptive statistics were calculated and normal distributions were found for all variables except self-efficacy (see Table 6). The negative skewness (-2.1) and elevated level of kurtosis (8.9) may be attributed to the high self-efficacy consistently reported by the majority of the sample.

Table 6

*Descriptive Statistics for the Composite Scores Representing Each Variable*

Variable	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
Support	76.1	10.2	-1.1	1.3
Workload Satisfaction	38.3	10.5	-0.6	-0.4
Resources	41.1	10.0	-0.8	0.2
Self-efficacy	33.4	5.1	-2.1	8.9
Work Engagement	95.6	12.9	-0.6	0.6

Note.  $N = 334$

Further analysis revealed several notable details regarding certain items from each measure. The mean scores for the statements representing the workload satisfaction variable within the MEMEM ranged from 3.55 to 5.38 (see Table 7). However, the three lowest rated statements were attributed to transition time ( $M = 3.55$ ), class size ( $M = 4.61$ ), and planning time ( $M = 4.28$ ). Additionally, the highest rated mean statement concerned the ease of managing musical performances ( $M = 5.38$ ).

Table 7

*Descriptive Statistics for the MEMEM—Workload Satisfaction*

	Mean	SD
My workload is manageable.	5.26	1.45
I manage the number of performances required of me with ease.	5.35	1.39
I have adequate transition time between classes.	3.55	2.07
The number of students that I teach is manageable.	5.03	1.72
I have a reasonable number of classes to teach each day.	5.12	1.77
I am not overwhelmed by the number of classes that I teach each week.	5.06	1.74
I teach classes that have an ideal number of students in them.	4.61	1.74
I have adequate planning time during every school day.	4.28	2.06

*Note.* Participants responded to each statement using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*never true*) to 7 (*always true*).

The highest rated statement from the resource variable concerned adequate keyboard instruments (see Table 8). The three lowest rated statements concerned audio systems ( $M = 4.97$ ), textbooks ( $M = 4.67$ ), and support for purchasing instruments and supplies ( $M = 4.66$ ).

Table 8

*Descriptive Statistics for the MEMEM—Resources*

	Mean	SD
I have adequate classroom space to teach effectively.	5.49	1.78
I have an adequate sound system	4.97	1.99
I have an adequate keyboard instrument in my room.	5.94	1.53
I am satisfied with my textbook series	4.67	1.95
I have adequate musical instruments to teach effectively.	5.01	1.82
I have satisfactory student supplies to teach effectively.	5.04	1.73
I have satisfactory teacher supplies to teach and work effectively.	5.39	1.53
I have support to purchase additional instruments and supplies as needed.	4.66	1.83

*Note.* Participants responded to each statement using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*never true*) to 7 (*always true*).

Overall, data representing the items from the support measure exhibited means that ranged from 5.46 to 6.33 except for two statements concerning adequate orientation ( $M = 4.92$ ) and adequate training ( $M = 5.00$ ; see Table 9). A number of participants indicated that their current job orientation and training were not effective; but the low mean scores for these two items may be attributed to the sample demographics. Many respondents were from rural or smaller districts and may be less likely to have new-teacher orientation and training. The highest rated response item within the measure pertained to positive relationships with students ( $M = 6.33$ ).

Table 9

*Descriptive Statistics for the MEMEM—Support*

	Mean	SD
I have a good relationship with other music teachers in my district.	6.15	1.08
I have a good relationship with other music teachers in my school building.	5.46	1.39
I have a good relationship with other staff members in my school.	6.28	0.69
I have a good relationship with members of the community.	6.20	0.84
I have a good relationship with students in my school.	6.33	0.52
I have a good relationship with others employed in the school district.	6.30	0.67
I have received good guidance from my administrator.	5.64	1.35
I am respected by my administrator.	6.08	1.31
I am treated fairly by my administrator.	6.04	1.36
My administrator recognizes achievements in my classroom.	5.66	1.49
I am supported by my administrator.	5.99	1.33
I received adequate orientation when I took my position.	4.92	1.79
I received adequate training when I took my current position.	5.00	1.72

*Note.* Participants responded to each statement using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*never true*) to 7 (*always true*).

Analysis of the mean scores from the New General Self-Efficacy scale (NGSE) revealed that the participants exhibited high levels of general self-efficacy (see Table 10). In fact, the highest rated mean statement concerned participant's ability to attain success at any work endeavor ( $M = 4.34$ ). The work engagement measure (UWES) also exhibited consistently high responses (see Table 11). One statement, which pertained to educators' pride in their jobs, had the highest overall mean score ( $M = 6.21$ ).

Table 10

*Descriptive Statistics for the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSE)*

	Mean	SD
I will be able to achieve most of the goals I have set for myself at my job.	4.05	0.87
When facing difficult tasks at my job, I am certain I will accomplish them.	4.09	0.75
In general, I think that I can obtain outcomes that are important to me at my job.	4.20	0.71
I believe I can succeed at most any work endeavor to which I set my mind.	4.34	0.73
I will be able to successfully overcome many challenges at my job.	4.17	0.77
I am confident that I can perform effectively on many different tasks at my job.	4.28	0.73
Compared to other people in my profession, I can do most tasks very well.	4.12	0.77
Even when things are tough at my job, I can perform quite well.	4.20	0.73

*Note.* Participants responded to each statement using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 5 (*strongly disagree*).

Table 11

*Descriptive Statistics for the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES)*

	Mean	SD
At my work, I feel bursting with energy.	5.32	1.07
I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose.	5.88	1.01
Time flies when I'm working.	5.93	0.91
At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.	5.45	1.06
I am enthusiastic about my job.	5.95	0.93
When I am working, I forget everything else around me.	5.43	1.27
My job inspires me.	5.63	1.08
When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.	5.36	1.21
I feel happy when I am working intensely.	5.84	1.04
I am proud of the work that I do.	6.21	0.88
I am immersed in my work.	5.81	1.03
I can continue working for very long periods of time.	5.70	1.12
To me, my job is challenging.	5.81	1.12
I get carried away when I'm working.	5.35	1.20
At my job, I am very resilient, mentally.	5.52	1.02
It is difficult to detach myself from my job.	4.59	1.59
At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well.	5.86	1.01

*Note.* Participants responded to each statement using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 7 (*always*).

### **Third Research Question**

Pearson product-moment correlations were conducted (see Table 12) to answer the third research question. All of the independent variables exhibited statistically significant ( $p < .01$ ) correlations with the dependent variable of work engagement: (a)

support ( $r = .46, p < .01$ ), (b) workload satisfaction ( $r = .28, p < .01$ ), (c) resources ( $r = .12, p < .05$ ), (d) self-efficacy ( $r = .20, p < .01$ ), and (e) salary ( $r = .13, p < .05$ ).

Additional correlations beyond the .01 level of significance were found between the following variables: (a) salary and resources ( $r = .15$ ), (b) support and resources ( $r = .46$ ), (c) support and workload satisfaction ( $r = .40$ ), and (d) resources and workload satisfaction ( $r = .34$ ). Correlations beyond the .05 level of significance were found between the following variables: (a) salary and support ( $r = .14$ ) and (b) self-efficacy and support ( $r = .13$ ).

Table 12

*Intercorrelations between Work Engagement Variables*

Variable	WkEng	Sal	SE	Sup	Res	Wkld Sat
WkEng	-	.13*	.20**	.46**	.12*	.28**
Sal		-	.09	.14*	.15**	.01
SE			-	.13*	.08	.09
Sup				-	.46**	.40**
Res					-	.34**
Wkld Sat						-

*Note.* WkEng = Work Engagement; Sal = Salary; SE = Self-efficacy; Sup = Support; Res = Resources; Wkld Sat = Workload Satisfaction.

\*  $p < .05$ , two-tailed. \*\*  $p < .01$ , two-tailed.



#### Fourth Research Question

To answer the fourth research question, a simultaneous multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine which of the following variables were statistically significant predictors of elementary music educators' work engagement: (a) support, (b) self-efficacy, (c) workload satisfaction, (d) salary, and (e) resources. The five independent variables combined to account for 17.6% of the variance in work engagement. Accordingly, the overall multiple regression was statistically significant,  $R^2 = .176$ ,  $F(5, 328) = 14.02$ ,  $p < .001$ .

Results further revealed that support ( $p < .001$ ), workload satisfaction ( $p < .001$ ), self-efficacy ( $p < .001$ ), and salary ( $p < .05$ ) were statistically significant predictors of work engagement (see Table13). On average, for each *SD* unit change in support, work engagement increased by .252 of a *SD* unit, once the other variables were taken into account. Second, for each *SD* unit change in workload satisfaction, work engagement increased by .216 of a *SD* unit, once the other variables were taken into account. Third, for each *SD* unit change in self-efficacy, work engagement increased by .369 of a *SD* unit, once the other variables were taken into account. Finally, for each *SD* unit change in salary, work engagement increased by .611 of a *SD* unit, once the other variables were taken into account.

Tests for tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF) were conducted to check for the existence of multicollinearity (see Table13). Tolerance values ranged from .710 to .980, indicating that all variables were safely independent from each other. Values for the VIF ranged from 1.02 to 1.41, which fall well below the levels that indicate the existence of multicollinearity.

Table 13

*Summary of the Simultaneous Regression Analysis (N = 334)*

Variable	<i>B</i>	SE	$\beta$	<i>p</i>	Tolerance	VIF
Salary	.61	.28	.13	.03	.95	1.05
Self-efficacy	.37	.13	.15	.00	.97	1.03
Support	.25	.08	.20	.00	.71	1.40
Resources	.09	.08	.07	.25	.75	1.34
Workload Satisfaction	.22	.07	.17	.00	.78	1.28

*Note.*  $R^2 = .176$ ,  $F(5, 328) = 14.02$ ,  $p < .001$

### Summary

The majority of participants taught elementary general music (96.7%) in one building, and they had an average of 15 years teaching experience. Results also indicated the majority of participants were female and approximately half worked in rural school districts. The variables of workload satisfaction, resources, and work engagement had a normal distribution while self-efficacy was negatively skewed. The participants' responses for the MEMEM were mostly positive, with the exception of a few areas. Participants exhibited high levels of general self-efficacy and work engagement. Statistically significant correlations ( $p < .01$ ,  $p < .05$ ) were found between work engagement and all independent variables with the exception of resources. Results of a simultaneous multiple regression analysis determined the variables of

support, workload satisfaction, self-efficacy, and salary were statistically significant predictors of work engagement.

## **Chapter V**

### **Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to discover which variables best predict elementary music educator's work engagement. After a thorough review of the literature, it was determined that the following independent variables may be effective predictors of work engagement: (a) support, (b) self-efficacy, (c) workload, (d) salary, and (e) resources. The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002) was used to measure the dependent variable of work engagement. The Maughan Elementary Music Educator Measure (MEMEM) was designed by the researcher to measure the independent variables of support, workload satisfaction, salary, and resources. The New General Self-Efficacy scale (NGSE; Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001) was used to measure the independent variable of self-efficacy.

In February of 2012, an e-mail message was sent to a sample of elementary music educators representing four states (Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska). The sample was selected from the alphabetical school listings made available on each state department of education Web page. The Internet-based service Survey Monkey was used to administer the measures to participants. An initial e-mail request was sent to 1,000 elementary music educators (250 per state). Potential participants received a request for participation, which included a direct link to the survey. Based on the initial request, it was discovered that 82 e-mails were undeliverable. Subsequently, additional e-mail addresses were collected. After one week, a follow-up e-mail was sent out to any potential participants who had not yet responded. After the second week, a third final e-mail was sent to all those who had not responded. The survey was closed at the

end of the three-week period. Once all the data were collected, it was determined that 334 participants completed the measures, resulting in a 32.9% response rate.

Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the reliability for all measures and their subscales. The reliability analysis of the MEMEM, UWES, and NGSE indicated all items were internally consistent. Descriptive statistics were calculated for the dependent and independent variables followed by a correlation analysis. A simultaneous multiple regression analysis indicated the following variables were statistically significant ( $p < .01$ ) predictors of work engagement: (a) support, (b) workload, (c) self-efficacy, and (d) salary.

## **Summary of Results**

### **First research question.**

Participants' demographics were analyzed to answer the first research question. Results indicated that the majority of participants were female (80.0%). This finding is similar to data from the U.S. Department of Education (2007–2008c), which indicated the majority (75.6%) of U.S. teachers in public and private schools are female. Furthermore, participants taught for an average of 16.9 years. Participants taught at the following locations: (a) rural (50%), (b) suburban (30.2%), (c) urban (15.6%), and (d) other (4.2%).

Participants who taught only elementary general music represented 49.7% of the sample, while 47% taught elementary general music in addition to at least one other music or academic subject. The remaining participants (2.7%) taught elementary instrumental music. In terms of teaching responsibilities, these results are similar to those reported by Ciorba and McLay (2010) who found that only 42% ( $n = 528$ ) of the

Illinois music educators surveyed were teaching in one area of expertise (e.g., general music) while the majority of the sample ( $n = 723$ ) reported teaching in more than one area of expertise (e.g., general music and middle school choir). Since less than half the elementary educators representing the current study were given the sole responsibility of teaching elementary general music, future music educators would be best served if they were prepared to teach in various areas of music (e.g., elementary general, secondary band and choir, etc.).

In terms of salary, 71% of the sample reported a yearly income ranging from \$30,000 to \$55,000. This finding is not surprising, as the National Education Association (2012) has determined the average teaching salary in the United States is \$57,218. According to the NEA, the average salaries by state were as follows: (a) Kansas, \$46,401; (b) Iowa, \$50,634; (c) Missouri, \$46,411; and (c) Nebraska, \$44,957 (National Education Association, 2013).

### **Second research question.**

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze each item and the composite scores for the following measures: (a) the Maughan Elementary Music Educator Measure (MEMEM), (b) the New General Self-Efficacy scale (NGSE), and (c) the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES). Normal distributions were found for all measures with the exception of self-efficacy. The severe skewness, as represented by the self-efficacy measure, may be attributed to the high levels of self-efficacy reported by the sample.

Further analysis revealed several details regarding the individual items within each measure. The mean scores for the items representing the workload satisfaction

variable were fairly high. The highest rated mean statement revealed that participants believed they could manage various music performances effectively. The three lowest rated statements addressed the issues of transition time, class size, and planning time. Though specific data on the average U.S. class size and its benefits are limited, researchers generally recommend smaller class sizes for more effective teaching (Ehrenberg, Brewer, Gamoran, & Willms, 2001; Johnson, 2006). Hamman, Daugherty, and Mills (1987) revealed that large class sizes, in combination with limited planning time or transition time, can lead to burnout among music educators. More than 50 years ago, planning time was thought to be inadequate as many used their planning time for lessons, rehearsals, and so forth (Steg, 1955). Recent research has shown that these issues are still an area of concern for music educators (McCann & Joahannessen, 2004; Scheib, 2003).

Within the resource portion of the MEMEM, the four lowest rated statements concerned audio systems, textbooks, classroom instruments, and support for purchasing instruments and supplies. Music educators vary in their expectations of adequate resources, and thus, these results do not reveal new information. The highest rated statement concerned adequate keyboard instruments.

Overall, data representing the support section of the MEMEM indicated high mean scores with the exception of two statements. Many participants reported ineffective job orientation and training procedures, suggesting that music educators would benefit from more guidance and support when they begin a new job. The highest rated responses were attributed to positive relationships with and support from the students. This is an important finding, as teachers spend the majority of their day with

students. If these relationships remain healthy, teachers are more likely to have a positive work experience.

Analysis of the mean scores from the New General Self-Efficacy scale showed that overall, the participants exhibited high levels of general self-efficacy. The statement with the highest mean concerned participant's ability to attain success at any work endeavor. The work engagement measure also exhibited consistently high responses. One statement ("I am proud of the work that I do.") had the highest overall mean. These results confirm that participants generally reported high self-efficacy, and they were also highly engaged in their work.

### **Third research question.**

A correlation analysis was conducted to answer the third research question: What are the interrelationships among the variables of (a) support, (b) self-efficacy, (c) workload, (d) salary, (e) resources, and (f) work engagement? Based on the results, several conclusions can be made regarding the intercorrelations between the variables. The correlation between support and work engagement was particularly noteworthy ( $r = .46, p < .01$ ). This finding supports previous studies that have discovered a connection between work engagement and support (Carlson, 2004; Maughan, 2012; Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006; Kellermeyer, 2009).

Furthermore, there was a significant correlation between workload satisfaction and work engagement ( $r = .28, p < .01$ ). These results are similar to previous studies, which have indicated that excessive workloads might hinder teachers' work engagement levels (McCann & Joahannessen, 2004; Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006). In



addition, Scheib (2003) found music teachers may exacerbate their workload by setting very high expectations for themselves and their students. Moreover, work engagement shared a significant correlation with self-efficacy ( $r = .20, p < .01$ ). This finding supports previous research that linked high self-efficacy with work engagement (Bakker et al., 2008; Collins, 2009; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2007, 2009a, 2009b).

There was a small but significant correlation between work engagement and salary ( $r = .13, p < .05$ ). This result does support previous research, which has indicated salary increases may help educators remain engaged in their work (Hancock, 2008). Conversely, Ingersoll (2001) found that salary is a secondary factor in a teacher's decision to leave his or her job.

Significant correlations were also discovered between the independent variables of support and workload satisfaction ( $r = .40, p < .01$ ), as well as between resources and workload satisfaction ( $r = .34, p < .01$ ). The correlation between support and workload satisfaction is notable as previous research has not been able to determine a relationship between these two variables. However, this study indicates appropriate support may help teachers attain workload satisfaction. In addition, the correlation between support and resources ( $r = .46, p < .01$ ) may be expected as teachers who are well-supported may see evidence of that support in their resources.

#### **Fourth research question.**

A simultaneous multiple regression analysis was conducted to answer the fourth research question: Which of the following variables best predict elementary music

educators' work engagement: (a) support, (b) self-efficacy, (c) workload, (d) salary, and (e) resources? Results indicated that support is a statistically significant predictor of work engagement beyond the .01 level, which is similar to findings reported by Gardner (2010), Maughan (2012), and Melvin (2010). The regression analysis also revealed that workload satisfaction ( $p < .01$ ), self-efficacy ( $p < .01$ ) and salary ( $p < .05$ ) were statistically significant predictors of work engagement.

Numerous studies have indicated that multiple forms of support (administrative, parent, community, etc.) can increase a teacher's job satisfaction and work engagement (Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007; Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006; Johnson & Birkeland, 2003; Kellermeyer, 2009). Previous researchers have found that support does more than aid teachers' work engagement; support also helps teachers deal with pupil misconduct more effectively (Bakker et al., 2007). Additionally, researchers have found that workload can influence an educator's decision to leave his or her job (Hancock, 2008; Scheib, 2003; Stinebrickner, 1998). Self-efficacy has also been positively linked to work engagement in previous research (Bakker, et al., 2008; Xanthopoulou et al., 2007; Xanthopoulou, 2009a, 2009b).

### **Implications**

The findings from this study provide numerous implications for elementary music educators' work engagement. The results of the multiple regression analysis indicate that support, workload satisfaction, self-efficacy, and salary were statistically significant predictors of work engagement. Music educators have some control over these variables, which can affect their levels of work engagement.

Music educators should expect to be supported by administrators, colleagues, parents, students, and the community. Previous research has indicated elementary administrators not only were supportive of the music programs in their schools, but the majority (92.5%) also required music education as an elementary subject (Abril&Gault, 2006). Furthermore, many researchers have recommended that administrators take a more active role in helping educators attain job satisfaction (Carlson, 2004; Hicks, 2011; Ingersoll& Smith, 2003).

However, elementary administrators and fellow teachers may not have the time or inclination to build supportive relationships with special subject teachers (e.g., art, music, physical education). In this case, it is recommended that elementary music educators become their own advocates and work to build supportive relationships with the entire school community. To start this process, music educators need to overcome the social isolation that may exist in their schools and take time out of their days to interact with teachers, parents, and administrators. It is very important that music educators share their classroom successes with the educational community. By sharing this information, perhaps administrators and other teachers would be more likely to lend support to the music education program.

Participants in this study reported a variety of teaching assignments. Less than half the sample taught only elementary general music, while the remainder of the sample performed various teaching responsibilities. This discovery has implications for university teaching programs, as future music educators require diverse training to successfully navigate their future career path successfully.

Traditionally, universities tend to track music education majors into two categories: vocal music education and instrumental music education. Often, the students who major in vocal music education are possible candidates for the elementary general classroom. Some vocal music education majors may even decide to become elementary general educators during their university training. Vocal music education is an excellent place for elementary general music educators to begin their training; however, based on the results of this study, elementary music educators may be expected to teach a variety of music-related subjects, including instrumental music and secondary choral classes. Instrumental music education majors may also be asked to teach a variety of music classes. A number of participants indicated they were teaching instrumental music, guitar, and music theory in addition to their elementary general music classes. Because of this, it is recommended that universities should prepare music education majors to teach at all levels and areas in music education to assist preservice teachers with their future professional responsibilities.

Other concerns from participants included the issues of transition time and planning time. Transitions between classes in the elementary general classroom are typically brief. This is a result of elementary schedules that are designed to have the maximum number of special subject classes each day (e.g., library, physical education, computers, music, art). These classroom schedules may be set up so that one class leaves the room while another enters. Based on data from this study, music educators would like to have more transition time in their schedules. However, those who create elementary schedules may not always take teacher input into consideration. In this case, music educators need to advocate for themselves and their students. Music

educators and other special subject teachers need to approach administrators to discuss changes to the schedule. Abril and Gault (2006) found administrators are aware that increased testing and scheduling issues have had a negative impact on elementary music programs. If music educators make a concerted effort to communicate their concerns and build positive working relationships, perhaps administrators would work to create more satisfactory schedules.

Another concern among participants was the issue of planning time. While the effect of an in-school planning period has not been studied in relation to work engagement, adequate planning periods may positively affect elementary music educators' work engagement. Music educators should draw attention to inadequate planning time, especially if it is negatively affecting their teaching.

On average, participants indicated dissatisfaction with their classroom audio system, textbooks, instruments, and budget. However, the current study did not examine the specific reasons behind this dissatisfaction. For example, do most music educators use an audio system every day? Are educators using textbooks or their own materials from Orff, Kodály, and other training? Additionally, it is not known whether the participants in this study had a small classroom budget or none at all. Before implications can be drawn from this data, additional research is needed.

Teacher orientation and training are not always considered necessary for successful teaching. However, a number of participants revealed that their orientation and training were inadequate when they took their current jobs. This discovery has implications for administrators, counselors, and personnel management in school districts. These groups should approach teachers in their districts to discover the

deficiencies of their current orientation and training to improve the experience for new employees.

Results of this study also indicated that salary is a significant predictor of work engagement, implying that educators should have adequate salaries—comparable to other professionals with the same training. Since salaries are set by individual school districts, this recommendation has little substance other than a reminder that teachers still require better compensation for their work.

### **Recommendations**

This is the first research study to measure elementary music educators' work engagement. As a result, this study has the potential to provide many avenues for future research. Participants were frequently concerned about time issues in their workday. Many indicated that they do not have enough transition time between classes. A study that addresses how transition times affect work engagement would allow music educators to make research-based recommendations to their administrators.

Further investigation into class size and its relationship to work engagement is also recommended. The current study included one general statement about class size. Future research could include a series of detailed questions and/or statements to determine the effect that class size, total student enrollment, and so forth, has on music teacher work engagement.

Additional research is needed to understand what resources are required in the music education classroom and their impact on an educator's work engagement. A comparison of work engagement levels of teachers with adequate resources (e.g., audio

system, textbooks, instruments) to those with inadequate resources could prove beneficial to the profession.

It is recommended that further investigation should be conducted on classroom budgets and their effect on teacher work engagement. Budgets are a form of support, and lack of a budget could negatively affect a teacher's work engagement. Currently, there is very little research connecting classroom budgets to work engagement.

Further research should be conducted with other populations to determine if the results of the current study can be replicated across other teaching populations (high school vocal music educators, middle school instrumental music educators, etc.). Additional investigation on the effect of support, workload, and salary on work engagement would also be useful within these populations. As secondary and elementary music educators have distinct and separate responsibilities, the variables that affect work engagement may be different.

Future research could also include the development of a path analytical model to fully examine the direct and indirect effects among the selected variables. Such a model could lay important groundwork and lead to future research developing an educational theory pertaining to work engagement among music educators.

## **Conclusion**

These findings contribute to the current literature by providing a new awareness of the impact that support, workload, self-efficacy, and salary have on the work engagement of elementary music educators. Workload and salary were previously considered possible predictors of work engagement. The current study indicates these variables are indeed statistically significant predictors of work engagement among

elementary general teachers. This study has revealed that elementary music educators are not able to fully engage in their work without the help of others. As such, adequate support is crucial for educators to remain fully engaged in their work. It is hoped that this and future research will encourage music educators to build positive relationships within their work environments while continuing to improve their overall work engagement.



## REFERENCES

- Allegretto, S. A., Corcoran, S. P., Mishel, L. (2004). *How does teacher pay compare? Methodological challenges and answers*. Economic Policy Institute, Washington, DC.
- Bakker, A. (2010). Engagement and “job crafting”: engaged employees create their own great place to work. In S. L. Albrecht (Ed.), *Handbook of employee engagement* (pp. 229–244). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Bakker, A. B. (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(4), 265–269. doi:10.1177/0963721411414534
- Bakker, A. B., & Bal, P. M. (2010). Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among starting teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83, 189–206. doi:10.1348/096317909X402596
- Bakker, A. B., Hakanen, J. J., Demerouti, E., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2007). Job resources boost work engagement, particularly when job demands are high. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(2), 274–284. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.99.2.274
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, 22, 187–200. doi:10.1080/02678370802393649
- Bakker, A. B., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2009). The crossover of daily work engagement: Test of an actor-partner independence model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(6), 1562–1571. doi:10.1037/a0017525
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191–215. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: Freeman & Co.
- Blos, P. (1942). Mental hygiene and the teaching profession. *Educational method*, 21(5), 224–229.
- 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. doi:10.3102/0034654308321455

- Bresó, E., Schaufeli, W. B., & Salanova, M. (2011). Can a self-efficacy-based intervention decrease burnout, increase engagement, and enhance performance? A quasi-experimental study. *Higher Education, 61*(4), 339–355. doi:10.1007/s10734-010-9334-6
- Burrack, F., & Payne, P. (2011). Impact of budget cuts on music education in Kansas' schools: Summary of initial findings. Kansas Music Educators Advocacy Committee. Retrieved from [http://www.ksmea.org/advocacy/impact\\_of\\_budget\\_cuts\\_in\\_kansas.pdf](http://www.ksmea.org/advocacy/impact_of_budget_cuts_in_kansas.pdf)
- Byrum, T. B. (2008). *Teachers' perceptions of the effect of principal leadership on teacher retention*. (Order No. 3318382, East Carolina University). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304367113?accountid=12964>
- Carlson, D. N. (2004). *The principal's role in retaining teachers: Effective practices that enhance teacher retention and impact teacher mobility*. (Order No. 3142999, The University of Wisconsin - Madison). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305109895?accountid=12964>
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new General Self-Efficacy Scale. *Organizational Research Methods, 4*, 62–83. doi:10.1177/109442810141004
- Ciorba, C.R., & McLay, M. (2010). Describing Illinois music programs using the whole school effectiveness guidelines survey for music education: A statewide investigation. *Contributions to Music Education, 37*(1), 37–50. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Collins, K. K. (2009). *Examining a strengths-based approach to employee engagement and the mediating effects of strengths self-efficacy*. (Order No. 3421103, Alliant International University, Los Angeles). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, , 147*. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/750968369?accountid=12964>. (750968369).
- Conway, C. M. (2003). An examination of district-sponsored beginning music teacher mentor practices. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 51*, 6–23. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3345645>
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Csikszentmihalyi, I. (2006). *A life worth living: Contributions to positive psychology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- DeLorenzo, L. C. (1992). The perceived problems of beginning music teachers. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 113*, 9–25. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40318508>

- Edgerton, S. K. (1977). Teachers in role conflict: The hidden dilemma. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 59(2), 120–123. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20298866>
- Edutopia: The George Lucas Foundation. (2010). Do you feel obligated to buy school supplies with your own money? Survey/Poll. Retrieved from <http://www.edutopia.org/node/5683/results>
- Ehrenberg, R. G., Brewer, D. J., Gamoran, A., & Willms, J. D. (2001). *The class size controversy* (CHERI Working Paper #14). Retrieved from Cornell University, ILR School site: <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/workingpapers/25/>
- Flores, L. (2008). *Strengths self-efficacy scale development report*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burnout. *Journal of Social Issues*, 30, 159–165. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1974.tb00706.x
- Gardner, R. D. (2010). Should I stay or should I go? Factors that influence retention, turnover, and attrition of K–12 music teachers in the United States. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 111, 112–121. doi:10.1080/10632910903458896
- Grantham, J. H. (2006). *Helping teachers "do what they do": Teachers' perceptions of the influence of peer and administrator support on teacher retention*. (Order No. 3252113, The Florida State University). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305332365?accountid=12964>
- Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43, 495–513. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001
- Hakanen, J. J., & Roodt, G. (2010). Using the job demands-resources model to predict engagement: Analysing a conceptual model. In A. B. Bakker & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *Work Engagement: A Handbook of Essential Theory and Research* (pp. 85–101). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Hamann, D. L., Daugherty, E., & Mills, C. R. (1987). An investigation of burnout assessment and potential job related variables among public school music educators. *Psychology of Music*, 15, 128–140. doi:10.1177/0305735687152002
- Hancock, C. B. (2008). Music teachers at risk for attrition and migration: An analysis of the 1999–2000 Schools and Staffing Survey. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 56, 130–144.
- Hancock, C. B. (2009). National estimates of retention, migration, and attrition. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 57, 92–107.

- Heitin, L. (2012). Teachers' satisfaction with jobs plummets, new survey reveals. *Education Week*, 31(24). Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?sid=0e33eef1-9deb-44a4-9d63-9b098255101d%40sessionmgr110&vid=1&hid=105&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=tfh&AN=73466577>
- Henke, R., Chen, X., Geis, S., & Knepper, P. (2000). *Progress through the teacher pipeline: 1992–93 college graduates and elementary/secondary teaching as of 1997* (Report no. NCES 2000-152). Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Heston, M., Dedrick, C, Raschke, D., & Whitehead, J. (1996). Job satisfaction and stress among band directors. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 44, 319–327. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3345444>
- Hicks, C. L. (2011). *Teacher and administrator perceptions of administrative support in schools*. (Order No. 3452506, Northcentral University). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/864823428?accountid=12964>
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38, 499–534. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3202489>
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2003, May). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, pp. 30–33. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&sid=4a94d5b3-8e3e-4d16-b1b4-8236ad2ccfe2%40sessionmgr11&hid=7>
- Johnson, S. M. (2006). The workplace matters: Teacher quality, retention, and effectiveness. *National Education Association*. Retrieved from [www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED495822.pdf](http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED495822.pdf)
- Johnson, S. M., & Birkeland, S. E. (2003). Pursuing a “sense of success”: New teachers explain their career decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40, 581–617. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3699446>
- Keigher, A., & Cross, F. (2010). *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the 2008–09 Teacher Follow-up Survey* (NCES 2010-353). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics. Retrieved from: [nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/2009321.pdf](http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/2009321.pdf) - 2009-07-06
- Kellermeyer, R. J. (2009). *Personal beliefs and job satisfaction of illinois elementary general music teachers*. (Order No. 3395571, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304895263?accountid=12964>

- Krantz-Kent, R. (March, 2008). *Teachers' work patterns: When, where, and how much do U.S. teachers work?* Monthly Labor Review, Bureau of Labor Statistics (March). Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2008/03/art4full.pdf>
- Long, N. J., & Newman, R. G. (1969). The straws that break the teacher's back. In H. F. Clarizio (Ed.), *Mental health and the educative process: Selected readings* (pp. 282–288). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally Company.
- Luekens, M. T., Lyter, D. M., & Fox, E. E. (2004). Teacher Attrition and Mobility: Results from the Teacher Follow-up Survey, 2000–2001. *National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2004/2004301.pdf>
- 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*, 6–19. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3345689>
- Maslach, C. (1982). *Burnout: The cost of caring*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2*, 99–113.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). *MBI: The Maslach burnout inventory: Manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). *The truth about burnout: How organizations cause personal stress and what to do about it*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.
- Maslach, C., & Schaufeli, W. B. (1993). Historical and conceptual development of burnout. In W. B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, & T. Marek (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 1–16). Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.
- Maughan, E. G. (2012). *Factors affecting elementary general music educators' work engagement: A pilot study*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- McCann, T. M., & Johannessen, L. R. (2004). Why do new teachers cry? *The Clearing House, 77*(4), 138–145. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30189884>
- McLain, B. P. (2005). Environmental support and music teacher burnout. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 164*, 71–84. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40319261>
- Melvin, B. K. (2011). *Teacher perceptions of administrative leadership practices and the impact on retention*. (Order No. 3439060, Fielding Graduate University). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/850458409?accountid=12964>

- National Education Association. (1932). Administrative practices affecting classroom teachers: Part 1: The selection and appointment of teachers. (1932). *Research Bulletin*, 10(1), 5–27.
- National Education Association. (1945). Teacher status and teacher morale. *Research Bulletin*, 23(4), 129–136.
- National Education Association. (2013). State affiliates. Retrieved from <http://www.nea.org/home/49809.htm>
- NEA Research. (2012, December). *Rankings and estimates: Rankings of the states 2012 and estimates of school statistics 2013*. Retrieved from [http://www.nea.org/assets/img/content/NEA\\_Rankings\\_And\\_Estimates-2013\\_\(2\).pdf](http://www.nea.org/assets/img/content/NEA_Rankings_And_Estimates-2013_(2).pdf)
- Rosey, M. I. (1943). Why is everybody tired? *Educational Method*, 22(8), 366–373.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 293–315. doi:10.1002/job.248
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. In A. B. Bakker & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *Work Engagement: A Handbook of Essential Theory and Research* (pp. 10–24). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Enzmann, D. (1998). *The burnout companion to study and research: A critical analysis*. London, United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2009). Burnout: 35 years of research and practice. *Career Development International*, 14(3), 204–220. doi:10.1108/13620430910966406
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A confirmative analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71–92.
- Scheib, J. W. (2002). *Roles, expectations, and tension in the professional life of the school music teacher: A collective case study*. (Order No. 3049467, The University of Wisconsin - Madison). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305527749?accountid=12964>
- Scheib, J. W. (2003). Role stress in the professional life of the school music teacher: A collective case study. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 51, 124–136. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3345846>

- Scheib, J. W. (2004). Why band directors leave: From the mouths of maestros. *Music Educators Journal*, 9(1), 53–57. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3400106>
- Scherbaum, C. A., Cohen-Charash, Y., & Kern, M. J. (2006). Measuring general self-efficacy: A comparison of three measures using item response theory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(6), 1047–1063. doi:10.1177/0013164406288171
- Schunk, D. H. (1995). Self-efficacy, motivation, and performance. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 7(2), 112–137.
- Seligmann, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55, 5–14. Retrieved from <http://www.bdp-gus.de/gus/Positive-Psychologie-Aufruf-2000.pdf>
- Sindberg, L., & Lipscomb, S. D. (2005). Professional isolation and the public school music teacher. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 166, 43–56. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40319279>
- Smith, D., & Milstein, M. (1984). Stress and teachers: Old wine in new bottles. *Urban Education*, 19, 39–51. doi:10.1177/004208598401900105
- Steg, O. W. (1955). The total work-load of high school music teachers in Michigan. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 3(2). Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3343625>
- Stinebrickner, T. (1998). An empirical investigation of teacher attrition. *Economics of Education Review*, 17(2), 127–136.
- Tye, B. B., & O'Brien, L. (2002). Why are experienced teachers leaving the profession? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(1), 24–32. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=6&hid=21&sid=18036f0c-d9c4-44e7-bae7-1509b26a1455%40sessionmgr15>
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2007–2008a). *Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS)*, Public School Teacher data files. Retrieved from [http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/tables/sass0708\\_004\\_t1n.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/tables/sass0708_004_t1n.asp)
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2007–2008b). *Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS)*, Public School District data file. Retrieved from [http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/tables/sass0708\\_2009320\\_d1s\\_03.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/tables/sass0708_2009320_d1s_03.asp)
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2007–2008c). *Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS)*, Public School Teacher, BIE School

- Teacher, and Private School Teacher data files. Retrieved from [http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/tables/sass0708\\_029\\_t12n.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/tables/sass0708_029_t12n.asp)
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2008–2009). *Teacher Follow-up Survey (TFS), Current and Former Teacher Data Files*. Retrieved from [http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/tables/tfs0809\\_023\\_cf1n.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/tables/tfs0809_023_cf1n.asp)
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary Day Schools, 1955–56 through 1984–85; Common Core of Data (CCD), State Nonfiscal Survey of Public Elementary/Secondary Education, 1985–86 through 2007–08; Private School Universe Survey (PSS), 1989–90 through 2007–08; Projections of Education Statistics to 2018*. Retrieved from [http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d09/tables/dt09\\_064.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d09/tables/dt09_064.asp)
- Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989). Impact of conceptions of ability on self-regulatory mechanisms and complex decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 407–415.
- Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review, 26*(2), 179–201.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). The role of personal resources in the job demands-resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management, 14*(2), 121–141. doi:10.1037/1072-5245.14.2.121
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009a). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 74*, 235–244. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2008.11.003
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009b). Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 82*, 183–200.
- Youngs, B. (1978). Anxiety and stress—how they affect teachers' teaching. *NASSP Bulletin, 62*, 78–83. doi:10.1177/019263657806242114



APPENDIX 1

UTRECHT WORK ENGAGEMENT SCALE (UWES)

The following 17 statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job.

- 1 – never
- 2 - almost never
- 3 – rarely
- 4 – sometimes
- 5 – often
- 6 - very often
- 7 – always

1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Time flies when I'm working.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I am enthusiastic about my job.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. When I am working, I forget everything else around me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. My job inspires me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. I feel happy when I am working intensely.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. I am proud of the work that I do.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. I am immersed in my work.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. I can continue working for very long periods at a time.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. To me, my job is challenging.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. I get carried away when I'm working.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. At my job, I am very resilient, mentally.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. It is difficult to detach myself from my job.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

APPENDIX 2

THE NEW GENERAL SELF-EFFICACY SCALE (NGSE)

Using the scale provided, please rate how these statements describe your current teaching position.

- 1- strongly agree
- 2 - agree
- 3 - neutral
- 4 - disagree
- 5 - strongly disagree

1. I will be able to achieve most of the goals that I have set for myself at my job.  
1            2            3            4            5
2. When facing difficult tasks at my job, I am certain that I will accomplish them.  
1            2            3            4            5
3. In general, I think that I can obtain outcomes that are important to me at my job.  
1            2            3            4            5
4. I believe I can succeed at most any work endeavor to which I set my mind.  
1            2            3            4            5
5. I will be able to successfully overcome many challenges at my job.  
1            2            3            4            5
6. I am confident that I can perform effectively on many different tasks at my job.  
1            2            3            4            5
7. Compared to other people in my profession, I can do most tasks very well.  
1            2            3            4            5
8. Even when things are tough at my job, I can perform quite well.  
1            2            3            4            5

APPENDIX 3

MAUGHAN ELEMENTARY MUSIC EDUCATOR MEASURE (MEMEM)

Please rate how these statements describe your current teaching situation.

- 1 – Never true
- 2 – Rarely true
- 3 – Sometimes but infrequently true
- 4 – Neutral
- 5 – Sometimes true
- 6 – Usually true
- 7 – Always true

**WORKLOAD SATISFACTION**

1. My workload is manageable.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I manage the number of performances required of me with ease.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I have adequate transition time between classes.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. The number of students that I teach is manageable.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I have a manageable number of classes to teach each day.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I am not overwhelmed by the number of classes I teach each week.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. I teach classes that have an ideal number of students in them.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. I have adequate planning time during every school day.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. I teach in multiple buildings.

Yes No

**RESOURCES**

10. I have adequate classroom space to teach effectively.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. I have an adequate sound system.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. I have a keyboard instrument in my classroom.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. I am satisfied with my textbook series.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. I have adequate musical instruments to teach effectively.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. I have satisfactory student supplies to teach effectively.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. I have satisfactory teacher supplies to teach and work effectively.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. I have support to purchase additional instruments and supplies as needed.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

#### **SUPPORT**

18. I have a good relationship with other music teachers in my district.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. I have a good relationship with other music teachers in my school building.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. I have a good relationship with other staff members in my school.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. I have a good relationship with members of the community.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. I have a good relationship with students in my school.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. I have a good relationship with others employed in the school district.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. I have received good guidance from my administrator.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7



25. I am respected by my administrator.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. I am treated fairly by my administrator.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. My administrator recognizes achievements in my classroom.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

28. I am supported by my administrator.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29. I received adequate orientation when I took my current position.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

30. I received adequate training when I took my current position.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

APPENDIX 4

ELEMENTARY MUSIC EDUCATOR DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Gender

Male

Female

Prefer not to respond

2. How many years have you been teaching?

\_\_\_\_\_ Years of experience

3. Please state your age (this information will be anonymous and confidential).

\_\_\_\_\_ Age

4. What is your teaching speciality? (check all that apply)

elementary general music

elementary instrumental music

elementary orchestra

middle school choral music

middle school instrumental music

middle school orchestra

middle school jazz band

high school choir

high school instrumental music

high school orchestra

high school jazz band

- music theory
- guitar class
- mariachi
- other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

5. What is your annual teaching salary?

- \$25,000 - \$30,000
- \$30,000 - \$35,000
- \$35,000 - \$40,000
- \$40,000 - \$45,000
- \$45,000 - \$50,000
- \$50,000 - \$55,000
- \$55,000 - \$60,000
- \$60,000 - \$65,000
- \$65,000 - \$70,000
- \$70,000 - \$75,000
- \$75,000 - \$80,000
- \$80,000 - \$85,000

6. In what state do you teach? \_\_\_\_\_

7. In your opinion, your school district is(check all that apply):

\_\_\_\_ Rural

\_\_\_\_ Suburban

\_\_\_\_ Urban

8. Do you intend to teach music until you reach retirement age?

\_\_\_\_ yes

\_\_\_\_ no

\_\_\_\_ not sure

APPENDIX 5  
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL



**Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects**  
**Approval of Initial Submission – Exempt from IRB Review – AP01**

Date: February 15, 2013

IRB#: 2322

Principal Investigator: Elizabeth G Hagman, MS

Approval Date: 02/14/2013

Exempt Category: 2

Study Title: Factors Affecting Elementary General Music Educators' Work Engagement

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), I have reviewed the above-referenced research study and determined that it meets the criteria for exemption from IRB review. To view the documents approved for this submission, open this study from the *My Studies* option, go to *Submission History*, go to *Completed Submissions* tab and then click the *Details* icon.

As principal investigator of this research study, you are responsible to:

- Conduct the research study in a manner consistent with the requirements of the IRB and federal regulations 45 CFR 46.
- Request approval from the IRB prior to implementing any/all modifications as changes could affect the exempt status determination.
- Maintain accurate and complete study records for evaluation by the HRPP Quality Improvement Program and, if applicable, inspection by regulatory agencies and/or the study sponsor.
- Notify the IRB at the completion of the project.

If you have questions about this notification or using iRIS, contact the IRB @ 405-325-8110 or [irb@ou.edu](mailto:irb@ou.edu).

Cordially,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Lara Mayeux'.

Lara Mayeux, Ph.D.  
Vice Chair, Institutional Review Board

APPENDIX 6  
SURVEY INVITATION E-MAIL MESSAGE



Dear music educator,

My name is Elizabeth Hagman and I am a PhD student majoring in music education at the University of Oklahoma. I am conducting a study that involves work engagement and elementary music teachers. As you have been identified as an elementary music educator, I would like to invite you to participate in this study.

The link below will lead you to a short survey. The survey will help determine what factors are necessary for elementary music educators to have optimal work engagement. If you would like to participate in this research, click the link below. Participation is completely voluntary and all results will remain completely anonymous. You will not be identified or compensated in any way for your participation. If you have any questions, please email me.

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/HT3X96D>

Thank you,

Elizabeth Hagman  
University of Oklahoma doctoral student  
[Elizabeth.G.Hagman-1@ou.edu](mailto:Elizabeth.G.Hagman-1@ou.edu)

The University of Oklahoma is an Equal Opportunity Institution

APPENDIX 7  
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

**University of Oklahoma  
Institutional Review Board  
Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study**

**Project Title:** Examining Work Engagement Among Elementary Music Educators

**Principal**

**Investigator:** Elizabeth Hagman

**Department:** Music

Dear Participant,

My name is Elizabeth Hagman and I am a PhD student at the University of Oklahoma. You are being asked to volunteer for this research study, which is being conducted as an online survey. This study is part of my dissertation research and is being conducted at University of Oklahoma. You were selected as a possible participant because you are employed as an elementary general music educator in your district. Please read this form and ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to take part in this study.

The purpose of this study is to discover how workload, resources, and support affect work engagement in elementary music educators. Approximately 1,000 music educators will take part in this study.

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to complete a short online survey which should take a few minutes to complete. There are no risks to participation in this study. You will not be reimbursed for your time and participation in this study. There are no benefits to participating in this study.

All data generated during this study will remain completely anonymous. The survey utilizes SSL encryption technology. This technology insures a secure line of communication, keeping your survey responses completely private during transmission. Your name, the name of your school, and your email address will not be recorded. In published reports, there will be no information included that will make it possible to identify you. Research records will be stored securely and only approved researchers will have access to the records. There are organizations that may inspect and/or copy your research records for quality assurance and data analysis. These organizations include the OU Institutional Review Board.

Participation in this study is voluntary. If you withdraw or decline participation, you will not be penalized or lose benefits or services unrelated to the study. If you decide to participate, you may decline to answer any question and may choose to withdraw at any time.

If you have concerns or complaints about the research, the researcher(s) conducting this study can be contacted at (785) 567-7849 or [Elizabeth.G.Hagman-1@ou.edu](mailto:Elizabeth.G.Hagman-1@ou.edu) (researcher) or [cciorba@ou.edu](mailto:cciorba@ou.edu) (faculty sponsor).

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, concerns, or complaints about the research and wish to talk to someone other than individuals on the research team or if you cannot reach the research team, you may contact the University of Oklahoma – Norman Campus Institutional Review Board (OU-NC IRB) at 405-325-8110 or [irb@ou.edu](mailto:irb@ou.edu).

***Please feel free to print a copy of this information to keep for your records.***

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Hagman  
Graduate Student  
University of Oklahoma  
School of Music  
500 W. Boyd  
Norman, OK 73019-2071  
Cell: (785) 567-7849  
Email: [Elizabeth.G.Hagman-1@ou.edu](mailto:Elizabeth.G.Hagman-1@ou.edu)

Charles R. Ciorba, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor of Music Education  
University of Oklahoma  
School of Music  
500 W. Boyd, Rm 031  
Norman, OK 73019-2071  
Office: (405) 325-4146  
Email: [cciorba@ou.edu](mailto:cciorba@ou.edu)