

AN EXAMINATION OF THE TIME MANAGEMENT BEHAVIORS AND WORK-LIFE BALANCE
OF K-12 MUSIC EDUCATORS

Scott Bley

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate College of Bowling Green
State University in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF MUSIC

May 2015

Committee:

Elizabeth Menard, Advisor

Cole Burger

© 2015

Scott Bley

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Elizabeth Menard, Advisor

This research study was designed to assess the workload, time management, and work-life balance of K-12 music educators. Using a mixed methods approach, K-12 music educators in Ohio ($N = 347$) completed an online survey of job requirements and estimated time spent working outside the school day. A shortened version of the *Time Management Behavior Scale* (TMBS) was adapted for the survey to assess music educators' time management skills. Questions from the *Work-Life Balance Checklist* (WLBC) and the *Quality of Life Questionnaire* (QoLQ) were adapted to assess music educators' work-life balance. The survey data was analyzed statistically and Pearson product-moment correlations were used to identify relationships between demographic variables, time spent on work, time management skills, and work-life balance. Results showed a significant positive correlation between time spent on other job-related tasks outside the school day and scores on the TMBS ($p < 0.01$), suggesting that music educators develop time management skills in response to increased workload. A significant negative correlation was shown between workload and work-life balance ($p < 0.01$), indicating lower levels of work-life balance with increased time spent working outside the school day. No significant relationship was found between scores on the TMBS and work-life balance, although a significant negative correlation was shown between scores on the mechanics of time management (MTM) subscale of the TMBS and work-life balance. This correlation may reflect their relationships with workload (i.e. as workload increases, MTM increases and work-life balance decreases, resulting in the negative relationship between MTM and work-life balance). Engagement in MTM as an attempt to gain control of increased workload may also increase an

individual's awareness of the disparity between time devoted to work and non-work commitments. Participants also responded to open-ended questions and described their personal strategies for time management and work-life balance. A content analysis of open-ended responses revealed five time management strategies prevalent among music educators in the study: list, prioritize, organize, schedule, and delegate. Four high work-life balance themes emerged from a content of analysis of responses by participants with high levels of work-life balance: identify priorities, set boundaries, take care of yourself, and priorities change. Three low work-life balance themes emerged from a content analysis of responses by participants with low levels of work-life balance: misplaced priorities, resignation, and personal sacrifice. Results may provide a starting point toward addressing concerns of attrition among music educators, developing solutions to avoid burnout, and better preparing preservice teachers for the realities of teaching music.

Don't let making a living prevent you from making a life.

—John Wooden, *Wooden: A Lifetime of Observations and Reflections On and Off the Court*, 1997

For music teachers everywhere. Thank you for the sacrifices you make every day, known and unknown. Don't think that because some people don't notice what you do that it doesn't matter.

It does.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the help of music educators from across Ohio. On top of your already busy schedules, thank you for taking the time to complete the online survey and participate in this worthwhile study.

Throughout this study, I have benefitted greatly from the mentoring of Elizabeth Menard and comments received from Cole Burger. Thank you for your wisdom, insight, understanding, and timely review of my many drafts.

I am also grateful for the guidance I have received from my other professors during my time at Bowling Green State University: Bruce Moss, Carol Hayward, Ken Thompson, Vincent Kantorski, Lisa Gruenhagen, Mark Bunce, Benjamin Greene, and Savilla Banister. Thank you for teaching me. I am a better teacher, musician, and human being because of you.

Thank you to my music colleagues and mentors in Salina, Kansas, especially Gayle McMillen, Ben Rohrer, Lindsay Ladman-Modin, Amanda Smith, Ryan Holmquist, Susan Higbee, David Higbee, and Doug Talbott. During my student teaching and when I started out as a beginning teacher, you always had my back. The eight years I spent teaching in Salina are some of the fondest memories I have. They laid a foundation for my future as a music educator.

Finally, thank you to my mom and dad, who have always supported my music endeavors. I don't know where I would be without your love and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| Statement of the Problem..... | 3 |
| Need for the Study | 4 |
| Purpose of the Study | 5 |
| Guiding Questions | 5 |
| Definitions..... | 5 |
| CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE | 6 |
| Workload and Stress | 6 |
| General Education..... | 6 |
| Music Education | 7 |
| Time Management | 9 |
| General Education..... | 10 |
| Music Education | 10 |
| Work-Life Balance..... | 12 |
| Summary | 13 |
| CHAPTER III. PROCEDURES | 14 |
| Survey Design..... | 14 |
| Non-Work Environment | 14 |
| Work Environment..... | 14 |
| Time Management | 15 |
| Work-Life Balance..... | 16 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Open-Ended Questions | 16 |
| Data Collection | 17 |
| Pilot Survey..... | 17 |
| Selection of Participants | 17 |
| Survey Administration | 18 |
| Participant Demographics | 18 |
| Personal Demographics | 19 |
| Work Environment Demographics | 20 |
| Non-Work Environment Demographics | 21 |
| Analysis Procedures | 23 |
| Statistical Analysis..... | 23 |
| Content Analysis | 24 |
| CHAPTER IV. RESULTS..... | 25 |
| Time Spent on Work by Music Educators..... | 25 |
| The School Day..... | 25 |
| Duties outside the School Day | 26 |
| Time Spent Working outside the School Day..... | 26 |
| Perceptions of Time Spent on Work..... | 30 |
| Music Educators' Time Management Skills..... | 32 |
| Time Management Scores..... | 32 |
| Correlates of Time Management Scores..... | 34 |
| Work-Life Balance of Music Educators | 37 |
| Work-Life Balance Scores | 37 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Career Choice..... | 38 |
| Correlates of Work-Life Balance..... | 40 |
| The Relationship between Time Management and Work-Life Balance..... | 43 |
| Strategies for Time Management and Work-Life Balance | 44 |
| Time Management Strategies | 44 |
| Work-Life Balance Strategies..... | 45 |
| Coding of Work-Life Balance Responses..... | 46 |
| CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION..... | 49 |
| Conclusions..... | 49 |
| Time Spent on Work by Music Educators | 49 |
| Time Spent Working outside the School Day..... | 50 |
| Required Duties | 50 |
| Other Job-Related Tasks | 51 |
| Music Educators' Time Management Skills..... | 52 |
| Correlates of Time Management | 53 |
| Work-Life Balance of Music Educators | 54 |
| Correlates of Work-Life Balance..... | 55 |
| The Relationships between Time Management and Work-Life Balance | 56 |
| Strategies for Time Management and Work-Life Balance | 57 |
| Time Management Strategies | 57 |
| Work-Life Balance Strategies..... | 59 |
| Identify Your Priorities | 59 |
| Misplaced Priorities | 60 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Set Boundaries | 62 |
| Resignation | 63 |
| Take Care of Yourself..... | 66 |
| Personal Sacrifice..... | 67 |
| Priorities Change..... | 68 |
| Limitations of the Study..... | 72 |
| Suggestions for Future Research | 73 |
| Implications for Music Education..... | 75 |
| REFERENCES | 78 |
| APPENDIX A. IMPLIED INFORMED CONSENT FORM | 83 |
| APPENDIX B. SURVEY OF THE TIME MANAGEMENT BEHAVIORS AND WORK-LIFE BALANCE OF K-12 MUSIC EDUCATORS..... | 85 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| 3.1 Personal Demographics | 20 |
| 3.2 Work Environment Demographics | 21 |
| 3.3 Non-Work Environment Demographics | 22 |
| 3.4 Number and Age of Children..... | 23 |
| 4.1 Time during the Contract Day | 25 |
| 4.2 Required Duties outside the School Day | 26 |
| 4.3 Time Spent Working outside the School Day..... | 27 |
| 4.4 Descriptive Statistics of Time Spent on Work..... | 28 |
| 4.5 Personal Demographics for Time Spent on Work | 29 |
| 4.6 Work Demographics for Time Spent on Work..... | 30 |
| 4.7 Perceptions of Time Spent on Work..... | 31 |
| 4.8 TMBS Reliability..... | 32 |
| 4.9 TMBS Scores | 33 |
| 4.10 Descriptive Statistics of TMBS Scores..... | 34 |
| 4.11 “I need to find ways to complete my job-related tasks more efficiently” | 34 |
| 4.12 Correlates of Time Management | 36 |
| 4.13 Work-Life Balance Section Reliability..... | 37 |
| 4.14 Work-Life Balance Scores | 38 |
| 4.15 Descriptive Statistics of Work-Life Balance Scores..... | 38 |
| 4.16 “I am thinking about changing my career choice” | 38 |
| 4.17 Personal Demographics for Work-Life Balance Scores | 39 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 4.18 Family Demographics for Work-Life Balance Scores..... | 40 |
| 4.19 Correlates of Work-Life Balance Scores | 42 |
| 4.20 Additional Correlates of Work-Life Balance Scores | 43 |
| 4.21 The Relationship between Time Management and Work-Life Balance..... | 44 |
| 4.22 Text Analysis of Time Management Strategies Use by Music Educators..... | 45 |
| 4.23 High Work-Life Balance Themes for Music Educators | 47 |
| 4.24 Low Work-Life Balance Themes for Music Educators..... | 48 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AWOFAbsence of Work Overload / Free Time

MTMMechanics of Time Management

PCTPerceived Control of Time

POPreference for Organization

QoLQ*Quality of Life Questionnaire*

SGPSetting of Goals and Priorities

TMBS.....*Time Management Behavior Scale*

WLBC*Work-Life Balance Checklist*

PREFACE

Have you ever stopped and asked yourself, “What am I doing with my life?” Maybe you used different words like, “Why am I doing this?” or “Why am I not happy?” or “What happened and how did I get here?” During my eighth year of teaching band, I asked myself similar questions. I felt like I was missing something in my life, but I couldn’t quite put my finger on what it was.

I remember starting out my teaching career and working until 8 or 9 every night. It was so exciting and new. I loved every minute. I didn’t think anything of it. I remember my mentor, Gayle McMillen, checking up on me after my first year, concerned that I might be getting burnt out. But I assured him I was fine. I had so much energy. I could live off that. And I did. At least for a few years.

Then I started wondering why the hours weren’t getting any less. Maybe I needed to be more organized and more efficient with my time. So I read about systems, organization, and time management. I made changes. I became more efficient and productive. But the hours stayed. I was getting more done, but putting in the same amount of time.

I remember talks with another colleague, Lindsay Ladman-Modin, with whom I shared an office. She also had a habit of working late. Then she got married. And she spent less time at school. My other two colleagues, Ben Rohrer and Amanda Smith, were also married and spent less time at school than I did. What were they doing that I wasn’t? Something wasn’t right, but I didn’t know what it was.

Then I read a book that changed my life. The book was called *The Five Secrets You Must Discover Before You Die*. The author, John Izzo, and his team of researchers interviewed several hundred people over the age of 60 whom others considered to be wise and happy. They

identified five themes that they all seemed to have in common that contributed to their happiness. When I started viewing my life through the eyes of those wise and happy older people, I started making changes in my life. I joined the military. I started dating again. I pursued my dream of composing music.

I am still in the military. I am still single. And I am not a famous composer. But I'm okay with that. In fact, through a series of interesting events, I ended up in graduate school for music education. I've decided that teaching students about music is indeed what I want to do with the rest of my life. I love working with young people and exposing them to the power of music. But I also know that I have other goals in life. And I need to focus on them more. Because I'm running out of time. In fact, we're all running out of time.

Have you heard the story about the bank account where you get 86,400 pennies deposited every day? The catch is, you cannot carry any remaining balance to the next day. At the end of the day, whatever amount is left gets wiped off the books. You have to spend every penny every day or you lose it. The story is a metaphor for time. Each penny represents one second. Each day you choose how you spend your time. I believe that time is a resource like money. And just like money, we decide how we spend our time. But the difference is, you cannot save time. You cannot put it in a jar and spend it "someday" in the future.

Time is finite. It is not limitless. If you spend too much time on one thing, you have less time for other things. You may think you have all the time in the world, but you are only borrowing against the future. Eventually you may have to lose sleep. Or your daily workout. Maybe skip a meal. Your health isn't a concern. Yet. Maybe you put off time with your family to address the current crisis at work. You'll get to it "someday." But somehow, "someday" never arrives. One day you might wake up and discover that you lost your opportunity. To be with the

person you love. To spend time with your kids. To volunteer for a cause that is dear to your heart. You missed your chance. But you can't do it over. You can't do *life* over. There are no second chances at *life*.

After eight years of teaching band, I had to ask myself if I agreed with how I was spending my time. It's not an easy question when you've spent so much of your life and money working toward a career and then when you have it you question if it's worth your time. It doesn't seem right. It feels downright wrong and maybe even sacrilegious to question your livelihood. It's your identity. Or is it?

I believe that life is more than your livelihood. And your identity is more than your job. And you shouldn't have to sacrifice your life for your job, even if it is the best job in the world. You shouldn't have to miss out on watching your children growing up. You should be able to pursue other enjoyable activities, date your significant other, go to the gym, and maintain a healthy, balanced lifestyle.

So, when it came time to decide on a thesis topic, what I really wanted to know was, how can I still have a life and teach music full-time? How can I make time for a future spouse and children? How can I make time for little league games or gymnastics meets with my kids? How can I maintain an active, healthy lifestyle? How can I make sure that when I look back on my life, I have no regrets about how I spent my time?

The real paradox of the whole situation was attempting to maintain my work-life balance while writing a thesis on work-life balance. I don't know that I've found the answer to balancing work and life as a music teacher. And perhaps that's the most important thing I've learned during this process. Some of the most important questions don't have clear cut answers.

And sometimes, not knowing the answer is okay. But still, asking the right questions at least helps set us on a course where we can learn and grow.

During this research study I have learned that it is possible to be a committed, devoted teacher and still have a life. Many of the music educators in this study have excellent levels of work-life balance. They didn't choose between teaching music and having a life. They found a way to do both. Whether you agree with my conclusions or not, I hope that this study inspires you to reflect on how you are spending your time. What really matters to you?

Your work?

Your students?

Your education?

Your family and friends?

Your church?

Your health?

Your hobbies and other activities?

Only you can answer those questions for yourself. Only you can decide whether you are spending your time on what really matters to you at this point in your life. It's not too late to make some adjustments. It's not too late to change course. You only get one chance. When your older self looks back on how you spent your time, will you be pleased with the choices you made?

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

It is not uncommon for teachers to work beyond their contractual obligations in the evenings, on the weekends, and during the summer in order to accomplish their teaching duties (Wolf, 2002). For many, the intrinsic rewards for teachers come at the cost of high personal commitment (LeRoux & Van Niekerk, 2009). The demands on their time, among other work-related issues, have been shown to be the source of the highest areas of stress for teachers (Hasty, 2007).

For music educators, the time commitments may be even more demanding depending on a variety of factors: the size of the music department, the size of the district, the number of students in the music program, the number of classes assigned, and the number of performances in the evenings and on the weekends, for example. An excessive workload, sometimes referred to as role overload, has been cited for concerns among music teachers (Scheib, 2002). Role overload and other role-related tension can lead to teacher burnout when the quantity of work due to class size or other demands does not reconcile with the time given to complete the work (Scheib, 2007). In addition to increased stress, an excessive workload can contribute to decreased job satisfaction among public school band directors (Heston, 1996).

Overall stress levels have been found to be indicators of intentions to leave the teaching profession (Hasty, 2007). For some band directors, a heavy workload and increased class sizes have been cited as reasons for planning to leave their current position or the teaching profession entirely (Scheib, 2004). According to reports, the rate of attrition for music teachers is similar to nonmusic teachers resulting in a loss of approximately 16% of the teacher population annually (Hancock, 2009).

A reduction in non-instructional duties and an increase in planning time could improve job satisfaction, quality of instruction, and potentially lead to a decrease in attrition among teachers (Wolf, 2002). Some policy makers are opposed to increasing planning time because it would require additional classes, more teachers, and an increase in the cost of education. They may see planning time as wasteful because it does not involve face-to-face time instructing students. In fact, one study showed that teachers use their planning time for a variety of tasks in addition to lesson planning, indicating that if not used for lesson planning, increased planning time would not necessarily improve instruction (Nantz, 1993).

Successful music teachers have been shown to have excellent time management skills (Miksza, 2010; Teachout, 1997). They are able to accomplish their many job duties, including planning for instruction. Because a positive relationship has been shown between quality lesson planning and quality instruction (Dorovolomo, 2010), it could be inferred that part of the reason for this quality instruction may be attributed to the ability to manage one's time effectively. For band directors in particular, good time management skills have also shown a significant relationship to job satisfaction (Howard, 2006).

This research study was designed to assess the workload, time management, and work-life balance of music educators. K-12 music educators in Ohio were surveyed to determine how much time they spent completing their job requirements and to assess their time management skills and work-life balance. The results of the survey were analyzed to determine if a relationship exists between time spent on work and time management skills. Understanding the relationship between time management skills and time spent at work may provide support for the effectiveness of time management training as a way to decrease time spent at work. The results of the survey were also used to determine if a relationship exists between work-life balance and

either time spent at work or time management skills. This study may provide insight into the workload, time management skills, and work-life balance of music educators. Results of this study could provide music educators with strategies to foster a healthy work-life balance and longevity in the profession.

Statement of the Problem

Time management has been identified as an area of high stress for preservice teachers (Abebe, 2011), many of whom may not be adequately prepared to deal with the commitment and time involved in teaching music (Campbell & Thompson, 2007). Experienced music teachers have displayed reduced levels of stress by developing coping mechanisms or better time management strategies (Hedden, 2005). Beginning music teachers, on the other hand, are at an increased risk for attrition than their more experienced counterparts (McClain, 2005; Hancock, 2008; Thomas & Kiley, 1994 in Wolf, 2002), leaving the profession before they develop proper time management skills or coping mechanisms to deal with the heavy workload and stress involved in teaching music.

Without an increase in planning time to address the excessive time demands of teaching music, improving the time management skills of music educators may be the next best strategy for increasing job satisfaction, improving instructional quality, reducing stress, and increasing retention in the field. Some have suggested providing time management skills training to preservice teachers to prepare them for the demands of teaching (Abebe & HaileMariam, 2011). Time management skills and cutting back on overtime or excessive working hours have been suggested for all music teachers as a means to cope with job-related stress (LeRoux, 2009). Band directors specifically could benefit from time management strategies to assist in coping with the workload associated with leading a band program (Heston, 1996).

Need for the Study

Time management and work-life balance have been studied in the social sciences and analyzed among members of other professions outside of music education. Nonis et al. (2011) studied time management among salespeople and determined that better time management behaviors may improve job performance. Work-life balance has been studied among post-secondary students enrolled in a virtual school. They found significant gender differences in the area of “Absence of excessive workload / Free time” showing that men were less overwhelmed with work and had a better quality of life (Boixados et al., 2012). Time management has been identified as an area that would benefit music educators in coping with the workload associated with leading a music program (Heston, 2006).

There is a need for further study into how music educators manage their time and maintain a positive work-life balance. How many hours outside the school day do music educators spend on school-related work? Do experienced music educators have better time management skills? Do music educators struggle with balancing work and non-work commitments? Do music educators with better time management skills have better work-life balance? What is the relationship between time management behaviors and work-life balance? What strategies do music educators use to complete their job requirements and still maintain a positive work-life balance? Identifying the time management practices and work-life balance strategies of experienced music educators may provide beneficial information for preservice and beginning music educators as a strategy to reduce stress levels, increase job satisfaction, and improve the quality of instruction.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the time management behaviors and work-life balance of K-12 music educators.

Guiding Questions

1. How much time do music educators spend doing their jobs?
2. How do music educators score on measures of time management?
3. How do music educators score on measures of work-life balance?
4. Is there a relationship between time management and work-life balance for music educators?
5. What strategies do music educators use to complete their job requirements and maintain a positive work-life balance?

Definitions

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions will be used:

- time management: “behaviors that aim at achieving an effective use of time while performing certain goal-directed activities” (Claessens et al., 2007).
- work-life balance: “an employee’s perception that multiple domains of personal time, family care, and work are maintained and integrated with a minimum of role conflict” (Delina & Raya, 2013).
- quality of life: “concern for the subject’s experience of their social life, their everyday activity and their own health” (Boixados et al., 2009).

CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Job satisfaction of teachers in many fields may be influenced by issues such as work overload, time management, and work-life balance. Research in the areas of work overload, burnout, and attrition has suggested time management training as a possible solution for music educators to deal with the heavy workload involved in teaching music. Fewer studies have been conducted in the profession that measure time management skills or work-life balance for music educators. An understanding of how to cope with these issues may be key to longevity in the music education profession.

Workload and Stress

A review of research revealed studies involving educators which focused on workload or other stressors in teaching. A heavy workload has been identified as one of the main reasons for teacher attrition, migration, and burnout (Wolf, 2002; Ingersoll, 2002; Abebe & HaileMariam, 2011; Heston et al., 1996; Scheib, 2003; Scheib, 2004; McLain, 2005; Scheib, 2007; Campbell & Thompson, 2007; Hancock, 2008; Le Roux & Van Niekerk, 2009).

General Education. Wolf (2002) surveyed 92 teachers in one school district to determine the amount of time required to complete job tasks and its relationship to job satisfaction. In addition to surveys, participants also completed a seven-day log of job-related activities, rated job tasks by degree to which they support teaching, and answered questions related to job satisfaction and their perceptions of teaching. Results indicated that teachers worked about 57 hours per week, which included working at home and on the weekend, planning lessons, grading, and other administrative duties. Teachers overwhelmingly agreed that their time is valuable and that by reducing non-instructional duties and increasing planning time that their job satisfaction and teacher effectiveness would improve.

Ingersoll (2002) examined teacher turnover using data from the *Schools and Staffing Survey* (SASS) and the *Teacher Follow-up Survey* (TFS). Results indicated that 39% of teachers leave the profession within the first five years of teaching. Personal reasons, including health concerns, pregnancy, or family needs, accounted for 39% of the turnover reported in schools. Working conditions and organizational conditions contributed to the highest sources of turnover (59%) due to job dissatisfaction or to pursue another career. Lack of planning time and large class sizes were cited among the reasons for job dissatisfaction. Given the higher turnover rate among beginning teachers, Ingersoll suggested increasing administrative support for new teachers through mentoring or providing classroom supplies.

Music Education. Heston et al. (1996) surveyed 120 public school band directors in one Midwestern state to determine variables related to job satisfaction and stress, as well as coping mechanisms for dealing with job-related stress. Using a 5-point Likert scale, respondents rated 10 areas of job satisfaction and 10 potential stressors. The highest rated stressors were in the areas of student attitude, student behavior, and workload. These researchers suggested time management training as a potential solution for coping with the workload associated with teaching band.

Scheib (2003) conducted a collective case study with four members of one high school music department to determine their roles, expectations, and responsibilities; and the tension created when these conflict, dissatisfy, overwhelm, or are unclear. Results indicated that role overload was one of the causes of stress for the participants. In 2004, Scheib used email surveys to interview eight teachers who indicated that they were planning to leave their current position or the profession entirely at the end of the school year. Respondents cited workload and other working conditions among the major reasons for their decision. In 2007, Scheib conducted a

literature review of role-related tension and job satisfaction for school personnel. Role-related tension can lead to teacher burnout when the quantity of work, due to class size or other demands, does not align with the time given to complete work (role overload), when the job requirements are not clear (role ambiguity), when there are not enough resources to accomplish the job (resource inadequacy), or when teachers feel that they are not being used to their fullest (underutilization of skills). The review included a number of studies in the area of music education that have illustrated the many role-related stressors inherent in the profession.

McLain (2005) surveyed 514 music educators using the *Maslach Burnout Inventory ES* (MBI-ES) to determine the relationship between burnout and environmental support. The MBI-ES uses 22 questions to assess burnout in three areas: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. Participants also responded to additional questions related to environmental factors in their working environment. Results indicated a significant relationship between emotional exhaustion and 11 of the environmental factors, including hours of preparation ($p < 0.0328$) among others.

Campbell and Thompson (2007) developed and piloted a Teacher Concerns Checklist to measure concerns related to self, task, and impact. They surveyed 1,121 pre-service music education teachers from 16 higher education institutions in the United States. The highest task concerns included not having enough time to rest and prepare for class, not having enough time to plan, and having too many administrative tasks. The relatively moderate ratings suggested an unrealistically optimistic view of skills and abilities among preservice music educators.

In 2008, Hancock examined the 1999-2000 Schools and Staffing Survey to assess retention, attrition, and migration among music teachers. The survey yielded 1,931 respondents who identified themselves as music teachers. The dependent variable was low or high teacher

attrition/migration as determined by responses to survey questions; multiple independent variables were derived from other questions on the survey. Results placed “extracurricular hours” among the many significant factors contributing to attrition or migration of music educators.

Le Roux and Van Niekerk (2009) reported on music teacher burnout, reviewed areas of stress, and identified coping methods for dealing with stress. Factors contributing to stress included lack of recognition by administration, unclear goals, too much work, emotional exhaustion, and reduced personal accomplishment. Learning effective time management and cutting back on overtime or excessive working hours were identified among the 13 suggestions for music teachers to cope with job-related stress.

Many studies in the areas of work overload, teacher burnout and stress cited teacher concerns of having too much work and not enough time to complete it. The vast amount of research in this area has concluded that music educators face many obstacles to longevity in the profession.

Time Management

Time management has been defined and measured in a variety of ways. After reviewing many definitions from the literature, Claessens et al. (2007) defined time management as “behaviors that aim at achieving an effective use of time while performing certain goal-directed activities.” In addition, they reviewed the psychometric properties of a variety of survey tools used to measure time management and determined that the *Time Management Behavior Scale* (TMBS) developed by Macan et al. (1994) provided the most reasonably sound measure based on a process model of time management.

General Education. Several studies in the field of education have suggested time management training as a solution for the high workload involved in teaching (Hasty, 2007; Abebe & HaileMariam, 2011; Hedden, 2005; Howard, 2006). Fewer studies in education have measured the time management skills of the participants (Woolfolk & Woolfolk, 1986; Peeters & Rutte, 2005).

Hasty (2007) analyzed the relationship between teacher stress levels and their intentions to leave their jobs. He surveyed 616 Nebraska teachers using Fimian's (1988) *Teacher Stress Inventory*. Respondents also indicated their intentions to leave their current position in the next year, three years, and five years. The highest areas of stress for teachers were in the areas of time management and work-related stressors though no specific stressors were related to intentions to leave the profession. Overall stress levels were found to be indicators of intentions to leave the profession.

Abebe and HaileMariam (2011) surveyed 42 preservice teachers and 40 cooperating teachers using the *Rating Pre-service Teacher Events for Stress* questionnaire to determine areas of stress for teachers and potential remedies. Participants agreed that the highest areas of stress for teachers were student discipline, time management, unmotivated students and preparing for lectures. Potential remedies varied among the respondents. Researchers suggested increasing support from behavior professionals and providing time management skills training for teachers.

Music Education. Hedden (2005) surveyed 96 music teachers regarding their sources of stress in 1996 and again in 2003 to measure any change in stress level over time and to determine if relationships exist between gender or location (urban vs. nonurban) and stress levels. Using Fimian's (1998) *Teacher Concerns Inventory* (TCI), respondents rated 49 potential stressors which yielded composite scores in 10 areas. Significant areas of decreased stress occurred after

the seven years in the areas of time management, work-related stressors, professional distress, and discipline, and motivation. The music teachers in the study demonstrated professional longevity and an ability to adjust and cope with job-related stress.

In 2006, Howard surveyed 214 instrumental music educators in Oklahoma to assess job satisfaction and resilience in the profession. Using an online survey, respondents rated statements related to career satisfaction and resilience using a 4-point Likert scale. Results indicated seven variables that were significantly related to job satisfaction: pre-service training, time management skills, budget, choosing teaching again as a profession, salary, colleague and peer support. Though other research has noted the importance of time management skills in fostering positive job satisfaction, the majority of Oklahoma band directors indicated that they had effective time management skills.

Though identified as a potential solution for music educators to cope with work overload and burnout, defining time management and measuring the time management skills of participants have been missing from the related music education literature. Claessens et al. (2007) conducted a review of time management literature between 1954 and 2005. Of the 35 empirical studies identified, most used student samples or adult samples outside of education. Two studies specifically mention teachers. In one study from 1986, Woolfolk and Woolfolk studied 81 beginning teachers using a combination of experiment, survey, and intervention to determine tasks that need to be finished (with different deadlines and measurement of meeting deadlines). In another study from 2005, Peeters and Rutte surveyed 123 elementary teachers using a shortened version of the TMBS to measure burnout, emotional exhaustion, and personal accomplishment. Results indicated that time management significantly compensates for a lack of autonomy in both low and high work demands situations.

Work-Life Balance

Research in the area of work-life balance is limited. Delina and Raya (2013) defined work-life balance as “an employee’s perception that multiple domains of personal time, family care, and work are maintained and integrated with a minimum of role conflict.” Two tools have been identified in the literature for measuring work-life balance: the *Quality of Life Questionnaire* (QoLQ; Boixadós et al., 2009) and the *Checklist Manual on Work-Life Balance* developed by Daniels and McCarraher (Delina & Raya, 2013). Both of these tools have been studied and shown to have reliable psychometric properties.

Many studies involving educators and music educators study burnout and the effects of a heavy workload on stress, but do not take into account the effects of a heavy workload on non-work commitments. The *Encyclopedia of Social Problems* reframes burnout from another perspective: “Individuals who are unable to balance their work and non-work commitments are more likely to experience job burnout” (Parrillo, 2008). In essence, job burnout may be more likely for individuals who are unable to find a positive work-life balance, and not necessarily from a heavy workload.

A review of literature revealed no studies that measured work-life balance for educators. In one study of educators, the importance of family was cited as a reason for leaving the profession (Kersaint et al., 2007). A group of researchers used Ajzen’s Theory of Planned Behavior as the framework for analyzing retention and resignation among teachers. 901 leavers and 898 stayers from one Florida school district responded to statements using a Likert scale and indicated the extent to which it factored into their decision to leave or stay. Results indicated that time with family was considered high importance for leavers and low for stayers.

Summary

Current research exists in the areas of attrition, burnout, and role overload for music educators. Whether referred to as role overload, work overload, or a lack of time available to complete work, researchers agree that many teachers have more responsibilities than they have time available to complete them. Researchers also frequently identify the heavy time demands as one of the main causes of teacher attrition, migration, and burnout (Wolf, 2002; Ingersoll, 2002; Abebe & HaileMariam, 2011; Heston et al., 1996; Scheib, 2003; Scheib, 2004; McLain, 2005; Scheib, 2007; Campbell & Thompson, 2007; Hancock, 2008; Le Roux & Van Niekerk, 2009).

This study was conducted to add to the scant research available and to increase our understanding in the areas of time management and work-life balance for music educators. Many researchers suggest that time management training could provide an effective coping mechanism for music educators with a heavy workload (Hasty, 2007; Abebe & HaileMariam, 2011; Hedden, 2005). Yet, one study of Oklahoma instrumental teachers (Howard, 2006) revealed that band directors already possess effective time management skills; however, that study measured time management skills with one statement that asked the participants to rate their time management skills – it did not measure the time management behaviors of participants. In the few studies involving time management and educators, only one used a tool specifically designed to measure the time management behaviors of participants (Peeters & Rutte, 2005). Little research has been conducted in the area of work-life balance for educators. Studying work-life balance among music educators may provide additional insight into improving their working conditions and ultimately, their quality of life.

CHAPTER III. PROCEDURES

For the purposes of this study, I used a survey design approach to gather the necessary data. Driscoll (2011) recommends using a survey when attempting to learn about a “general trend in people’s opinions, experiences, and behavior.” This chapter describes (a) the design of the survey, (b) the selection of the participants, (c) the administration of the survey, (d) the participant demographics, and (e) the analysis procedures.

Survey Design

I based the design of the survey on previous surveys involving music educators as well as research outside of the field of music education in the areas of time management and work-life balance (Howard, 2006; Hedden, 2005; Hancock, 2008; Macan et al., 1990; Macan, 1994; Mudrack, 1997; Daniels & McCarraher, 2000; Dex & Bond, 2005; Ruiz & Baca, 1999; Boixadós et al., 2009). The final survey consisted of demographic questions, questions about a participant’s job requirements, a series of statements related to time management and work-life balance using a 5-point Likert style rating scale, and two open-ended questions.

Non-Work Environment. Section one included demographic questions that were designed to provide information about the participants as well as insight into factors possibly contributing to their time management behaviors and work-life balance. Participants provided information regarding gender, age, experience, and education. Information regarding family life was another important area surveyed, specifically current relationship status, a spouse’s employment status, and number and age of children.

Work Environment. Section two involved questions related to a participant’s teaching position: public or private school setting, classes taught, salaried or hourly, benefits, length of the contract day, weekly planning time, required duties outside the school day, estimated time to

complete required duties, and estimated time to complete other job-related tasks outside the school day. To assist participants with accurate reporting of estimated times, specific instructions were included in each question. The length of the contracted school day was to be calculated “from the time you are required to arrive until the time you are allowed to leave at the end of the day.” Planning time was defined as “non-instructional time during the school day that you are given to prepare for classes.” Participants were specifically asked not to include time spent eating, traveling, or in meetings. Time spent outside the school day on job responsibilities was reported in two separate areas: time spent completing duties that are required of one’s position (e.g. marching band, show choir, jazz band, musical) and time spent completing other job-related tasks (e.g. administrative tasks, grading, lesson preparation). Six additional statements were included that asked participants to respond using a 5-point Likert scale regarding their efficiency at work, their workload compared to others, their compensation, and their career choice.

Time Management. For section three, I adapted the *Time Management Behavior Scale* (TMBS) developed by Macan et al. (1990). Claessens et al. (2007) compared the reliability and construct validity of the most common survey instruments used in time management research and found the most support for the TMBS, providing support for its use in this study. The TMBS includes four subscales based on four dimensions of time management: mechanics of time management (MTM), setting goals and priorities (SGP), preference for organization (PO), and perceived control of time (PCT). In a subsequent study using the TMBS, Macan (1994) found support suggesting that PCT was an outcome of time management behaviors, and not a time management behavior itself. The PCT subscale, therefore, was removed from the current study. Additionally, Mudrack (1994) showed that a shortened version of the TMBS could be used while

still maintaining the validity and reliability of the results. For the present study, I used 15 questions suggested by Mudrack in the dimensions of MTM, SGP, and PO.

Work-Life Balance. For section four, I adapted material from two survey instruments: the *Work-Life Balance Checklist* (WLBC; Daniels & McCarraher, 2000) and the *Quality of Life Questionnaire* (QoLQ; Ruiz & Baca, 1999). The WLBC consists of 10 statements to which individuals respond using a 3-point Likert scale. The WLBC has been shown to have acceptable reliability (Delina & Raya, 2013). Dex and Bond (2005) found that three of the statements from the WLBC could only be responded to meaningfully by people in relationships. The remaining seven statements were used in the present study. Delina and Raya (2013) included five more yes/no statements in their study of women to provide additional clarity for their results. Three of those statements were adapted for music educators in the current study. Ruiz and Baca (1993) developed the QoLQ to measure health-related perceived quality of life. A factor analysis of the QoLQ resulted in four factors: social support, general satisfaction, physical/psychological well-being, and absence of work overload/free time (AWOF). The QoLQ has been shown to have acceptable reliability (Boixados et al., 2009). The seven questions from the AWOF subscale were reworded as statements and used in the present study. In total, 17 statements were included in the work-life balance section of the current survey.

Open-Ended Questions. Section five of the survey included two open-ended questions designed to provide insight into the strategies used by participants to complete their job requirements while still maintaining a positive work-life balance. Responses to these questions provided qualitative data, which informed the statistical analysis derived from the previous sections of the survey.

To increase survey participation, anonymity of respondents and time to complete the survey were important considerations. Care was taken to craft questions in a way that would not deter prospective participants from taking part in the study or from finishing the survey. Participation was completely anonymous and individuals were not asked overly personal or uniquely identifying information. Participants had the choice of not responding to certain questions if they preferred. Additionally, time to complete the survey was kept under 20 minutes. This study was submitted to the BGSU Human Subjects Review Board for review and was granted “exempt” status .

Data Collection. I chose SurveyMonkey (www.surveymonkey.com) as the mechanism for delivering the survey because it provided the ability to use skip logic for certain question as well as randomization of statements in the time management and work-life balance sections in order to remove question-order bias. SurveyMonkey also maintained the anonymity of responses while also ensuring that participants only completed the survey one time.

Pilot Survey. I sent a pilot survey to music colleagues at the postsecondary level to test the design of the survey and to ensure that it could be completed in 20 minutes or less. Following the pilot survey, some of the questions from the WLBC were reworded to make them sound less British and more American. I added a question to the beginning of the survey to qualify each participant as a person “currently employed as a music educator at the elementary, middle school, or high school level.” A copy of the final survey that was used in the study is included in Appendix B.

Selection of Participants

Using an Ohio Music Educators Association (OMEA) membership list, I removed any individuals who indicated they taught in higher education or at the preK level and selected those

participants who indicated they taught only at the elementary, middle school, or high school levels. Within this list, I further removed individuals with email extensions that indicated post-secondary affiliations. This process yielded a pool of 2,336 band, choir, orchestra, and general music educators. These individuals were sent an email invitation to participate in the study and self-selected to participate by clicking on a link to the electronic consent form and survey. No written consent was obtained as completion and return of the survey indicated that the subject had read the electronic consent form and consented to take part in the survey. A copy of the electronic consent form is included in Appendix A. Subject participation in the survey was anonymous. The survey did not ask for anyone's name or any other unique identifying information.

Survey Administration

The timing of the survey was critical to achieve a high response rate without being overlooked due to the high demands often placed on music educators at the beginning or end of the semester. The initial email, which included a link to the electronic consent form and survey, was sent in early November to 2,336 potential participants. Thanksgiving and end-of-semester holiday concerts were at least a month away. A follow-up reminder email was sent two weeks later to individuals who had not yet responded to the survey. The survey remained open to participants for four weeks.

Participant Demographics

Of the 2,336 email invitations sent out, a total of 400 individuals completed the online survey resulting in a 17% response rate. Two individuals indicated that they were no longer employed as a music educator at the elementary, middle school, or high school level and were disqualified from completing the survey. Additionally, because the major areas of focus in this

study were time management and work-life balance, individuals who did not complete the time management section ($n = 39$), and individuals who did not complete the work-life balance section ($n = 12$) were removed from the survey, leaving 347 total surveys which were used in the final analysis ($N = 347$).

Personal Demographics. Table 3.1 shows the number of participants by gender, age, level of education, and years of experience. The majority (61%) of participants were female. About half of the participants (48%) were younger than 40 and about half (52%) were older than 40. Seventy four percent of participants reported having at least a master's degree. The range of experience extended from two participants in their first year of teaching to two individuals who reported more than 40 years of experience in music education. The majority of participants (74%) were experienced music educators with more than 10 years in the profession.

Table 3.1
Personal Demographics

| Demographic | <i>n</i> | % |
|------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Gender | | |
| Female | 209 | 60.58 |
| Male | 136 | 39.42 |
| Total number reporting | 345 | |
| Age | | |
| 21-30 | 41 | 11.88 |
| 31-40 | 124 | 35.94 |
| 41-50 | 90 | 26.09 |
| 51-60 | 83 | 24.06 |
| 60+ | 7 | 2.03 |
| Total number reporting | 345 | |
| Education | | |
| Bachelors | 14 | 4.03 |
| Bachelors + | 75 | 21.61 |
| Masters | 97 | 27.95 |
| Masters + | 158 | 45.53 |
| Doctorate | 3 | 0.86 |
| Total number reporting | 347 | |
| Years of Teaching Experience | | |
| 0-5 years | 16 | 5.56 |
| 6-10 years | 56 | 19.44 |
| 11-20 years | 110 | 38.19 |
| 21-30 years | 85 | 29.51 |
| More than 30 years | 21 | 7.29 |
| Total number reporting | 288 | |

Work Environment Demographics. Table 3.2 shows the number of participants by school setting, grade level(s) taught, and subject area(s) taught. Twenty-seven individuals (8%) indicated they taught primarily in a private school. Thirty-one percent of music educators reported only teaching at one grade level. Many participants taught in a combination of grade levels and subject areas. Sixty percent (209) of participants indicated teaching only one of four main areas of music education. One hundred and nineteen participants reported teaching in two areas (34%) and 19 participants (5%) reported teaching in three or more areas.

Table 3.2
Work Environment Demographics

| Demographic | <i>n</i> | % |
|-------------------|----------|-------|
| School Setting | | |
| Other | 3 | 0.87 |
| Private School | 27 | 7.80 |
| Public School | 316 | 91.33 |
| Grade Level(s)* | | |
| E | 45 | 12.97 |
| M | 22 | 6.34 |
| H | 40 | 11.53 |
| EM | 28 | 8.07 |
| EH | 10 | 2.88 |
| MH | 104 | 29.97 |
| EMH | 98 | 28.24 |
| Subject Area(s)** | | |
| BAND | 90 | 25.94 |
| ORCH | 31 | 8.93 |
| CHOIR | 48 | 13.83 |
| GM | 40 | 11.53 |
| BAND/ORCH | 11 | 3.17 |
| BAND/CHOIR | 18 | 5.19 |
| BAND/GM | 53 | 15.27 |
| ORCH/GM | 1 | 0.29 |
| CHOIR/GM | 36 | 10.37 |
| COMB3 | 18 | 5.19 |
| COMB4 | 1 | 0.29 |

Note. * E = Elementary, M = Middle School, H = High School

** ORCH = Orchestra, GM = General Music, COMB3 = Combination of 3 Subjects, COMB4 = Combination of 4 Subjects

Non-Work Environment Demographics. Table 3.3 shows the number of participants by relationship status, work status of significant other, and whether they have children. The vast majority of participants (77%) indicated being married. An additional 18 participants (5%) reported being in a domestic partnership, civil union, or cohabiting with a significant other. As a combined subgroup, 82% of respondents indicated having a significant other in their lives. Of the individuals with a significant other, 25 participants (9%) indicated that their spouse does not work. The majority of participants (68%) reported having children.

Table 3.3
Non-Work Environment Demographics

| Demographic | <i>n</i> | % |
|--|----------|-------|
| Relationship Status | 267 | 77.17 |
| Married | 9 | 2.60 |
| In a domestic partnership or civil union | 9 | 2.60 |
| Single, but cohabiting with a significant other | 35 | 10.12 |
| Single, never married | 20 | 5.78 |
| Divorced | 4 | 1.16 |
| Widowed | 2 | 0.58 |
| Separated | | |
| Does your spouse or significant other work or not? | | |
| No, he or she does not | 25 | 8.80 |
| Yes, he or she does | 259 | 91.20 |
| Children | | |
| No | 110 | 31.70 |
| Yes | 237 | 68.30 |

Table 3.4 shows the number and age of children for the 237 participants with children. Seventy percent of participants reported having at least one child under the age of 18, and 45% reported having at least one child 18 years of age or older. One hundred and thirty individuals (55%) reported having only young children and 70 individuals (30%) reported having only older children, with the remaining 37 participants (26%) having some combination of older and younger children.

Table 3.4
Number and Age of Children

| Children under 18 | Children 18 or older | Total Children | <i>n</i> | % |
|-------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------|-------|
| 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1.69 |
| 3 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 9.70 |
| 2 | 0 | 2 | 65 | 27.43 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 38 | 16.03 |
| 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1.27 |
| 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1.27 |
| 3 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 0.42 |
| 2 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 2.95 |
| 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 0.42 |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 6.75 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1.69 |
| 1 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 0.84 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 8.44 |
| 0 | 2 | 2 | 26 | 10.97 |
| 0 | 3 | 3 | 17 | 7.17 |
| 0 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2.11 |
| 0 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 0.84 |

Analysis Procedures

Statistical Analysis. Microsoft Excel, Microsoft Access, and Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) were used for statistical analysis of the data. Responses to the Likert-scale statements were converted to numerical values for calculating time management and work-life balance scores as well as subscale scores in areas of time management. Reverse scoring was used for statements negatively contributing to time management and work-life balance. The factor analysis of the TMBS conducted by Macan et al. (1990) was used as the basis for calculating subscale scores in three dimensions of time management: mechanics of time management (MTM), setting goals and priorities (SGP), and preference for organization (PO). Pearson *r* values were calculated between variables to identify significant correlations in the data.

Content Analysis. A text analysis was conducted on the open-ended responses for time management strategies to identify repeated words and phrases. Responses from participants with high levels of work-life balance were selected for content analysis and coding to identify specific themes contributing to high levels of work-life balance among music educators. Participants with low levels of work-life balance were also selected and their responses coded to identify specific themes contributing to low levels of work-life balance among music educators.

CHAPTER IV. RESULTS

The results of this study are organized according to the guiding questions. The first section provides descriptive statistics regarding the amount of time music educators spend working. Section two reports on time management behaviors across various subgroups of music educators using subscale scores and overall scores on the *Time Management Behavior Scale* (TMBS). Section three assesses the work-life balance of music educators by scoring responses to statements adapted from the *Work-Life Balance Checklist* (WLBC) and the *Quality of Life Questionnaire* (QoLQ). Section four analyzes the relationship between work-life balance and time management. Section five analyzes the open-ended responses to determine strategies used by music educators to fulfill their job duties while maintaining a positive work-life balance.

Time Spent on Work by Music Educators

The School Day. Participants were asked how long their contract day is and how many minutes of planning time they receive each week (see Table 4.1). The majority of participants (64%) reported a contract day of 7 to 7.25 hours.

Table 4.1
Time During the Contract Day

| Variable | <i>n</i> | % |
|---------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Length of School Day | | |
| 0-6 hours | 11 | 3.18 |
| 6-7 hours | 65 | 18.79 |
| 7-7.5 hours | 221 | 63.87 |
| 7.5-8 hours | 38 | 10.98 |
| More than 8 hours | 11 | 3.18 |
| Hours of Planning Time per Week | | |
| 0-1 hour | 46 | 13.90 |
| 1-2 hours | 23 | 6.95 |
| 2-3 hours | 42 | 12.69 |
| 3-4 hours | 116 | 35.05 |
| 4-5 hours | 64 | 19.34 |
| 5 or more hours | 40 | 12.08 |

Duties outside the School Day. Participants were asked what required duties they had outside the school day (see Table 4.2). One hundred and three respondents (30%) marked none of the selections. Of those, 61 indicated nothing in the “Other” field and 42 delineated other duties in the “Other” field, such as evening concerts, private lessons, or jazz band rehearsals.

Required duties were also converted to a numerical format and summed to indicate the number of duties per participant. Those who selected from the choices provided reported having up to 5 total duties (out of 7 possible). Those who marked none of the responses were further disaggregated by whether they indicated additional duties in the “Other” field.

Table 4.2
Required Duties outside the School Day

| Variable | <i>n</i> | % |
|-------------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Required Duties* | | |
| Marching Band | 147 | 42.36 |
| Pep / Athletic Band | 111 | 31.99 |
| Glee Club | 19 | 5.48 |
| Show Choir | 41 | 11.82 |
| Private Lessons | 49 | 14.12 |
| Jazz Band | 59 | 17.00 |
| Musical / Pit Orchestra | 112 | 32.28 |
| None marked / “Other” duties listed | 42 | 12.10 |
| None marked / “Other” blank | 61 | 17.58 |
| Number of Duties | | |
| 0 / “Other” blank | 61 | 17.58 |
| 0 / “Other” duties listed | 42 | 12.10 |
| 1 | 71 | 20.46 |
| 2 | 86 | 24.78 |
| 3 | 59 | 17.00 |
| 4 | 22 | 6.34 |
| 5 | 6 | 1.73 |

Note. * Percentages do not total to 100 because participants could mark more than one response.

Time Spent Working outside the School Day. Participants were asked to report time spent on work outside of the school day in two areas: (1) required duties and (2) other job-related

tasks (see Table 4.3). Nine percent of participants indicated that they do not spend time on duties outside the school day. This could mean that all of their duties occur during the school day.

Participant responses were summed to show the total number of hours spent working outside the school day. The majority of participants (58%) spent 10 or more total hours working outside the school day each week.

Table 4.3
Time Spent Working outside the School Day

| Variable | <i>n</i> | % |
|---|----------|-------|
| Required Duties | | |
| 0 hours | 30 | 9.17 |
| 0-2 hours | 43 | 13.15 |
| 2-5 hours | 84 | 25.69 |
| 5-10 hours | 92 | 28.13 |
| 10-20 hours | 69 | 21.10 |
| More than 20 hours | 9 | 2.75 |
| Other Job-Related Tasks | | |
| 0 hours | 5 | 1.47 |
| 0-2 hours | 55 | 16.22 |
| 2-5 hours | 108 | 31.86 |
| 5-10 hours | 121 | 35.69 |
| 10-20 hours | 49 | 14.45 |
| More than 20 hours | 1 | 0.29 |
| Total Time (Required Duties + Other Job-Related Tasks) | | |
| 0-2 hours | 9 | 2.80 |
| 2-5 hours | 36 | 11.21 |
| 5-10 hours | 89 | 27.73 |
| 10-15 hours | 66 | 20.56 |
| 15-20 hours | 59 | 18.38 |
| 20-25 hours | 30 | 9.35 |
| More than 25 hours | 32 | 9.97 |

Table 4.4 shows the range of responses and mean for time spent on work for all participants in the study. On average, music educators in this study spend 14.16 hours outside the school day per week on required duties and other job-related tasks combined.

Table 4.4
Descriptive Statistics of Time Spent on Work

| Variable | <i>N</i> | <i>Range</i> | <i>Min</i> | <i>Max</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Var</i> |
|------------------------------------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| During the School Day | | | | | | | |
| Length of contract day (hrs) | 346 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 7.39 | 0.702 | 0.493 |
| Planning time* | 331 | 5 | | 5 | 3.39 | 1.448 | 2.096 |
| Outside the School Day | | | | | | | |
| Required duties* | 327 | 31 | 0 | 31 | 7.66 | 6.447 | 41.562 |
| Other job-related tasks* | 339 | 31 | 0 | 31 | 6.73 | 4.428 | 19.611 |
| Total time outside the school day* | 324 | 51 | 0 | 51 | 14.16 | 8.679 | 75.332 |

Note. *Hours per week

Responses were disaggregated by gender, age, and level of education (see Table 4.5). Females reported spending fewer hours outside the school day completing duties and job-related tasks. Time spent working on other job-related tasks outside the school day seemed to follow a similar trend according to age, experience, and education level (i.e. younger participants with less education and less experience reported the most time, followed by a decrease in time for participants in their 30s as they started working toward advanced degrees, followed by a gradual increase in time toward the end of one's career).

Responses were also disaggregated by school setting, grade level, and subject area (see Table 4.6). Those who taught at the middle school and high school levels (MH) spent the most time outside the school day completing required duties. Elementary school teachers (E) reported spending the least time outside the school day completing required duties. Among the largest subgroups (band, choir, GM, band/GM, choir/GM), those who taught band/GM reported spending the most time outside the school day completing required duties. Those who taught in a combination of three different areas (COMB3) reported the highest overall time spent completing required duties. Orchestra, band/orch, and band/choir teachers reported spending the most time outside the school day on other job-related tasks.

Table 4.5
Personal Demographics for Time Spent on Work

| Demographic | <i>n</i> | % | Contract day (hrs) | Planning time* | Time spent on required duties outside the school day* | Time spent on other job-related tasks outside the school day* |
|-----------------|----------|-------|--------------------|----------------|---|---|
| Gender | | | | | | |
| Female | 209 | 60.58 | 7.35 | 3.29 | 6.14 | 6.39 |
| Male | 136 | 39.42 | 7.44 | 3.55 | 9.80 | 7.23 |
| Age | | | | | | |
| 21-30 | 41 | 11.88 | 7.32 | 3.51 | 7.63 | 7.40 |
| 31-40 | 124 | 35.94 | 7.50 | 3.42 | 7.74 | 6.57 |
| 41-50 | 90 | 26.09 | 7.44 | 3.39 | 7.51 | 6.47 |
| 51-60 | 83 | 24.06 | 7.26 | 3.38 | 7.47 | 7.08 |
| 60+ | 7 | 2.03 | 7.00 | 2.67 | 11.67 | 5.50 |
| Education Level | | | | | | |
| Bachelors | 14 | 4.03 | 7.14 | 2.30 | 5.79 | 7.62 |
| Bachelors + | 75 | 21.61 | 7.26 | 3.21 | 9.21 | 6.36 |
| Masters | 97 | 27.95 | 7.44 | 3.39 | 6.79 | 6.52 |
| Masters + | 158 | 45.53 | 7.43 | 3.55 | 7.63 | 6.86 |
| Doctorate | 3 | 0.86 | 7.33 | 4.42 | 8.00 | 12.33 |
| Experience | | | | | | |
| 0-5 years | 16 | 5.56 | 7.25 | 3.67 | 8.53 | 8.19 |
| 5-10 years | 56 | 19.44 | 7.50 | 3.49 | 8.11 | 6.39 |
| 10-20 years | 110 | 38.19 | 7.44 | 3.42 | 6.66 | 6.36 |
| 20-30 years | 85 | 29.51 | 7.34 | 3.25 | 7.55 | 6.75 |
| 30+ years | 21 | 7.29 | 6.86 | 3.20 | 9.17 | 7.37 |

Note. *Hours per week

Table 4.6
Work Demographics for Time Spent on Work

| Demographic | <i>n</i> | % | Contract day (hrs) | Planning time* | Time spent on required duties outside the school day* | Time spent on other job-related tasks outside the school day* |
|-----------------|----------|-------|--------------------|----------------|---|---|
| School Setting | | | | | | |
| Other | 3 | 0.87 | 7.00 | 2.42 | 2.50 | 7.00 |
| Private School | 27 | 7.80 | 7.39 | 3.60 | 7.38 | 7.19 |
| Public School | 316 | 91.33 | 7.39 | 3.37 | 7.71 | 6.70 |
| Grade Level** | | | | | | |
| E | 45 | 12.97 | 7.56 | 3.64 | 4.98 | 5.84 |
| M | 22 | 6.34 | 7.30 | 3.49 | 8.89 | 6.62 |
| H | 40 | 11.53 | 7.30 | 3.15 | 7.98 | 6.49 |
| EM | 28 | 8.07 | 7.57 | 3.44 | 6.26 | 7.52 |
| EH | 10 | 2.88 | 7.45 | 3.55 | 6.10 | 5.78 |
| MH | 104 | 29.97 | 7.33 | 3.34 | 8.91 | 6.91 |
| EMH | 98 | 28.24 | 7.37 | 3.36 | 7.76 | 6.93 |
| Subject Area*** | | | | | | |
| BAND | 90 | 25.94 | 7.32 | 3.18 | 8.83 | 6.06 |
| ORCH | 31 | 8.93 | 7.37 | 3.08 | 6.57 | 7.55 |
| CHOIR | 48 | 13.83 | 7.38 | 3.32 | 7.43 | 6.64 |
| GM | 40 | 11.53 | 7.55 | 3.82 | 4.92 | 6.26 |
| BAND/ORCH | 11 | 3.17 | 7.41 | 3.40 | 5.45 | 7.36 |
| BAND/CHOIR | 18 | 5.19 | 7.12 | 3.62 | 7.47 | 8.06 |
| BAND/GM | 53 | 15.27 | 7.44 | 3.53 | 9.04 | 7.08 |
| ORCH/GM | 1 | 0.29 | 7.50 | 0.75 | 5.00 | 5.00 |
| CHOIR/GM | 36 | 10.37 | 7.36 | 3.49 | 6.68 | 6.69 |
| COMB3 | 18 | 5.19 | 7.53 | 3.47 | 10.17 | 7.39 |
| COMB4 | 1 | 0.29 | 7.50 | 2.00 | 8.00 | 10.00 |

Note. * Hours per week ** E = Elementary, M = Middle School, H = High School; ***GM = General Music, COMB3 = Combination of 3 Subjects, COMB4 = Combination of 4 Subjects

Perceptions of Time Spent on Work. Participants responded to a series of statements about their time at work using a 5-point Likert scale with 1 representing strongly disagree and 5 representing strongly agree (see Table 4.7). Almost half of the participants (49%) agreed that they put in more hours than other people in similar positions with 34% people responding “Neither Agree Nor Disagree.” More participants agreed (45%) than disagreed (22%) that they

need to cut back on the amount of time spent on job-related tasks. Responses to the statement, “I don’t think about the hours I am putting in to complete my job requirements” were distributed somewhat evenly with 37% disagreeing and 44% agreeing. The majority of participants (58%) felt they were not adequately compensated for the amount of time spent on job-related tasks.

Table 4.7
Perceptions of Time Spent on Work

| Statement | <i>n</i> | % |
|---|----------|-------|
| <i>I put in more hours than other people in similar positions.</i> | | |
| 1 – Strongly Disagree | 7 | 2.02 |
| 2 – Disagree | 53 | 15.32 |
| 3 – Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 116 | 33.53 |
| 4 – Agree | 104 | 30.06 |
| 5 – Strongly Agree | 66 | 19.08 |
| <i>I need to cut back on the amount of time I spend on job-related tasks.</i> | | |
| 1 – Strongly Disagree | 13 | 3.76 |
| 2 – Disagree | 62 | 17.92 |
| 3 – Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 117 | 33.82 |
| 4 – Agree | 124 | 35.84 |
| 5 – Strongly Agree | 30 | 8.67 |
| <i>I don't think about the hours I am putting in to complete my job requirements.</i> | | |
| 1 – Strongly Disagree | 34 | 9.83 |
| 2 – Disagree | 94 | 27.17 |
| 3 – Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 66 | 19.08 |
| 4 – Agree | 103 | 29.77 |
| 5 – Strongly Agree | 49 | 14.16 |
| <i>I am adequately compensated for the amount of time I spend on job-related tasks.</i> | | |
| 1 – Strongly Disagree | 83 | 23.99 |
| 2 – Disagree | 116 | 33.53 |
| 3 – Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 52 | 15.03 |
| 4 – Agree | 77 | 22.25 |
| 5 – Strongly Agree | 17 | 4.91 |

Music Educators' Time Management Skills

Using the *Time Management Behavior Scale* (TMBS) adapted from Macan et al. (1994), participants responded to a series of statements about themselves using a 5-point Likert scale with 5 representing "Very Often True" and 1 representing "Seldom True." Table 4.8 shows Cronbach's alpha scores for the TMBS as well as each subscale. George and Mallery (2003) provide the following scale for interpreting Cronbach's alpha scores: " $\alpha > .9$ – Excellent, $\alpha > .8$ – Good, $\alpha > .7$ – Acceptable, $\alpha > .6$ – Questionable, $\alpha > .5$ – Poor, and $\alpha < .5$ – Unacceptable" (p. 231). The TMBS was found to have acceptable reliability as a measurement of time management behavior for music educators.

Table 4.8
TMBS Reliability

| Dimension ^a | No. of items | α |
|------------------------|--------------|----------|
| Overall TMBS Score | 15 | 0.819 |
| - MTM | 5 | 0.730 |
| - SGP | 7 | 0.820 |
| - PO | 3 | 0.785 |

Note. TMBS = *Time Management Behavior Scale* (Macan, 1994), MTM = Mechanics of Time Management subscale, SGP = Setting Goals and Priorities subscale, PO = Preference for Organization subscale

^a $N = 347$

Time Management Scores. Overall scores on the shortened TMBS were calculated based on the average of all responses by each participant (see Table 4.9). A score of 1 indicated a low frequency of time management behaviors and 5 indicated a high frequency of time management behaviors. A majority of participants (55%) earned an overall score of 4 or 5 (out of 5) on the TMBS. 40% earned an overall score of 3. None of the participants earned an overall score of 1. The mean of TMBS scores for all participants was 3.6. Additional descriptive statistics for all participants are displayed in Table 4.10.

Subscale scores on the TMBS were calculated using the three dimensions of time management theorized by Macan (1994): mechanics of time management (MTM), setting of goals and priorities (SGP), and preference for organization (PO). In the area of MTM, 40% of participants scored a 4 or 5. In the area of setting goals and priorities (SGP), 65% of participants scored a 4 or 5. In the area of preference for organization (PO), 67% of participants scored a 4 or 5. Table 4.9 shows the percent of participants earning each score.

Table 4.9
TMBS Scores

| Dimension | <i>n</i> | % |
|---------------------|----------|-------|
| Overall TMBS Scores | | |
| 2 – Moderately low | 16 | 4.61 |
| 3 – Moderate | 139 | 40.06 |
| 4 – Moderately high | 164 | 47.26 |
| 5 – High | 28 | 8.07 |
| MTM | | |
| 1 – Low | 8 | 2.31 |
| 2 – Moderately low | 73 | 21.04 |
| 3 – Moderate | 128 | 36.89 |
| 4 – Moderately high | 104 | 29.97 |
| 5 – High | 34 | 9.80 |
| SGP | | |
| 1 – Low | 1 | 0.29 |
| 2 – Moderately low | 19 | 5.48 |
| 3 – Moderate | 103 | 29.68 |
| 4 – Moderately high | 168 | 48.41 |
| 5 – High | 56 | 16.14 |
| PO | | |
| 1 – Low | 8 | 2.31 |
| 2 – Moderately low | 34 | 9.80 |
| 3 – Moderate | 74 | 21.33 |
| 4 – Moderately high | 112 | 32.28 |
| 5 – High | 119 | 34.29 |

Note. TMBS = *Time Management Behavior Scale* (Macan, 1994), MTM = Mechanics of Time Management subscale, SGP = Setting Goals and Priorities subscale, PO = Preference for Organization subscale

Table 4.10
Descriptive Statistics of TMBS Scores

| Dimension ^a | Range | Min | Max | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Var</i> |
|------------------------|-------|-----|-----|----------|-----------|------------|
| TMBS | 3.2 | 1.8 | 5.0 | 3.590 | 0.633 | 0.400 |
| - MTM | 4.0 | 1.0 | 5.0 | 3.251 | 0.932 | 0.868 |
| - SGP | 3.7 | 1.3 | 5.0 | 3.725 | 0.726 | 0.526 |
| - PO | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3.84 | 1.026 | 1.052 |

Note. TMBS = *Time Management Behavior Scale* (Macan, 1994), MTM = *Mechanics of Time Management* subscale, SGP = *Setting Goals and Priorities* subscale, PO = *Preference for Organization* subscale

^a*N* = 347

Participants were asked how efficient they were when completing job-related tasks (see Table 4.11). Nearly half (49%) of the respondents agreed that they needed to find ways to complete job-related tasks more efficiently.

Table 4.11
I need to find ways to complete my job-related tasks more efficiently.

| Response | <i>n</i> | % |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| 1 – Strongly Disagree | 25 | 7.23 |
| 2 – Disagree | 66 | 19.08 |
| 3 – Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 85 | 24.57 |
| 4 – Agree | 142 | 41.04 |
| 5 – Strongly Agree | 28 | 8.09 |

Correlates of Time Management Scores. Using Pearson *r* values, a correlation matrix was created to analyze the relationship between scores on the TMBS and other variables (see Table 4.12). Significant positive relationships were found between TMBS scores and years of experience ($p < 0.05$), as well as time spent outside the school day on other job-related tasks ($p < 0.01$). This suggests that more experienced individuals and those who spent more time on job-related tasks engaged in time management behaviors more frequently. The mechanics of time management (MTM) and setting of goals and priorities (SGP) subscales also showed

significant positive relationships ($p < 0.01$) with time spent on other job-related tasks (i.e. individuals who spent more time on job-related tasks engaged in MTM and SGP more frequently). SGP also showed a significant positive correlation ($p < 0.01$) with experience (i.e. individuals with more experience engaged in SGP more frequently).

Though time spent on required duties outside the school day did not show a significant relationship with overall scores on the TMBS, the preference for organization (PO) subscale did show a significant negative correlation ($p < 0.01$) with time spent on required duties outside the school day. In this case, individuals with higher PO scores reported spending less time on required duties outside the school day, whereas individuals with lower PO scores reported spending more time on required duties outside the school day.

Table 4.12
Correlates of Time Management

| Variable | | <i>TMBS</i> | <i>MTM</i> | <i>SGP</i> | <i>PO</i> |
|---|---------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Experience | Pearson Correlation | .133* | .023 | .177** | .075 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .024 | .697 | .003 | .202 |
| | N | 288 | 288 | 288 | 288 |
| Age | Pearson Correlation | -.012 | -.035 | .049 | -.064 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .826 | .521 | .366 | .232 |
| | N | 345 | 345 | 345 | 345 |
| Length of contract day | Pearson Correlation | -.032 | -.025 | -.064 | .043 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .551 | .647 | .239 | .426 |
| | N | 346 | 346 | 346 | 346 |
| Planning time | Pearson Correlation | -.059 | -.029 | -.047 | -.060 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .288 | .596 | .395 | .280 |
| | N | 331 | 331 | 331 | 331 |
| Time spent on required duties outside the school day | Pearson Correlation | -.072 | -.049 | -.001 | -.143** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .194 | .380 | .989 | .010 |
| | N | 327 | 327 | 327 | 327 |
| Time spent on other job-related tasks outside the school day | Pearson Correlation | .230** | .198** | .198** | .081 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .139 |
| | N | 339 | 339 | 339 | 339 |
| Total time outside the school day (required duties + other job-related tasks) | Pearson Correlation | .081 | .075 | .119* | -.062 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .148 | .180 | .032 | .264 |
| | N | 324 | 324 | 324 | 324 |
| Total time spent on work (length of contract day + total time outside the school day) | Pearson Correlation | .072 | .070 | .108 | -.063 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .200 | .209 | .054 | .260 |
| | N | 321 | 321 | 321 | 321 |

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). TMBS = *Time Management Behavior Scale* (Macan, 1994), MTM = *Mechanics of Time Management* subscale, SGP = *Setting Goals and Priorities* subscale, PO = *Preference for Organization* subscale

Work-Life Balance of Music Educators

Using statements related to work-life balance derived from other surveys (Dex & Bond, 2005; Boixados et al., 2009), participants responded to a series of statements about themselves using a 5-point Likert scale with 5 representing “Strongly Agree” and 1 representing “Strongly Disagree.” Table 4.13 shows Cronbach's alpha scores for each instrument that contributed to the makeup of the work-life balance section of the survey. Using the guidelines developed by George and Mallery (2003), the work-life balance section was found to have excellent reliability as a measurement of work-life balance for music educators.

Table 4.13
Work-Life Balance Section Reliability

| Scale ^a | No. of Items | α |
|---|--------------|----------|
| Overall Work-Life Balance Score (All 17 Questions) | 17 | 0.923 |
| - <i>Work-Life Balance Checklist 7</i> * | 7 | 0.834 |
| - <i>Work-Life Balance Checklist 7</i> with 3 additional questions* | 10 | 0.914 |
| - Absence of Work Overload / Free Time Subscale** | 7 | 0.845 |

Note. * Dex & Bond, 2005; ** from the *Quality of Life Questionnaire* (Boixados et al., 2009)

^aN = 347

Work-Life Balance Scores. Each participant was given an overall work-life balance score based on their average of all 17 responses (see Table 4.14). Average scores ranged from 1 (low level of work-life balance) to 5 (high level of work-life balance). Forty-seven percent of participants scored 1 or 2 on work-life balance. Only 42 participants (12%) earned an overall score of 4 or 5. The mean work-life balance score for all participants in the study was 2.6. Descriptive statistics of work-life balance scores for all participants in the study are displayed in Table 4.15.

Table 4.14
Work-Life Balance Scores

| Score | <i>n</i> | % |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-------|
| 1 – low work-life balance | 15 | 4.32 |
| 2 – moderately low work-life balance | 147 | 42.36 |
| 3 – moderate work-life balance | 143 | 41.21 |
| 4 – moderately high work-life balance | 41 | 11.82 |
| 5 – high work-life balance | 1 | 0.29 |

Table 4.15
Descriptive Statistics of Work-Life Balance Scores

| | <i>N</i> | <i>Range</i> | <i>Min</i> | <i>Max</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Var</i> |
|-----|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| WLB | 347 | 3.6 | 1.1 | 4.7 | 2.613 | .705 | .497 |

Career Choice. Participants were asked if they were reconsidering their career choice (see Table 4.16). The majority of participants (61%) indicated that they were not thinking about changing their career choice; however, 27% agreed that they were thinking about changing careers. Career choice will be discussed further in the work-life balance strategies section of chapter five.

Table 4.16
I am thinking about changing my career choice.

| Response | <i>n</i> | % |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| 1 – Strongly Disagree | 129 | 37.50 |
| 2 – Disagree | 80 | 23.26 |
| 3 – Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 47 | 13.66 |
| 4 – Agree | 66 | 19.19 |
| 5 – Strongly Agree | 23 | 6.69 |

Work-life balance scores were disaggregated by gender, experience, age, and education level (see Table 4.17). Older participants, more experienced educators and individuals with more education tended to have higher work-life balance scores.

Table 4.17
Personal Demographics for Work-Life Balance Scores

| Variable | <i>n</i> | % | WLB |
|--------------------|----------|-------|------|
| Gender | | | |
| Female | 209 | 60.58 | 2.64 |
| Male | 136 | 39.42 | 2.57 |
| Experience | | | |
| 0-5 years | 16 | 5.56 | 2.34 |
| 5-10 years | 56 | 19.44 | 2.60 |
| 10-20 years | 110 | 38.19 | 2.57 |
| 20-30 years | 85 | 29.51 | 2.67 |
| More than 30 years | 21 | 7.29 | 2.89 |
| Age | | | |
| 21-30 | 41 | 11.88 | 2.51 |
| 31-40 | 124 | 35.94 | 2.58 |
| 41-50 | 90 | 26.09 | 2.55 |
| 51-60 | 83 | 24.06 | 2.74 |
| 60+ | 7 | 2.03 | 2.88 |
| Level of Education | | | |
| Bachelors | 14 | 4.03 | 2.32 |
| Bachelors + | 75 | 21.61 | 2.50 |
| Masters | 97 | 27.95 | 2.71 |
| Masters + | 158 | 45.53 | 2.63 |
| Doctorate | 3 | 0.86 | 2.78 |

Work-life balance scores were also disaggregated by relationship status, working status of spouse, having children, and number and age of children (see Table 4.18). Among relationship status subgroups, participants who were separated earned the lowest work-life balance scores. Individuals with stay-at-home spouses had higher work-life balance scores than individuals with working spouses. Work-life balance scores were nearly identical between participants with children and participants without children. Among those who had children, individuals with young children had lower work-life balance scores than those with grown children.

Table 4.18
Family Demographics for Work-Life Balance Scores

| Demographic | <i>n</i> | % | WLB |
|--|----------|-------|------|
| Relationship Status | | | |
| Married | 267 | 77.17 | 2.62 |
| In a domestic partnership or civil union | 9 | 2.60 | 2.41 |
| Single, but cohabiting with a significant other | 9 | 2.60 | 2.55 |
| Single, never married | 35 | 10.12 | 2.62 |
| Divorced | 20 | 5.78 | 2.53 |
| Widowed | 4 | 1.16 | 3.28 |
| Separated | 2 | 0.58 | 2.21 |
| <i>Does your spouse or significant other work?</i> | | | |
| No, he or she does not | 25 | 8.80 | 2.73 |
| Yes, he or she does | 259 | 91.20 | 2.60 |
| <i>Do you have any children?</i> | | | |
| No | 110 | 31.70 | 2.62 |
| Yes | 237 | 68.30 | 2.61 |
| <i>How many children under 18 do you have?</i> | | | |
| 4 | 4 | 1.71 | 2.35 |
| 3 | 30 | 12.82 | 2.33 |
| 2 | 73 | 31.20 | 2.58 |
| 1 | 60 | 25.64 | 2.66 |
| 0 | 67 | 28.63 | 2.74 |
| <i>How many children 18 or older do you have?</i> | | | |
| 5 | 2 | 0.86 | 3.24 |
| 4 | 8 | 3.43 | 2.96 |
| 3 | 18 | 7.73 | 3.06 |
| 2 | 33 | 14.16 | 2.53 |
| 1 | 46 | 19.74 | 2.70 |
| 0 | 126 | 54.08 | 2.51 |

Correlates of Work-Life Balance. Pearson correlations were calculated to analyze the relationship between work-life balance scores and other variables (see Table 4.19). Negative correlations were found between work-life balance scores and number of classes taught, number of required duties outside the school day ($p < 0.01$), length of the school day, time spent on required duties outside the school day ($p < 0.01$), and time spent on other job-related tasks outside the school day (i.e. participants with more classes, more required duties outside the school day, longer contract days, more time spent on required duties, and more time spent on

other job-related tasks had lower work-life balance scores). Positive correlations were found between work-life balance scores and amount of planning time, experience ($p < 0.01$), and age ($p < 0.05$). In this case, higher work-life balance scores were earned by older individuals, more experienced educators, and teachers with more planning time.

Pearson product-moment correlations were also calculated for work-life balance scores and responses to other statements on the survey (see Table 4.20). Individuals with higher work-life balance scores tended to agree that they do not think about the hours they are putting in for work ($p < 0.01$) and that they were adequately compensated for their time at work ($p < 0.01$). Individuals with lower work-life balance scores tended to agree more that they put in more hours than other people in similar positions ($p < 0.01$), that they needed to cut back on the amount of time spent working ($p < 0.01$), that they needed to find ways to complete their job-related tasks more efficiently ($p < 0.01$), and that they were considering changing their career choice ($p < 0.01$).

Table 4.19
Correlates of Work-Life Balance Scores

| Variable | | WLB |
|---|---------------------|----------------|
| Number of classes taught (number of “preps”) | Pearson Correlation | -.104 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .053 |
| | N | 347 |
| Number of required duties outside the school day | Pearson Correlation | -.189** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 347 |
| Experience | Pearson Correlation | .154** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .009 |
| | N | 288 |
| Age | Pearson Correlation | .116* |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .031 |
| | N | 345 |
| Number of young children (<18yo) | Pearson Correlation | -.174** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .008 |
| | N | 234 |
| Number of grown children (>=18yo) | Pearson Correlation | .191** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .003 |
| | N | 233 |
| Length of contract day | Pearson Correlation | -.010 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .847 |
| | N | 346 |
| Amount of planning time | Pearson Correlation | .105 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .056 |
| | N | 331 |
| Time spent on required duties outside the school day | Pearson Correlation | -.227** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 327 |
| Time spent on other job-related tasks outside the school day | Pearson Correlation | -.280** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 339 |
| Total time spent working outside the school day (required duties + other job-related tasks) | Pearson Correlation | -.293** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 324 |
| Total time spent working (length of contract day + total time spent working outside the school day) | Pearson Correlation | -.297** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 321 |

Note. **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.20
Additional Correlates of Work-Life Balance Scores

| Statement | | WLB |
|---|---------------------|----------------|
| <i>I put in more hours than other people in similar positions.</i> | Pearson Correlation | -.271** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 346 |
| <i>I need to cut back on the amount of time I spend on job-related tasks.</i> | Pearson Correlation | -.569** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 346 |
| <i>I need to find ways to complete my job-related tasks more efficiently.</i> | Pearson Correlation | -.305** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 346 |
| <i>I don't think about the hours I am putting in to complete my job requirements.</i> | Pearson Correlation | .432** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 346 |
| <i>I am thinking about changing my career choice.</i> | Pearson Correlation | -.359** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 345 |
| <i>I am adequately compensated for the amount of time I spend on job-related tasks.</i> | Pearson Correlation | .347** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 345 |

Note. **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The Relationship between Time Management and Work-Life Balance

Pearson correlations were calculated to analyze the relationship between time management behaviors and work-life balance (see Table 4.21). Overall scores on the *Time Management Scale* (TMBS) as well as the setting goals and priorities (SGP) subscale showed a negative correlation with work-life balance (i.e. increases in TMBS and SGP coincided with decreases in work-life balance scores). The mechanics of time management (MTM) subscale showed a significant ($p < 0.01$) negative relationship with work-life balance (i.e. increases in MTM coincided with decreases in work-life balance scores). Further discussion can be found in chapter five to explain these unexpected negative correlations. The preference for organization

(PO) subscale was the only subscale to show a positive relationship with work-life balance (i.e. increases in PO coincided with increases in work-life balance scores).

Table 4.21
The Relationship between Time Management and Work-Life Balance

| Scale | | WLB |
|-------|---------------------|----------------|
| TMBS | Pearson Correlation | -.092 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .087 |
| | N | 347 |
| - MTM | Pearson Correlation | -.192** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 347 |
| - SGP | Pearson Correlation | -.038 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .485 |
| | N | 347 |
| - PO | Pearson Correlation | .069 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .202 |
| | N | 347 |

Note. **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). TMBS = *Time Management Behavior Scale* (Macan, 1994), MTM = *Mechanics of Time Management* subscale, SGP = *Setting Goals and Priorities* subscale, PO = *Preference for Organization* subscale

Strategies for Time Management and Work-Life Balance

In the open-ended response section, participants were asked two questions: (1) what personal strategies do you use to make the most of your time when competing job requirements, and (2) what personal strategies do you use to keep your work from carrying over into your personal life? Their responses are analyzed in two sections below: time management strategies and work-life balance strategies.

Time Management Strategies. Two hundred and ninety-two participants responded to the first open-ended question regarding their personal time management strategies. The text analysis feature available in SurveyMonkey provided a list of frequently used words and phrases.

Frequently occurring words were grouped into categories reflecting the top five time management strategies used by music educators: list, prioritize, organize, schedule, and delegate (see Table 4.22).

Table 4.22
Text Analysis of Time Management Strategies Used by Music Educators

| Category | Words Used | Frequency | % |
|------------|--|-----------|-------|
| LIST | list(s) to-do list(s) checklist(s) | 115 | 39.38 |
| PRIORITIZE | priority(-ies) prioritize(-ing) | 57 | 19.52 |
| ORGANIZE | organize(-ing/-ed) organization(-al) | 42 | 14.38 |
| SCHEDULE | schedule calendar appointment(s) | 32 | 10.95 |
| DELEGATE | delegate delegation “ask(-ing) for help” volunteers | 25 | 8.56 |

Work-Life Balance Strategies. Two hundred and ninety-five participants described strategies they use to keep work from carrying over into their personal lives. To analyze the responses, participants with high work-life balance scores were identified. Individuals with a work-life balance score of at least a 4.0 were selected, yielding 11 work-life balance exemplars from a variety of subject areas. Because this sample seemed to include relatively older individuals, I identified another group of young work-life balance exemplars. These individuals were younger than 30 with a work-life balance score of at least a 3.25. Of the 41 participants younger than 30, seven individuals earned a work-life balance score of at least a 3.25. Because both of these samples included relatively few single individuals, I identified a third group of

single work-life balance exemplars. These individuals were single with a work-life balance score of at least a 2.75. Of the 35 single participants, 10 earned a work-life balance score of at least 2.75. Because all of these groups tended to include relatively few individuals with children younger than 18, I identified a fourth group of work-life balance exemplars with young children and a work-life balance score of at least 3.6. Of the 167 participants with young children, 12 had a work-life balance score of at least 3.6. The final sample pool used in the content analysis included 39 participants, of which 26 submitted responses.

Coding of Work-Life Balance Responses. To determine how to code the work-life balance responses, I read through the high work-life balance responses to get an overall feel for the content. Then I reread the responses and underlined key words and phrases that seemed to appear frequently. Next I wrote down the key words and phrases and grouped them according to their similarities which resulted in four emerging themes for high work-life balance: identify your priorities, set boundaries, priorities change, and take care of yourself. Finally, I reread all of the high work-life balance responses and used the four themes to code the responses (see Table 4.23).

Using these four high work-life balance themes, I also analyzed work-life balance responses from participants with the lowest work-life balance scores. Twenty-five participants earned a work-life balance score of 1.65 or less, of which 22 submitted work-life balance responses. I also coded the low work-life balance responses for their own themes using the same process outlined above. Three themes emerged from the low work-life balance responses: misplaced priorities, resignation, and personal sacrifice. I then coded the high work-life balance responses using the low work-life balance themes (see Table 4.23).

Table 4.23
High Work-Life Balance Themes for Music Educators

| High WLB Themes | Examples | No. responses by High WLB participants ^a | No. responses by Low WLB participants ^b |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|
| Identify Your Priorities | my work is my life family comes first | 5 | 4 |
| Set Boundaries | compartmentalize <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • leave it at school • don't take work home (stay late to do it) • don't check work email at home set limits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • leave at a certain time • save easy work simplify <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • eliminate unnecessary work say no <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no private lessons • no extracurricular activities | 13 | 9 |
| Take Care of Yourself | know your limits make time for yourself <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • take a break • exercise enlist the support of others <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • administration • colleagues • spouse • counselor • spirituality | 8 | 4 |
| Priorities Change | redefine boundaries take control make a change <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • change jobs • quit | 5 | 0 |

Note. ^a*n* = 26, ^b*n* = 22

Table 4.24
Low Work-Life Balance Themes for Music Educators

| Low WLB Themes | Examples | No. responses by High WLB participants ^a | No. responses by Low WLB participants ^b |
|----------------------|--|---|--|
| Misplaced Priorities | guilt <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • my family suffers worry <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • constant thoughts • I feel like I'm lowering my standards | 0 | 10 |
| Resignation | I can't change it I have no control over it it comes with the job lack of support | 0 | 6 |
| Personal Sacrifice | Sacrifice I work late until too exhausted. I get up early I go to work at 4am | 0 | 3 |

Note. ^a*n* = 26, ^b*n* = 22

CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION

The discussion of the study is divided into four main sections: (1) conclusions, (2) limitations of the study, (3) suggestions for future research, and (4) implications for music education. The presentation of conclusions will be arranged to address each of the guiding questions. Much of the survey data from this study was analyzed using correlations. Though a discussion of correlations precludes any determination of causation, it does provide a starting point for interpretations of the data. Use of qualitative data from participants further informs the discussion of results by providing additional insight into the time management behaviors and work-life balance of music educators as well as strategies for other music educators to incorporate into their work and personal lives.

Conclusions

Time Spent on Work by Music Educators. Music educators in this study reported an average contract day of 7.39 hours and approximately 14.16 hours per week working outside the school day (see Table 4.4). When combined into a 5-day week, this resulted in an average 51.11-hour workweek. Similar to Wolf's (2002) study of educators that reported an average of 57 hours spent on work per week, these results may suggest that the time demands for music educators may be slightly less than those of teachers in other subject areas; however, when considering differences in methodology and sample, the difference of 5.89 hours per week may be negligible. Wolf's participants completed a survey as well as a seven-day log; this study used a self-report survey based on estimates, which may be less accurate than a seven-day log of duties. Additionally, Wolf surveyed teachers in one district while this study included teachers from all across Ohio; the results of one school district may not necessarily reflect conditions in the education profession as a whole.

These results may be surprising, given the required duties outside the school day that are inherent in the music education profession, such as rehearsals and performances. Yet support for these results may be found when considering the amount of time spent on other job-related tasks by non-music teachers. In subject areas such as math, science, or language arts, where students may be expected to turn in papers on a regular basis, other job-related tasks such as grading and administrative tasks may be more time-consuming than in music classes.

Time Spent Working outside the School Day. Time spent on required duties and other job-related tasks outside the school day varied based on personal demographics (see Table 4.5). Results indicated that males, younger teachers, and teachers with less experience spent more time working outside the school day. Though the study involved a majority of female participants (61%), males overall reported spending more time outside the school day on both required duties and other job-related tasks. Possible explanations may be that females may feel more pressure to spend more time at home or males may be more prevalent in certain subject areas or grade levels where the time commitments outside the school day are greater.

Individuals teaching in a combination of three or four subject areas reported the greatest combined time spent on required duties and other job-related tasks outside the school day (see Table 4.6). This may suggest that time spent working outside the school day is greater for music educators in smaller school districts, where teaching several subject areas may be more prevalent. One individual from a small school district who reported spending 10 hours outside the school day each week on required duties wrote: “My work always carries into my personal life. Small schools hire very few staff to cover all their needs. It's part of the job.”

Required Duties. Middle school and high school music educators reported the greatest amount of time spent on required duties outside the school day (see Table 4.6). This may be

attributed to a lack of extracurricular activities that are offered at the elementary level.

Additionally, because instrumental music may not be offered until 5th or 6th grade in some districts, this could also account for the increased time spent on required duties outside the school day by middle school and high school music educators.

Participants reported teaching in one, two, three, or four subject areas. Though individuals reported teaching up to four different subject areas, the majority of participants taught in one or two areas. Among participants who reported teaching in one subject area, band directors reported the highest amount of time spent on required duties outside the school day. Among participants who reported teaching in two subject areas, those who taught band and general music reported the greatest amount of time spent on required duties outside the school day. These results may suggest that the required time outside the school day is greater for band directors. Considering the time bands often spend rehearsing and performing for sporting events outside the school day, this makes sense.

Other Job-Related Tasks. Time spent on other job-related tasks outside the school day tended to follow a similar trend according to age, experience, and level of education (see Table 4.5). Time spent on job-related tasks outside the school day seemed to start off high for beginning teachers, decreased for teachers in their 30s, and then increased again toward the end of one's career. This trend seems to reflect the stages that individuals may go through during their teaching career: novice, intermediate, and veteran. For novice teachers, starting out in a new career involves preparing new materials, learning the procedures for the school district, and getting to know the students and families in their music groups, to name a few. Intermediate professionals who have "learned the ropes" may tend to spend less time on other job-related tasks so that they can focus on raising families or advancing their education. After earning

tenure, intermediate professionals may also experience less pressure than novice teachers to put in extra time outside the school day due to their increased job security. Veteran teachers with advanced degrees or whose children have gone off to college may find that they have expendable time that they choose to allocate back to their careers. Understanding these trends may provide some comfort to beginning teachers who may feel overwhelmed by workload when starting out in the profession. With experience, their time spent outside the school day may improve.

Music Educators' Time Management Skills. Music educators in this study earned an average score of 3.59 on the shortened *Time Management Behavior Scale* (TMBS) (see Table 4.10). With the range of possible scores spanning 1 to 5, a score of 3.59 represents a moderate to moderately high frequency of engagement in time management behaviors as defined by the TMBS. Using the subscales of the TMBS defined by Macan (1994), average scores were calculated in three dimensions of time management: mechanics of time management (MTM), setting goals and priorities (SGP), and preference for organization (PO). While the mean subscales scores were not significantly different, it is interesting to note how music educators scored in each area. The highest mean subscale score calculated for participants in this study was in the area of PO ($M = 3.84$). PO is defined as “both a general organized approach to work projects as well as maintenance of an organized work environment” (Macan, 1994). The lowest mean subscale score was in the area of MTM ($M = 3.25$). Macan (1994) defines MTM as “the behaviors typically associated with managing time, such as making lists, scheduling, and planning.” The mean SGP score for participants in this study was 3.73. SGP is defined as “the setting of goals concerning what the person wants or needs to accomplish and the prioritizing of tasks necessary to achieve these goals” (Macan, 1994).

Whether a mean score of 3.59 on the TMBS is comparable with others who have taken the test is difficult to determine. This study reported average scores whereas other studies using the TMBS reported total scores (Macan et al., 1990; Mudrack, 1997). One study of college students reported average scores using a 5-point Likert scale (Macan, 1994). When compared with that study, music educators in this study earned similar SGP subscale scores, higher MTM subscale scores, and lower PO subscale scores. When compared with adults in the sale industry from another study, music educators in this study scored higher in the area of SGP, but lower in the areas of MTM and PO (Nonis et al., 2011).

Correlates of Time Management. Within this study, overall TMBS scores showed no significant correlation with time spent on required duties outside the school day (see Table 4.12). This may suggest that time management behaviors have little effect on the hours outside the school day that a teacher is required to fulfill, such as marching band, musical pit rehearsal, or evening performances. PO was the only subscale that did, however, show a significant negative correlation ($p < 0.01$) with required hours outside the school day. This may suggest that music teachers who are not as organized tend to spend more time completing required duties than others with the same duties. These teachers may benefit from organizational strategies and may be able to decrease their required hours outside the school day by maintaining an organized workspace. Another interpretation is that teachers who are required to put in excessive hours outside the school day may actually prefer disorganization. Perhaps they find it less stressful to simply allow materials to pile up on their desk rather than file them away after a long day at school. Unfortunately, this interpretation provides little opportunity for decreasing time spent on required duties outside the school day.

Overall scores on the TMBS showed a significant positive correlation ($p < 0.01$) with time spent on other job-related tasks outside the school day (see Table 4.12). In other words, music educators who had higher scores on the TMBS spent more time outside the school day completing other job-related tasks and music educators with lower scores on the TMBS spent less time outside the school day completing other job-related tasks. This data seems counterintuitive to what time management training often purports to do, namely decreasing the amount of time spent on tasks. This may suggest that for music educators, time management skills are developed in response to the high workload involved. These results support the findings by Howard (2006) that band directors have effective time management skills. This data is further supported by Macan (1994) whose theoretical framework for time management identified perceived control of time (PCT) as an outcome of time management behaviors. Music educators may have developed time management strategies in an effort to gain control over the high demands placed on their time.

Work-Life Balance of Music Educators. Music educators in this study earned an average work-life balance score of 2.61 (see Table 4.15). With the range of possible scores spanning 1 to 5, a mean score of 2.61 represents a moderately low to moderate level of work-life balance. Whether a mean work-life balance score of 2.61 is comparable with other populations cannot be determined because these scores were based on a combination of material from two different research studies. Without another population to compare these results to, it may be more helpful to compare the scores of subgroups within the study and analyze the correlates of work-life balance scores among other variables within the study.

Work-life balance scores were lowest for younger music educators with less experience and less education (see Table 4.17). Scores tended to increase with age, experience, and

education. This data may suggest that beginning teachers (who tend to be younger and have less education) have more difficulty balancing work and non-work commitments. Work-life balance may increase over time as music educators gain experience, job security, and increased salary. This data could also suggest that the average work-life balance of these subgroups increases over time as music teachers leave the profession due to burnout or stress from work overload.

Correlates of Work-Life Balance. Significant positive correlations were identified between work-life balance scores and experience ($p < 0.01$) as well as age ($p < 0.05$) (see Table 4.19). When comparing the correlations between work-life balance and age, the relationship seemed to be weaker than the correlation between work-life balance and experience. This may be accounted for when considering that significant negative correlations were shown with work-life balance and number of young children ($p < 0.01$) and significant positive correlations were shown with work-life balance and number of older children ($p < 0.01$). This may suggest that music educators experience a drop in work-life balance scores as they start families that then recovers over time as their children get older. A sudden drop in work-life balance after starting a family that gradually increased over time could account for the relatively weaker correlation between work-life balance and age.

Though children could account for the weaker correlation between work-life balance and age, the stronger correlation between work-life balance and experience may suggest that work-life balance is influenced by other factors related to experience: (1) expert knowledge of one's job resulting in less time needed to prepare for it (2) increased pay, and (3) tenure, resulting in increased job security. The significant positive correlations ($p < 0.01$) between work-life balance and responses to "I don't think about the hours I am putting in to complete my job requirements" as well as "I am adequately compensated for the amount of time I spend on job-related tasks"

provide additional support for this line of reasoning (see Table 4.20). In essence, veteran music educators may report higher levels of work-life balance because they think less about the details of their job than novice teachers do.

Some of the most significant negative correlates of work-life balance occurred with number of required duties outside the school day ($p < 0.01$), time spent on required duties outside the school day ($p < 0.01$), and time spent on other job-related tasks outside the school day ($p < 0.01$). As a result, music educators experiencing work overload could also experience decreased levels of work-life balance. This may provide additional insight into the causes of teacher burnout, which has been attributed to an inability to balance work and non-work commitments (Parrillo, 2008). When individuals spend more time working outside the school day, they have less time available for other things, such as spending time with family and friends or engaged in other enjoyable activities.

The Relationship between Time Management and Work-Life Balance. Overall scores on the *Time Management Behavior Scale* (TMBS) tended to show relatively weak correlations with work-life balance (see Table 4.21); however, when analyzing the subscales of the TMBS, mechanics of time management (MTM) stood out as being the only subscale that showed a significant correlation ($p < 0.01$) with work-life balance scores. MTM includes behaviors such as making lists, scheduling, and planning (Macan, 1994). When considering the significant negative relationship between time spent outside the school day and work-life balance as well as the significant positive relationship between MTM and work-life balance, this data may suggest that individuals who spend large amounts of time outside the school day have developed strong MTM skills as a coping mechanism to deal with work overload. As time demands increase,

work-life balance decreases and MTM increases. As a result, work-life balance is more reflective of the hours spent outside the school day than a person's engagement in MTM.

This negative correlation could also suggest that by engaging in MTM as an attempt to gain control of work overload, music educators develop a hyperawareness of the disparity between time devoted to work and non-work activities. In essence, it may be accurate to say that the work-life balance section measures an individual's *awareness* of work-life balance. In a study with self-reported measures, this seems like a plausible explanation. This interpretation is supported by the significant negative correlation ($p < 0.05$) between MTM and responses to the statement "I don't think about the hours I am putting in to complete my job requirements" (see Table 4.20).

Additionally, preference for organization (PO) was the only subscale of the TMBS positively correlated with work-life balance scores. This should not be taken to mean that music educators should stop engaging in MTM and setting of goals and priorities (SGP); however, it provides support to suggest that engaging in those behaviors will not solve a deficiency in work-life balance. Though MTM and SGP may develop in response to the high demands on an individual's time (see Table 4.12), a more effective solution to improve work-life balance may be to reduce the demands on one's time (see Table 4.19).

Strategies for Time Management and Work-Life Balance. Participants responded to open-ended questions related to time management and work-life balance strategies. These responses provided qualitative data to inform the statistical analysis.

Time Management Strategies. The text analysis of responses revealed five main time management strategies used by music educators: list, prioritize, organize, schedule, and delegate (see Table 4.22). Four of these strategies correspond closely with the dimensions of time

management measured by the *Time Management Behavior Scale* (TMBS). Making lists and scheduling reflects the behaviors involved in the mechanics of time management (MTM) dimension of the TMBS. The delineation of two separate strategies used by music educators to manage their time could indicate two separate areas of MTM, with lists focusing more on tasks, and schedules focusing more on deadlines, meetings, and appointments. Many participants also indicated the importance of prioritizing items, which corresponds closely with behaviors related to the setting goals and priorities (SGP) subscale of the TMBS. Several individuals described maintaining an organized workspace or an organized method of completing work tasks, which corresponds with PO. The high response rate for these four categories provides support for these dimensions of time management as defined by the TMBS. The design of the survey could have also influenced the responses, by having participants respond to the open-ended questions after having taken the TMBS.

The fifth category, delegate, is not measured by the TMBS. Similar to Nelson (2003), this data supports delegation as an important dimension of time management. One high school band director with 30 years of experience summed up the importance of delegation in his response:

Delegation is key to longevity in this profession. I have been blessed to have others around to help with the workload. It is important for music educators to utilize colleagues, students, student parents, and family to help with the job workload. If one person takes on the job by themselves, it is my opinion the person will burn out and not have enough to offer children in a very short career time.

Another high school band director and elementary general music teacher with 30 years of experience explained in her response that time is a resource that cannot be reallocated once it has been spent. Delegation helps her make sure she is spending her time wisely: “Always look for

those volunteers that want to do simple things to help you that can never be forgotten, such as copying [...] Those minutes at the copier can be better spent working with children.” In a profession where the workload does not always coincide with the time available to complete it, music educators might be wise to adopt delegation as a personal time management strategy.

Work-Life Balance Strategies. Coding and analysis of responses by individuals with high work-life balance regarding personal strategies for maintaining a positive work-life balance revealed four main themes: identify priorities, set boundaries, take care of yourself, and priorities change (see Table 4.23). Coding and analysis of responses by individuals with low work-life balance revealed three themes at the opposite end of the work-life balance spectrum: misplaced priorities, resignation, and personal sacrifice (see Table 4.24). When responses by high work-life balance individuals were coded using the low work-life balance themes, none of the responses contained elements of the low work-life balance themes. When responses by low work-life balance individuals were coded using the high work-life balance themes, fewer responses contained elements of the high work-life balance themes. This data provides support for the effectiveness of the work-life balance strategies identified by music educators with high work-life balance.

Identify Your Priorities. Several individuals with high work-life balance explicitly identified the priorities in their lives. Many individuals with high work-life balance identified family as a priority in their lives. These tended to be married individuals with children. One male orchestra director at the elementary, middle school, and high school level with two young children stated, “My family is more important than my job, so I prioritize my life as such.” A female elementary general music and middle school choir teacher with one young child stated, “I care about my work but I put my family first.”

For other individuals with high work-life balance, work itself was identified as the main priority in their lives. These responses tended to occur more frequently among younger individuals or individuals without children. One unmarried, female band and choir director at the high school without children explained, “Work is a priority for me; I’m not satisfied in my personal life until my work is finished.” Another female who reported spending 20 hours each week outside of the school day working as a middle school and high school choir director responded:

My work is my personal life. I am single with no kids. My students, their parents and my co-workers are my life. I spend hours a day with the same kids between music classes and after school rehearsals and I know them better than their own parents at times.

My friends are parents of my students [...]

Regardless of whether their priorities were family or work, individuals with high work-life balance reported spending their time on what mattered most to them.

The concept of setting priorities is also reflected in the setting goals and priorities (SGP) subscale of the *Time Management Behavior Scale* (TMBS). Though overall TMBS scores showed a significant positive correlation ($p < 0.05$) with experience, it is interesting to note that SGP was the only subscale that significantly correlated ($p < 0.01$) with experience (see Table 4.12). And because experience showed significant positive correlations ($p < 0.01$) with work-life balance (see Table 4.19), this may suggest the importance of SGP for work-life balance, whether as a moderator or in some other capacity.

Misplaced Priorities. Several individuals with low work-life balance also identified priorities in their lives; however, they tended to indicate that they were not able to give them the attention they deserved because something else (namely work) took up most of their time. These

misplaced priorities were reflected in a number of responses by individuals with low work-life balance scores. One elementary general music teacher and choir director at the middle school and high school level stated: “I try to make time for my husband and kids, but it is difficult.” Another elementary general music teacher and band director at the middle school and high school level with two young children described the effect of work on his personal life:

I have no strategies to keep work from carrying over [into my personal life]. If I have work to get done for school, that is my top priority. My family life suffers due to the fact that I am never really away from work.

His response illustrates the paradox of misplaced priorities experienced by several music educators who have difficulty balancing their work and non-work commitments.

Individuals with low work-life balance also reported difficulty focusing on their priorities when away from work. One high school choir director who reported spending more than 30 hours each week working outside the school day, described her situation with three young children at home:

I try to make a conscious effort to spend time with my kids when I am home and not focus on work. It is very hard to eliminate the inner voice that is constantly making lists of tasks to complete, though. This takes lots of personal effort to give my family the time they deserve.

Though both high and low work-life balance individuals identified the priorities in their life, low work-life balance individuals tended to express guilt or worry that they were not giving some priorities the amount of attention they deserved.

With outside forces competing for an individual’s time, some music educators may find it difficult to meet the requirements of work and allocate sufficient time for other priorities in their

life. Compared to other correlates of work-life balance, responses to the statement “I need to cut back the amount of time I spend on job-related tasks” showed the most significant negative correlation ($p < 0.01$) with work-life balance (see Table 4.20), yet 45% of participants agreed with the statement (see Table 4.7). This conflict between time devoted to work and time devoted to other priorities in life perhaps best illustrates the work-life balance struggle faced by many music educators.

Set Boundaries. Individuals with high work-life balance identified a variety of ways that they set boundaries to keep work from encroaching on their personal lives, such as compartmentalizing, setting limits, simplifying, and saying no. For some, compartmentalization simply meant not taking work home where it could interfere with other priorities. One orchestra director who earned a work-life balance score of 4.1 stated her strategy very simply: “Get it done before I go home.” For others, compartmentalization meant not working too late. They set limits on the amount of time they were willing to work outside the school day. An elementary general music teacher and choir director at the middle school and high school with one young child said she sets a time to go home and then refuses to look at school email at home. Another elementary band and general music teacher reported, “I just made the decision that at 4:00, my day is done and I will leave, period. There have been three occasions where I have stayed past my allotted time [...]” By committing to keeping work separate from home and setting time limits on work, these music educators ensured that their other priorities were not pushed aside.

Some high work-life balance individuals described specific steps they took to simplify their work and keep it from interfering with their personal lives. “I plan very far in advance and stay organized so I can spread the work out over time. I have also eliminated things that were not required that took a lot of time,” responded one band director and general music teacher who

earned a work-life balance score of 4.3. In a profession where time is limited, another strategy adopted by several music educators with high work-life balance is saying no. For example, one elementary general music teacher and band director at the middle school and high school stated, “I do not commit to teaching private lessons or after school music programs.” The strategies of simplifying work and saying no helped these individuals free up time for other priorities.

While analyzing the data in the survey, an interesting observation was made that provides further evidence regarding the strategy of simplifying work and saying no. Each participant was assigned a number in chronological order based on when they responded to the survey. A significant positive correlation ($r = 0.168$, $n = 345$, $p < 0.05$) was found between the number of hours spent on required duties outside the school day and the amount of time it took to respond to the email survey. In other words, those who spent more time working on required duties outside the school day tended to take longer to respond to the survey than individuals with fewer required hours. Though originally unintended, the discovery relates directly to how music educators manage their time at work. This correlation may reflect a lack of organization or a heavy workload, or it may provide support for the strategy of saying no and not allowing oneself to get caught up in the constant swarm of email distractions and other interruptions while at work. One has to wonder how many music educators simply deleted the email invitation to participate in this study because they were just too busy.

Resignation. In contrast to the high work-life balance strategy of setting boundaries, several individuals with low work-life balance described a feeling of resignation regarding their ability to make changes to improve their work-life balance. One middle school and high school band director with one young child at home simply wrote, “Honestly, I am not successful [at

keeping work from carrying over into my personal life]. I have no strategies to share.” Another band director with one young child and one grown child explained,

I don't have any [strategies for keeping work out of my personal life]. Even in my 20th year of teaching, I feel as though decisions that result in extra workload are made by administration without understanding, discussion or concern about workload on certain "special" teachers in the district.

Still another band director stated, “I can't [keep my work out of my personal life]. My work dictates my personal life. That's part of being a high school band director.” These last two band directors went further to explain the personal sacrifices they had made as a result of the demands placed on them by their jobs. One expressed guilt that her teaching had been affected by her personal life, while at the same time feeling guilty about not being able to devote enough time to her husband and children: “It feels as though I'm lowering my own standards and teaching expectations to have time for things in my personal life. I definitely feel as though my personal life and family have sacrificed for the job.” The other band director, a veteran with many years of experience, seemed to express regret at not being able to make time for a significant other in his life:

If you want a personal life, your significant other had better be a musician and a music educator, or you'd better do something else. If you want a spouse, find one that fits the bill EARLY in life. Once you start working there is little time for relationships. No one is going to put up with being married to a high school band director if they themselves aren't or haven't been "into it.”

As these individuals with low work-life balance scores illustrate, music educators with many required duties outside the school day may find it difficult to balance work with other priorities.

Marching band will not disappear. The musical pit and the orchestra concert will not go away either. By their nature, they are tied to the position and they often occur outside the school day. Though the additional hours might be compensated through a salary provision or supplemental pay, one has to decide whether the tradeoff is worth the cost of sacrificing other priorities.

For those who may be in a position with many required duties outside the school day, mental compartmentalization may be an effective boundary-setting strategy to adopt. Responses to the statement, “I don’t think about the hours I am putting in to complete my job requirements” showed the most significant positive correlation ($p < 0.01$) with work-life balance when compared with other variables measured in this study (see Table 4.20). Though perhaps due in part to experience or the importance of work as a personal priority for some individuals, this correlation may provide some support for the effectiveness of not thinking about work when engaged in a non-work activity as a means toward improving work-life balance. One band director with two young children who had a work-life balance score of 4.1 indicated that he leaves “everything at work both mentally and physically.” Another band, choir, and general music teacher with two young children explained the importance of the mental compartmentalization in her life:

I have learned to shut off when I leave, at least outwardly. There are always ideas, to-do lists, repertoire, brainstorming, and other musical things bouncing around my head when I leave, but I make it a point that when I'm home, I'm home. This is especially challenging, as my husband and I are the music department staff at the same school. For the sake of our children, school stuff gets left at school as much as possible. I try to always be in the moment with my kids, family, and friends; even if it is a mundane moment at that particular time. Too many directors get themselves divorces, ulcers and

heart attacks because they just won't mentally compartmentalize – it's a cost I'm not willing to pay, and my program is thriving using my current strategy.

Take Care of Yourself. The previous quote highlights the importance of “taking care of yourself” as another strategy commonly reported by individuals with high work-life balance. For example, many participants with high work-life balance described setting aside time in their schedules for non-work activities. One middle school and high school orchestra director younger than 30 stated: “I try to limit the amount of work I bring home. I also make deliberate plans to do non-work activities during the weekend or after school at least once a week.” Another unmarried elementary and middle school teacher of band, choir, and general music indicated that she leaves “part of one day each weekend totally free of work-related activity.”

For one middle school and high school choir director with high work-life balance, taking care of herself involves spending time with positive people and taking breaks from work:

Remember kids come first in the classroom and the teachers lounge is off limits. Usually the lounge is the “Vampire” room. They will suck the blood out of a teaching professional due to their constant need to criticize the students and/or the administration, parents, or colleagues. Make your lunchtime a special break time to revitalize with other similar instructors or some days just be by yourself. Surround yourself with positive and impactful people.

Though not measured by the *Time Management Behaviors Scale* (TMBS), taking breaks has been identified by some researchers as an important component of effective time management (Nelson, 2003).

Fewer individuals with low work-life balance reported strategies they use to take care of themselves (see Table 4.23). One high school band director explained, “I exercise when I can so

that I can get some benefit and try to participate in activities that don't remind me of work." An orchestra director with low work-life balance mentioned practicing "intentional breathing." For these individuals with low work-life balance, these strategies may have been implemented in response to signs of stress or potential burnout. The importance of taking care of yourself can be summed up in the words of one participant with high work-life balance: "A director who is too overworked and stressed cannot give their students their best."

Personal Sacrifice. In addition to personal sacrifices described in earlier responses regarding misplaced priorities, some sacrifices made by individuals with low work-life balance may actually lead to more harm than good. For example, one elementary general music teacher and band director at the middle school and high school level with low work-life balance reported, "I try to say that I am going to leave by a certain time each day, but it never happens. I usually stay until I am done, or too exhausted to work anymore." Another example of potentially harmful behavior can be found in responses by several individuals with low work-life balance who reported getting up "very early" to get work done at school. A middle school and high school orchestra director with two young children wrote, "I get up very early in the morning (4 am) to complete things when my family is asleep." Another middle school and elementary general music teacher with two young children stated, "I also come in very early (1-2 hours before my contracted arrival time) three or more times a week, because before school is one of the only times that I am guaranteed uninterrupted time to work." Though working outside the school day was not necessarily uncommon for individuals with high work-life balance, none of the high work-life balance participants mentioned getting up early as a strategy, let alone "very" early. Indeed, some individuals may prefer to work in the morning because they feel more productive; however, the qualifier "very" to describe how early these individuals with low work-

life balance were getting up suggests that they were getting up earlier than even they would prefer. These individuals may actually be doing themselves more harm by sacrificing sleep in order to go to school early and work. It is also possible that getting up “very” early is not necessarily a choice for some individuals with low work-life balance, but instead the result of difficulty sleeping due anxiety or stress.

Another example of “taking care of yourself” that individuals with low work-life balance may benefit from is enlisting the support of others. Many individuals with high work-life balance described the support they receive from other people in their lives or the personal strength they gain from spiritual sources. One middle school and high school band director with high work-life balance shared how she reached out to others for help earlier in her career when she needed it:

[Keeping work from carrying over into my personal life] was a major issue for me earlier in my career; counseling helped me to “live in the moment,” and let things go, or at least leave them at work until I can deal with them. I also have a strong spiritual life, which is undoubtedly the single greatest reason that I’m able to keep things in perspective [...]

Another huge asset that I have is a strong administration. I have outstanding support from my principal, assistant principal, and the head band director, so I never feel alone in dealing with any issues that might become stressful.

As a person who struggled with work-life balance early in her career, she suggests that music educators with low work-life balance may benefit from enlisting the support of others to address concerns as a strategy to take care of themselves.

Priorities Change. The ability of music educators to make changes to improve work-life balance alludes to the final theme common among individuals with high work-life balance -- the realization that priorities can change over time. In response to changing priorities, many

participants with high work-life balance found ways to reduce the amount of time they spent working outside the school day. The significant negative correlation ($p < 0.01$) between work-life balance scores and time spent working outside the school day (see Table 4.19) supports the effectiveness of decreasing time spent working outside the school day as a way to increase work-life balance. For many educators who are passionate about sharing music with youth people, reducing the amount of time devoted to work can be difficult. It may even seem wrong. For one band and general music teacher at the middle school and high school, it took a major life event for her to reduce the amount of time she was spending at work:

When I first started teaching, I was spending almost all my time on school related things. After I got married, I made a change to limit how much time outside of school I would spend. I prioritize and do as much as I can and if I need to do something at home then I leave school at school and try not to worry about it [...] When I was teaching band it was much harder to limit the time I spend outside of school but in my current position, it's not too bad. My husband is also a music teacher [...] and we have both agreed to limit our school work and put our family first.

Her response demonstrates how she took control of the situation when her priorities in life changed. Another participant with high work-life balance reported how changing jobs helped improve her work-life balance:

Until five years ago I was a full-time English and music teacher and spent hours after school rehearsing and preparing for concerts. Now I [teach English] part-time and assist the band teacher in three classes. As such the workload is greatly diminished and so I don't have the stress levels I did earlier in my teaching experience.

The relationship between time spent on other job-related tasks outside the school day and one's age, experience, and level of education provides additional support for the theme that priorities can change in life. Though novice teachers reported the greatest amount of time spent outside the school day on other job-related tasks, intermediate professionals reported a decrease in time spent outside the school day on job-related tasks in their 30s as they started raising a family or working toward an advanced degree, which gradually increased towards the end of their career. Being aware of the novice, intermediate, and veteran stages of one's career and accepting that priorities can change over the course of one's life may provide additional clues to addressing work-life balance concerns among music educators. This knowledge can lead music educators to take steps to mitigate the effects that major life events may have on work-life balance as they feel called to reallocate time to other priorities in their life.

Significant changes in one area of life may require changes in another area of life to respond to decreased levels of work-life balance. For example, the arrival of a new baby, though a joyous event, may require an individual to be home with family more often, due to the responsibilities and rewards of parenting. Another example of changing priorities occurs as music educators seek advanced degrees. Events like this may cause individuals to re-evaluate their priorities. Music educators with high work-life balance adopted new strategies to set boundaries by compartmentalizing, setting limits, simplifying, and saying no. Though individuals with low work-life balance expressed misplaced priorities and difficulty setting boundaries or saying no, high work-life balance individuals may have found it easier to say "no" because they had a stronger "yes."

Sometimes the strongest "no" a music educator can give to address low work-life balance is to leave the profession. Although attrition has been identified as a concern in the education

profession as whole, quitting is one option that has been exercised by several music educators in response to work overload and burnout. Upon leaving the profession, these individuals may experience increased levels of work-life balance. Support for this position can be found in the significant negative correlation ($p < 0.01$) between work-life balance scores and responses to the statement, “I am thinking about changing my career choice” (see Table 4.20). This relationship suggests that, for some music educators, changing careers may be an effective response to low work-life balance. One participant with a work-life balance score of 4.3 explained the positive effects of deciding to quit her job: “Quitting my job as a high school choir director was key in my overall happiness at home, at school, etc.”

For individuals with low work-life balance committed to staying in the music profession, the strategies of high work-life balance music educators can provide guidance toward improving work-life balance. One response by an elementary, middle, and high school choir director and general music teacher with high work-life balance demonstrates how all of the strategies identified in this study can work together:

Now that I have two small children, I have definitely made a more conscious decision to leave my work at work. I used to be MUCH more stressed out but made some difficult decisions to stop doing all my supplemental positions. If I had taken this survey a year ago while I had one child and was also assisting with the competition marching band, the stress of my job and the carry over to stresses at home was much higher. After meeting with administrators to explain the need to eliminate some of these stresses for my own mental health and to feel as though I was giving my home/family life the time it deserved, changes have been made that have helped my job be more manageable. There are definitely times of the year that are more hectic and stressful due to the amount of

additional time needed on weekends or after school for various rehearsals and events, but overall I feel I have reached a healthy balance. So I guess my personal strategies involve knowing my limits and setting them firmly to ensure my family/personal life does not suffer at the hands of my job.

By identifying priorities, setting boundaries, taking care of themselves, and taking control of the situation when priorities change, music educators can improve their work-life balance.

Limitations of the Study

This study had several limitations. Individuals self-selected to participate in the study. In a profession where time is limited, some music educators may have been too busy to complete the survey. Having more beginning teachers would have benefited the study. The sample population could have been more diversified among subject areas in music as well. The population sample seemed to include a large subgroup of band directors who may have been more interested in a study regarding time management and work-life balance than music educators in areas with fewer required duties outside the school day.

The survey design was self-report and included several questions asking participants to estimate the amount of time spent on certain tasks outside the school day. Though specific instructions were given to assist participants with those calculations, no attempt was made to verify the accuracy of the responses.

Because this study only involved K-12 music educators in Ohio, the results may not be generalizable to other populations. No comparison group was used to determine whether work-life balance scores were accurate measures of the work-life balance construct. Data presented may be cautiously compared to other studies involving work-life balance and quality of life.

Suggestions for Future Research

This study focused on K-12 music educators in Ohio. To improve the generalizability of these results, future research in the areas of time management and work-life balance could involve music educators in higher education, non-music educators, and individuals from across the United States. Differences among state requirements or the environment of higher education may influence the workload of music educators in other settings. Surveying non-music educators could provide valuable information for educators in a variety of subject areas outside of music.

Participants in this study from smaller school districts indicated that they have a greater workload than teachers from larger districts due to smaller budgets and limited staffing. Future studies could include questions regarding size of school district, location of school district (urban, suburban, rural), size of school, size of music program, and size of music staff. These factors may influence workload of music educators and provide additional information regarding time spent at work.

The main purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between time management and work-life balance for music educators. Future studies could address the relationship between time management and other variables for music educators. Other variables affected by time management may include health, stress, or job satisfaction. Nelson (2003) studied the relationship between health disorders and time management among college students. Other studies have used the *Teacher Concerns Inventory* (TCI) to measure the stress of educators (Hasty, 2007; Hedden, 2005). Using the TCI in conjunction with the *Time Management Behavior Scale* (TMBS) may reveal significant relationships between time management and stress levels for music educators.

Future studies could address the relationship between perceived control of time (PCT) and work-life balance for music educators. This study did not measure the PCT of participants using the corresponding subscale in the TMBS because it had been identified as an outcome of time management behaviors and not a time management behavior in itself (Macan, 1994). Measuring the PCT of music educators in this study could support this theory, given that the music educators in this study who spent the most time at on work also earned the highest scores on the TMBS.

Time management literature seems to be limiting itself to a few select methods for measuring the time management construct (Claessens et al., 2007), though each method seems to define and measure time management differently. Future research in the area of time management should address other potential dimensions of time management such as delegation and taking breaks, as suggested by Nelson (2003). Definitions and theoretical models of time management should be revised and improved. Nelson attempted to accomplish this task, but his work has not received much traction among other researchers studying time management.

Researchers studying work-life balance should develop a tool for measuring work-life balance based upon a theoretical model of work-life balance. A factor analysis of a survey instrument designed to measure work-life balance may reveal several dimensions within work-life balance construct, assisting with definitions and revisions of a theoretical model of work-life balance. Using a tool to measure work-life balance, future research could study the relationship between other variables and work-life balance. Nonis et al. (2011) studied the relationship between personality traits, time management, and job performance among salespeople. Researchers in that study measured the personality traits of dispositional optimism and locus of control using the *Life-Orientation Test* developed by Scheier and Carver (1987) and Spector's

(1988) work locus of control scale, respectively. These tools could be used in conjunction with a tool to measure work-life balance to study the relationship between personality traits and work-life balance.

The present study used correlation as the basis for the statistical analysis. Future studies could use a regression analysis to identify predictors of positive work-life balance for music educators. Variables that correlate strongly with work-life balance, but not necessarily with each other, may provide insight for music educators to make changes to increase work-life balance. A regression analysis could take the results of this study further by using those variables to predict work-life balance for music educators. The variables identified from the regression analysis could be used as the basis for an experimental study among music educators to improve work-life balance. Music educators experiencing work overload or at risk of burnout could benefit from research that identifies variables to alleviate stress and improve work-life balance.

Implications for Music Education

The intent of this study was to examine the time management behaviors and work-life balance of K-12 music educators. To that end, results may provide a starting point toward addressing concerns of attrition among music teachers, developing solutions to avoid burnout, and better preparing preservice teachers for the realities of teaching music.

Studies have suggested time management training as a way to relieve work overload for music educators. Results of this study suggest that maintaining an organized workspace may be the most effective time management strategy for music educators to reduce time spent on required duties outside the school day. Other dimensions of time management such as mechanics of time management (MTM) and setting of goals and priorities (SGP) may develop in response to excessive workload, but do not reflect reduced hours spent on other job-related tasks.

Music educators should be mindful of the number of hours they spend working outside the school day. Individuals experiencing signs of burnout or stress should take steps to alleviate work overload. Strategies for reducing time spent working outside the school day include maintaining an organized workspace, delegating tasks to others, simplifying work, setting a time limit for going home, and saying no. Excessive hours spent on work outside the school day may contribute to low levels of work-life balance for individuals who end up sacrificing other non-work priorities.

Music educators with low work-life balance can take control of the situation and set boundaries to keep work from carrying over into their personal life. Making changes should occur gradually and be considered with input from all parties affected. Leaving work at school, not checking school email at home, and practicing mental compartmentalization may assist music educators in focusing on non-work priorities when away from school. Most importantly, music educators should know their limits, take care of themselves, and avoid adopting harmful coping strategies to deal with work overload.

Music educators should review their allocation of time regularly to determine if they are devoting enough attention to their priorities. Individuals who feel that they are not able to balance their work priorities with their non-work priorities, should enlist the support of others to identify potential solutions to relieve work demands outside the school day. Administrators should ensure that music educators have a reasonable workload, especially when assigning required duties outside the school day. Duties should be reassigned or reduced to alleviate work overload. Additional full-time or part-time staff could be hired to assist with a heavy workload. Scheduling could be adjusted to provide additional planning time during the school day.

Music educators should not feel guilty if their priorities change over the course of their teaching career. Life happens. Priorities change. Putting family or other non-work obligations ahead of work is not a sign of a bad music teacher. Changing teaching assignments, taking a job with another school district, or leaving the profession is not a sign of weakness. Individuals should be encouraged to find the job that is the right fit for their life. Staying in a position to the detriment of one's health and happiness is not worth the money or the regret at having missed out on the most important priorities in life. One choir director who earned a work-life balance score of 4.2 provided the following advice for anyone struggling with work-life balance as a music educator:

Remember that your music job is what you do to pay your bills. Yes a music job is your passion or you wouldn't do it because the pay certainly doesn't match the hourly scale; however, the personal rewards of giving students a life skill of music will far outweigh the bad days[...] Don't sweat the small stuff. Life is too short. Don't give away a minute of time with your family because you "need" to grade papers or clean the band room. It will still wait a day.

Music educators struggling with work-life balance need not abandon hope in the quest to balance work and non-work priorities. Though improvement in work-life balance is likely to be a gradual process, adopting high work-life balance strategies can pave the way for longevity in the profession and still make room for the most important priorities in a music educator's life.

REFERENCES

- Abebe, S., & HaileMariam, A. (2011). Teacher stressors and potential remedies from pre-service teachers' and cooperating teachers' perspectives. *Eastern Education Journal*, 40(1), 64-74.
- Boixadós, M., Pousada, M., Bueno, J., & Valiente, L. (2009). Quality of life questionnaire: Psychometric properties and relationships to healthy behavioral patterns. *Open Psychology Journal*, 2, 49-57.
- Bond, M. J., & Feather, N. T. (1988). Some correlates of structure and purpose in the use of time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(2), 321.
- Britton, B. K., & Tesser, A. (1991). Effects of time-management practices on college grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83(3), 405-410.
- Campbell, M. R., & Thompson, L. K. (2007). Perceived concerns of preservice music education teachers: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 55(2), 162-176.
- Claessens, B. J., Van Eerde, W., Rutte, C. G., & Roe, R. A. (2007). A review of the time management literature. *Personnel Review*, 36(2), 255-276.
- Daniels, L., & McCarraher, L. (2000). *The Work-life Manual: Gaining a Competitive Edge by Balancing the Demands of Employees' Work and Home Lives*. Industrial Society.
- Delina, G., & Raya, R. P. (2013). A study on work-life balance in working women. *International Journal of Commerce, Business Management*, 2(5), 274-282.
- Dex, S., & Bond, S. (2005). Measuring work-life balance and its covariates. *Work, Employment & Society*, 19(3), 627-637.

- Dorovolomo, J., Phan, H. P., & Maebuta, J. (2010). Quality lesson planning and quality delivery: Do they relate? *International Journal of Learning*, 17(3).
- Downey, R. G., Whitney, D. E., and Wefald, A. J. (2008). Burnout. Parrillo, V. N. (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Social Problems* (1, 102-104.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Driscoll, D. L. (2011). Introduction to primary research: Observations, surveys, and interviews. In C. Lowe & P. Zemliansky (eds.) *Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing* (vol. 2, pp. 153-174). Anderson, SC: Parlor Press LLC.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Grawitch, M. J., Barber, L. K., & Justice, L. (2010). Rethinking the work-life interface: It's not about balance, it's about resource allocation. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 2(2), 127-159.
- Hamann, D. L. and Gordon, D. G. (2000). Burnout: An Occupational Hazard. *Music Educators Journal*, 87, 34-39.
- 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(2), 130-144.
- Hancock, C. B. (2009). National estimates of retention, migration, and attrition: A multiyear comparison of music and non-music teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 57(2), 92-107.

- Hasty, R. E. (2007). *Teacher Attrition: The Relationship Between Teachers' Stress and Their Intentions to Leave Their Current Positions* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pheonix).
- Hedden, D. G. (2005). A study of stress and its manifestations among music educators. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 57-67.
- Heston, M. L., Dedrick, C., Raschke, D., & Whitehead, J. (1996). Job satisfaction and stress among band directors. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 44(4), 319-327.
- Howard, S. E. (2006). *Career satisfaction and resilience among Oklahoma band directors* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma).
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2002). The teacher shortage: A case of wrong diagnosis and wrong prescription. *NASSP bulletin*, 86(631), 16-31.
- Kersaint, G., Lewis, J., Potter, R., & Meisels, G. (2007). Why teachers leave: Factors that influence retention and resignation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 775-794.
- Lane, J. S., & Talbert, M. D. (2013). Examining lesson plan use among instrumental music education majors during practice teaching. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*. doi:10.1177/1057083713514979.
- Le Roux, B., & Van Niekerk, C. (2009). Music teacher burnout: How do we cope with it? (University of Pretoria Library Services Institutional Repository).
- Macan, T. H. (1994). Time management: Test of a process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(3), 381-391.
- Macan, T. H., Shahani, C., Dipboye, R. L., & Phillips, A. P. (1990). College students' time management: Correlations with academic performance and stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(4), 760-768.

- McLain, B. P. (2005). Environmental support and music teacher burnout. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 71-84.
- Miksza, P., Roeder, M., & Biggs, D. (2010). Surveying Colorado band directors' opinions of skills and characteristics important to successful music teaching. *Journal of research in Music Education*, 57(4), 364-381.
- Mudrack, P. E. (1997). The structure of perceptions of time. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57(2), 222-240.
- Murray, R. R. (2011). *Instructional Planning and Rehearsal Practices of Three Selected High School Band Directors* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi).
- Nantz, Q. L. (1993). The use of teacher planning time in a comprehensive American high school. (Dissertations from ProQuest. No. 3095).
- Nelson, K. G. (2003). *The Hawaii Time Management Scale and Health Related Behaviors* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii at Manoa).
- Nonis, S. A., Fenner, G. H., & Sager, J. K. (2011). Revisiting the relationship between time management and job performance. *World Journal of Management*, 3(2), 153-171.
- Peeters, M. A. G., & Rutte, C. G. (2005). Time management behavior as a moderator for the job demand-control interaction. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(1), 64-75.
doi:10.1037/1076-8998.10.1.64
- Ruíz, M. Á., & Baca, E. (1993). Design and validation of the "Quality of Life Questionnaire" ("Cuestionario de Calidad de Vida", CCV): A generic health-related perceived quality of life instrument. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*.
- Scheib, J. W. (2002). *Roles, Expectations, and Tension in the Professional Life of the School Music Teacher: A Collective Case Study*. University of Wisconsin--Madison.

- 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(2), 124-136.
- Scheib, J. W. (2004). Why band directors leave: From the mouths of maestros. *Music Educators Journal*, 91(1), 53-57.
- Scheib, J. W. (2007). School personnel role-related tension and job satisfaction. *Roles, Identify, Socialization, and Conflict: The Transition from Music Student to Music Teacher (A Literature Review)*, 50-68.
- Schmidt, M. (2005). Preservice string teachers' lesson-planning processes: An exploratory study. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 53(1), 6-25. doi: 10.1177/002242940505300102
- Stern, A. and Cox, J. (1993). Burnout: The Dull Reality. *Music Educators Journal*, 80, 33-36 + 49.
- Stoilov, T. (2012). Time Management.
- Teachout, D. J. (1997). Preservice and experienced teachers' opinions of skills and behaviors important to successful music teaching. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45(1), 41-50.
- Wolf, M. A. (2002). *Teacher time: A study of time and tasks required to complete job related work* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia).
- Woolfolk, R. L., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1986). Time management: An experimental investigation. *Journal of School Psychology*, 24(3), 267-275. doi:10.1016/0022-4405(86)90059-2



Implied Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research

Title of Project: An Examination of the Time Management Behaviors and Work-Life Balance of K-12 Music Educators

Principal Investigator: Scott Bley
Masters Candidate, Music Education
Bowling Green State University
1031 Moore Musical Arts Center
Bowling Green, OH 43403-0290
785-342-7943
sbley@bgsu.edu

Advisor: Elizabeth Menard, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Music Education
Bowling Green State University
1031 Moore Musical Arts Center
Bowling Green, OH 43403-0290
419-372-2625
emenard@bgsu.edu

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to examine the time management behaviors and work-life balance of K-12 music educators. As part of my research, I hope to find out what strategies music educators use to complete their job-related tasks and still maintain a positive work-life balance. There are no rewards or course credits given for the completion of this survey.

Procedure: You will be asked to complete a brief demographic questionnaire. Then, you will be asked to respond to a series of statements related to your time management behaviors, work-life balance, as well as 3 open-ended questions. Upon completing the survey, your participation in the study will be complete. Your involvement in the study will be about 15-20 minutes.

Voluntary Nature: Your participation is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw at any time. You may decide to skip questions or discontinue participation at any time without penalty. Deciding to participate or not will not affect your relationship with Bowling Green State University or your job.

Confidentiality/Anonymity Protection: The survey responses will be stored anonymously online and protected with a password. My advisor and I will have access to the data. Because some employers use tracking software, you may want to complete your survey on a personal computer. You are also reminded not to leave the survey open if using a public computer or a computer others may have access to and to clear your browser cache and page history after completing the survey.

Risks: The anticipated risks to you are no greater than those normally encountered in daily life.

Contact Information: Please contact Scott Bley (785-342-7943, sbley@bgsu.edu) or Dr. Elizabeth Menard (419-372-2625, emenard@bgsu.edu) if you have any questions about the research or your

participation in the research. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Review Board at 419-372-7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu, if you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research. Thank you for your time.

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study. Completion and return of the research survey indicates that you have read the information in this form and consent to take part in the research.

Please print this form to keep for your records or future reference.

APPENDIX B. SURVEY OF THE TIME MANAGEMENT BEHAVIORS AND
WORK-LIFE BALANCE OF K-12 MUSIC EDUCATORS



Bowling Green State University

**Survey of the Time Management Behaviors and Work-Life Balance of
K-12 Music Educators**

Section 1 - Demographics

1. Are you currently employed as a music educator at the elementary, middle school, or high school level?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
2. How many years have you been employed as a music educator?
3. What is your gender:
 - a. Female
 - b. Male
4. What is your age?
5. What is highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
 - a. Bachelors
 - b. Bachelors +
 - c. Masters
 - d. Masters +
 - e. Doctorate
6. Which of the following best describes your current relationship status?
 - a. Married
 - b. Widowed
 - c. Divorced
 - d. Separated
 - e. In a domestic partnership or civil union
 - f. Single, but cohabiting with a significant other
 - g. Single, never married
7. Does your spouse or significant other currently work, or not?
 - a. Yes, he or she does
 - b. No, he or she does not

8. Do you have any children?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
9. How many children under 18 do you have?
10. How many children aged 18 or older do you have?

Section 2 - Job Requirements

11. In which setting do you teach primarily?
 - a. Public School
 - b. Private School
 - c. Other (please specify): _____
12. What classes do you currently teach? *(Mark all that apply.)*
 - a. Band – Elementary
 - b. Band - Middle/Jr. High
 - c. Band - High School
 - d. Orchestra – Elementary
 - e. Orchestra - Middle/Jr. High
 - f. Orchestra - High School
 - g. Choir - Middle/Jr. High
 - h. Choir - High School
 - i. General Music – Elementary
 - j. General Music - Middle/Jr. High
 - k. Music Theory/Appreciation - High School
 - l. Other (please specify): _____
13. Is your position salaried or hourly?
 - a. Salary
 - b. Hourly
14. Which benefits are you eligible to receive in your position? *(Please mark all that apply.)*
 - a. Health Insurance
 - b. Retirement Plan
 - c. Other (please specify): _____
15. How long is your contracted school day? *(Please calculate from the time you are required to arrive until the time you are allowed to leave at the end of the day.)*
16. How many planning time minutes do you receive each WEEK? *(Planning time includes non-instructional time during the school day that you are given to prepare for classes. Do not include time spent eating, traveling, or in meetings.)*

17. What duties *outside the school day* are required of your position? (*Mark all that apply.*)
- a. Marching Band
 - b. Pep / Athletic Band
 - c. Glee Club
 - d. Show Choir
 - e. Private Lessons
 - f. Jazz Band
 - g. Musical / Pit Orchestra
 - h. Other (please specify): _____
18. In a typical WEEK, how many hours do you estimate that you spend completing duties *outside the school day* that are required of your position (i.e. duties you identified in the previous question)?
19. In a typical WEEK, how many hours do you estimate that you spend completing other job-related tasks (administrative tasks, paperwork, grading, lesson preparation, etc.) *outside the school day*?
20. Evaluate the following statements. (*5 - Strongly Agree, 4 - Agree, 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 1 - Strongly Disagree*)
- a. I put in more hours than other people in similar positions.
 - b. I need to cut back on the amount of time I spend on job-related tasks.
 - c. I need to find ways to complete my job-related tasks more efficiently.
 - d. I don't think about the hours I am putting in to complete my job requirements.
 - e. I am thinking about changing my career choice.
 - f. I am adequately compensated for the amount of time I spend on job-related tasks.
21. What other employment do you have in addition to your teaching? (*Please mark all that apply.*)
- a. I have no other employment outside of teaching.
 - b. Military - Guard / Reserve
 - c. Church - Musician / Choir Director
 - d. Private Lesson Studio
 - e. Other (please specify): _____

Section 3 - Time Management Survey

22. Evaluate the following statements. (5 - *Very Often True*, 4 - *Frequently True*, 3 - *True about as often as not*, 2 - *Occasionally True*, 1 - *Seldom True*)

- a. I carry an appointment book with me.
- b. I carry a notebook to jot down notes and ideas.
- c. I keep a daily log of my activities.
- d. I write down notes to remind myself of what I need to do.
- e. I make a list of things to do each day and check off each task as it is accomplished.
- f. I set priorities to determine the order in which I will perform tasks each day.
- g. During a workday, I evaluate how well I am following the schedule I have set down for myself.
- h. I set deadlines for myself when I set out to accomplish a task.
- i. I set short-term goals for what I want to accomplish in a few days or weeks.
- j. When I decide on what I will try to accomplish in the short term, I keep in mind my long-term objectives.
- k. I review my goals to determine if they need revising.
- l. I break complex, difficult projects down into smaller manageable tasks.
- m. When I am somewhat disorganized I am better able to adjust to unexpected events.
- n. I have some of my most creative ideas when I am disorganized.
- o. I can find the things I need for my work more easily when my workspace is messy and disorganized than when it is neat and organized.

Section 4 - Work-Life Balance

23. Evaluate the following statements. (5 - *Strongly Agree*, 4 - *Agree*, 3 - *Neither Agree Nor Disagree*, 2 - *Disagree*, 1 - *Strongly Disagree*)

- a. I feel like I work long hours.
- b. I have to take work home most evenings
- c. I often work late or on the weekend to deal with paperwork without interruptions.
- d. Relaxing and forgetting about work issues is hard to do.
- e. I worry about the effect of work stress on my health.
- f. Finding time for hobbies, leisure activities, or to maintain friendships and extended family relationships is difficult.
- g. I would like to reduce my working hours and stress levels, but feel I have no control over the current situation.
- h. I am able to balance my personal and professional life well.
- i. As a music teacher, my biggest challenge is work-life balance.
- j. In general, my level of satisfaction towards my quality of life is good.
- k. I have enough time to relax and enjoy myself every day.
- l. At the end of the working day, I feel so tired that all I want to do is rest.
- m. I currently have too much work to do.
- n. My work leaves me enough free time for other things that I want to do.
- o. I am able to pursue enjoyable activities outside of work.
- p. I am permanently tense as a result of my work.
- q. Work-related problems or concerns prevent me from enjoying my free time.

Section 5 - Open-Ended Questions

24. What personal strategies do you use to make the most use of your time when completing job requirements?
25. What personal strategies do you use to keep your work from carrying over into your personal life?