

Review of Educational Research

<http://rer.aera.net>

Retaining Teachers of Color: A Pressing Problem and a Potential Strategy for "Hard-to-Staff" Schools

Betty Achinstein, Rodney T. Ogawa, Dena Sexton and Casia Freitas
REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH 2010 80: 71
DOI: 10.3102/0034654309355994

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://rer.sagepub.com/content/80/1/71>

Published on behalf of



American Educational Research Association

and



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Review of Educational Research* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://rer.aera.net/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://rer.aera.net/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.aera.net/reprints>

Permissions: <http://www.aera.net/permissions>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Mar 24, 2010

[What is This?](#)

Downloaded from <http://rer.aera.net> at STANFORD UNIV on May 29, 2012

Retaining Teachers of Color: A Pressing Problem and a Potential Strategy for “Hard-to-Staff” Schools

Betty Achinstein, Rodney T. Ogawa, and Dena Sexton
University of California, Santa Cruz

Casia Freitas
New Teacher Center

Given calls to diversify the teaching workforce, this review examines research on retention and turnover of teachers of color, focusing on new teachers because they leave at disproportionately high rates. Reviewing 70 studies, the authors found that (a) recent national studies identify turnover rates for teachers of color are now higher than those for White teachers; (b) policy-amenable school-level conditions related to financial, human, social, and cultural capital can affect retention; (c) teachers of color are more likely than Whites to work and remain in “hard-to-staff” urban schools with high proportions of students from low-income and nondominant racial and cultural communities; and (d) factors affecting the retention of teachers of color can contribute to staffing urban schools with quality teachers, including teachers’ humanistic commitments, innovative approaches in the professional preparation of teachers of color, and the presence of multicultural capital in schools.

KEYWORDS: teachers of color, retention, diversity, new teachers.

In explaining the need to increase the racial and cultural diversity of the teacher workforce in the United States, educators and policymakers cite a “demographic imperative” to counter the disparity between the racial and cultural backgrounds of students and teachers and address concerns about a predominantly White teaching workforce (Banks, 1995; Cochran-Smith, 2004b; Dilworth, 1992).¹ Nationally, people of color represent 40.0% of the student population in public schools, whereas only 17.0% of public school teachers are people of color. Public school teachers of color are 7.9% Black, 6.2% Hispanic, 1.3% Asian, 0.7% Multiple Races, 0.5% American Indian or Alaska Native, and 0.2% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2004).² An underlying assumption of the demographic imperative is that in a pluralistic society it is problematic that public school students (students of color and White students alike) experience a primarily White teaching population (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Villegas & Irvine, 2009). Such an argument is

sometimes linked to equity of professional opportunities for people of color to remedy the ethnic/racial gap within a labor market.

Proponents of increasing the diversity of the teacher workforce also cite a “democratic imperative,” which highlights the failure of schools to serve the educational needs of students of color as evidenced in an achievement and retention gap between White students and students of color (Haycock, 2001). Some assumptions behind this second imperative are that teachers of color may be suited to teaching students of color because of a potential understanding of the cultural experiences of these learners and the possibility of promoting culturally responsive teaching, supporting cultural synchronicity, and building cultural bridges from home to school for learners (Irvine, 1988; Villegas & Irvine, 2009; Villegas & Lucas, 2004). Proponents of the democratic imperative cite an emerging body of research, which suggests that teachers of color can produce more favorable academic results on standardized test scores, attendance, retention, advanced-level course enrollment, and college-going rates for students of color than White colleagues (Clewell, Puma, & McKay, 2005; Dee, 2004; Ehrenberg & Brewer, 1995; England & Meier, 1986; Evans, 1992; Hanushek, 1992; Hanushek, Kain, O’Brien, & Rivkin, 2005; Haycock, 2001; Klopfenstein, 2005; Villegas & Davis, 2008; Villegas & Irvine, 2009). It is important to note that advocates of increasing diversity in the teacher workforce who cite the demographic and democratic imperatives do not claim White teachers cannot be effective teachers of students of color, that employment segregation should be promoted, or that all teachers of color are effective with students of color. Yet proponents claim the demographic discrepancy between the racial and cultural backgrounds of teachers and students may contribute to the democratic failure to provide students of color with opportunities to learn (Banks, 1995; Cochran-Smith, 2004b; Dilworth, 1992).

The focus of policies targeting the overall shortage of teachers and the underrepresentation of teachers of color has turned from recruitment to retention because studies reveal a “revolving door” through which large numbers of teachers leave their jobs before retirement (Ingersoll, 2003, 2004). The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF, 2003) concluded that shortages in the teacher workforce were primarily caused by attrition. In national analyses, teachers most commonly reported that their reason for school departure was job dissatisfaction rather than retirement, staffing actions, family or personal reasons, and pursuing other jobs (Ingersoll, 2001b; Ingersoll & Connor, 2009). Retirement accounts for only 12% of turnover among teachers of color nationally (Ingersoll & Connor, 2009). Turnover is particularly acute among new teachers and teachers of color, with up to 50% of new teachers leaving within 5 years (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Ingersoll, 2002). A recent national study revealed that teachers of color suffered greater job dissatisfaction and higher turnover than did White teachers (Ingersoll & Connor, 2009). Thus, the retention of teachers of color, with a particular focus on new teachers, is critical to increasing their representation in the teacher workforce.

In addition to enhancing the diversity of the teaching profession, increasing retention rates among teachers of color might contribute to solving the workforce problem confronting “hard-to-staff” schools. The NCTAF (2003) noted that teacher turnover is most pronounced in urban schools with larger numbers of “poor and minority students” (p. 387). The instructional quality, resources, stability, and curriculum coherence of these schools suffer because teacher turnover exacts

instructional, financial, and organizational costs on the schools and/or districts that are exited (S. M. Johnson, Berg, & Donaldson, 2005; Shields, Humphrey, Wechsler, Riehl, Tiffany-Morales, Woodworth, Young, & Price, 2001). Research indicates that higher proportions of teachers of color work and remain in hard-to-staff schools compared to White colleagues, suggesting that the stability and quality of the teacher workforce in urban schools might be enhanced by increasing retention rates among teachers of color (Adams & Dial, 1993; Darling-Hammond, Dilworth, & Bullmaster, 1996; Hanushek, Kain, & Rivkin, 2004; Harris & Associates, 1998; King, 1993; Kirby, Berends, & Naftel, 1999). Thus, the retention of teachers of color may be a strategy for addressing the problem of hard-to-staff schools. Alternatively, it also raises an equity challenge when teachers of color tend to work and remain in schools that may have unsupportive working conditions. This could reproduce the historic pattern of unequal access to resources experienced by people of color in U.S. schools.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this review is twofold. The *general* purpose is to examine research on the turnover and retention of teachers of color, with a focus on new teachers who are most likely to leave the profession. An *instrumental* purpose is to identify factors that affect the retention of teachers of color and can be changed by policy or administrative action to increase the representation of teachers of color, who can promote learning opportunities for students of color. To pursue these purposes, we seek to answer two basic questions: (a) What are the rates of turnover and retention among teachers of color? (b) What factors affect the turnover and retention of teachers of color?

We begin by describing the methods we employed to conduct this review, indicating the sources and procedures we used to identify studies, reporting the inclusion criteria we applied, and noting the review's limitations. We briefly discuss terminology regarding race and ethnicity, before outlining the frame and related literature that guided and focused the review. We summarize research on retention and turnover in the overall teacher workforce to provide points of comparison for the findings of research on turnover among teachers of color. We then report the findings of our review of the retention and turnover of teachers of color and factors that influence these workforce dynamics. We discuss conclusions drawn from the review, highlighting the policy amenable conditions that affect the retention and turnover of teachers of color. We close with implications for research, policy, and practice, with a spotlight on remedying the problem of hiring and retaining high-quality teachers in hard-to-staff schools.

Method

Literature Search

To identify studies for inclusion in this review, we began by examining existing reviews of research on teachers of color (e.g., Darling-Hammond et al., 1996; Gay, Dings, & Jackson, 2003; Quijcho & Rios, 2000; Torres, Santos, Peck, & Cortes, 2004; Villegas & Davis, 2008). We then conducted extensive online searches of numerous databases, including Education Resources Information Center, Education: A SAGE Full-Text Collection, PsycARTICLES, PsycINFO, Psychology: A SAGE Full-Text Collection, Sociological Abstracts, and Sociology: A SAGE Full-Text Collection.

Keyword search terms (looking across whole documents) were combined to locate research relevant to new teachers of color concerning induction, socialization, and retention. This revealed a small number of studies. Thus, to cast a broader net, we used multiple descriptors for (a) new teachers (e.g., *new teacher*, *beginning teacher*, and *novice*) and (b) teachers of color (e.g., *teachers of color*, *minority teachers*, *racial minority teacher*, *teacher ethnicity*), including terms for specific ethnic or racial subgroups (e.g., *African American*, *Black*, *Latina/o*, *Asian American*, *Native American*, *Filipino*, *Pacific Islander*). Multiple terms to denote teachers of color and ethnic or racial subgroups were combined with terms for teacher retention (e.g., *retention*, *attrition*, *turnover*, *persistence*), induction (e.g., *induction*, *mentor*, *support*), and teacher socialization. Because we considered how retention was affected by individual and organizational levels, we employed descriptors for (a) teacher background (*teacher socialization*, *biography*, *identity*, *teacher identity*, *teacher belief*, *teacher education*, *teacher preparation*, *pathways*) and (b) school organizations (*institution*, *school context*, *school culture*, *work*, *working conditions*, *school organization*, *community*, *teacher culture*). Using these more specific descriptors, we returned to all online databases. Searches included both published and unpublished documents. These searches located more than 3,400 documents. We supplemented these documents with others that were recommended by colleagues or were referenced in initial documents.

Inclusion Criteria

The four members of our research team worked together to identify three selection criteria for inclusion in the review: (a) reported an empirical study, (b) adhered to the American Educational Research Association's (2006) published standards for reporting on empirical social science research,³ and (c) informed an important aspect of retention of new teachers of color, such as retention rates and turnover factors. Two members of our research team then worked together in coming to a consensus on the specific studies included by reviewing abstracts and narrowing the selection to 70 documents based on the three above-mentioned criteria. For example, we excluded program evaluations that lacked descriptions of data sources and research methods, documents that speculated about retention factors but lacked empirical warrants, and studies that identified recruitment but not retention issues.

We emphasized relatively recent studies, highlighting research conducted in the United States. We did include earlier studies that continue to inform research on the topic and non-U.S. studies on teachers from nondominant cultural or linguistic communities. Because we found relatively few studies that directly focus on retention of new teachers of color, we reviewed many studies that address related topics such as experienced teachers of color. We also sought foundational studies on teacher retention and socialization in the overall teacher workforce (e.g., the work of Richard Ingersoll and Susan Moore Johnson). To provide a frame for our review and summarize research on turnover and retention in the overall teacher workforce, we drew heavily on Borman and Dowling's (2008) recent meta-analysis.

This review is limited by two related patterns: the predominance of research on the retention and induction of the general teacher workforce (without disaggregating by race/ethnicity) and the relative absence of studies that examine the intersection of socialization and retention of new teachers of color. Furthermore, the studies we cite have some methodological limitations along with some benefits. Many of the studies utilize the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and the

Teacher Follow-Up Study (TFS) administered by the National Center for Educational Statistics. These data sets enable researchers to analyze data from a large, representative national sample of teachers. Moreover, these data reflect actual retention and turnover behaviors for movers, leavers, and stayers rather than teachers' intentions. Five independent cycles of these surveys have been completed: the first from 1987 to 1989 and the most recent from 2003 to 2005. Thus, researchers can make cross-year comparisons. However, the TFS provides only a 1-year follow-up and thus does not enable research to account for temporary leavers who return to the profession (Murnane & Schwidene, 1989), nor do many studies that analyzed this data base identify shifters who remain in the profession but take on different roles. The findings of regional studies, some of which employ multiple data sets, can illuminate variations across geographic contexts but cannot be generalized to the nation's teacher workforce. Many of the studies cited here are case studies that provide richly textured depictions of teachers' lived experiences and thus contribute to developing theory and generating new questions; however, they do not yield generalizable results.

Clarifying Terminology

In this review we use the term *teachers of color* because it is a more contemporary description than the term *minority*, given shifting demographics in the United States. As Nieto (2000) notes, the term *people of color* describes groups such as African Americans, Asian Americans, American Indians, and Latinos, emerged from the communities themselves, and "implies important connections among the groups and underlines some common experiences" (p. 30). However, the existence of connections does not equate to a uniform experience. Our intention is not to treat groups as homogeneous. We further recognize that even within subgroups a single label, such as *Latino*, encompasses considerable variety. Any particular term fails to capture differences of class, national origin, immigration status, gender, language, and the like. However, although drawing conclusions about teachers of color from research on specific subgroups runs the risk of overgeneralizing, patterns that cut across subgroups can be informative.

Framework and Related Literature

The framework that guided this review was informed by empirical research on teacher turnover and retention in the general teacher workforce, which highlights how (a) teachers' personal and professional backgrounds and (b) organizational factors influence teacher workplace decisions. We organized factors that influence retention by dimensions that emerged from this general literature. For example, under teacher background we include personal characteristics and experiences, home communities, career phases, and pathways of professional preparation and certification. In addition, patterns in the general teacher workforce provide telling points of comparison for findings of research on turnover among a subpopulation—teachers of color.

Types and Rates of Overall Teacher Turnover

Teacher turnover presents a major challenge to building and maintaining the teacher workforce in the United States. *Turnover* refers to the departure of teachers from schools and includes "movers" who change schools and "leavers" who depart

teaching altogether (Ingersoll, 2001b; S. M. Johnson et al., 2005). Few studies include “returners,” who temporarily leave teaching then return (Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). Marvel, Lyter, Peltola, Strizek, and Morton’s (2007) analysis of the 2003–2004 SASS and 2004–2005 TFS revealed that 8% of the nation’s 3,214,900 public school teachers moved to other schools and another 8% left the profession, requiring schools to replace more than a quarter million teachers and representing more than a half million job transitions. Furthermore, the percentage of teachers leaving the profession increased over an 11-year period: 5.6% in 1988–1989, 6.6% in 1994–1995, and 7.4% in 1999–2000 (Leukens, Lyter, & Fox, 2004; Whitener & Gruber, 1997; Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). “Movers” account for at least half of annual turnover (Ingersoll, 2001b; Leukens et al., 2004; Marvel et al., 2007).

Research from Center X of the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) further complicates the analysis of teacher turnover by identifying “shifTERS,” who leave their schools to neither work at other schools nor leave the profession (Quartz & TEP Research Group, 2003; Quartz, Thomas, Anderson, Masyn, Lyons, & Olsen, 2008). Quartz and associates’ (2008) longitudinal study, which analyzed survey data on career movement collected over 6 years from 838 racially/ethnically diverse urban teachers who graduated from Center X’s Teacher Education Program, revealed that teachers followed diverse career “pathways.” Many “shifted” into nonteaching roles in education: (a) jobs outside K–12 public education, such as university faculty and (b) positions, other than full-time teaching, in public schools, such as school administrator or other leadership roles. In all, 84 teachers were shifTERS; 34 were leavers (nearly one third of whom returned to education). Through analyses of role changing, the authors found similarities for White, Asian, and Latina/o teachers, with Black teachers slightly more likely to shift roles than White teachers (although the authors cautioned that Black teachers were a small population).

Research on retention should, but rarely does, seek to tease out the variety of ways in which teachers “leave” schools to include movers, leavers, returners, and shifTERS. Cochran-Smith (2004a) calls for expanding the definition of retention:

We need to rethink what “staying” in teaching means as a goal for the educational community . . . to include (1) a variety of career trajectories with multiple avenues for leadership roles and advancement opportunities and (2) should also focus on retaining minority teachers and educators who “stay the course” of work for social justice across multiple roles and responsibilities. (p. 391)

Factors Affecting Retention in the Overall Teacher Workforce

In a recently published meta-analysis of 34 quantitative studies on factors that moderate teacher attrition (voluntary leavers from the profession), Borman and Dowling (2008) concluded, “Attrition appears to be influenced by a number of personal and professional factors” (p. 396) and “characteristics of teachers’ work conditions are more salient for predicting attrition than previously noted” (p. 398). They organized their moderators of attrition into five categories: (a) teacher demographic characteristics, (b) teacher qualifications, (c) school organizational characteristics, (d) school resources, and (e) school student body characteristics. We synthesized these five into two broader domains of teachers’ personal and professional backgrounds (incorporating aspects of a and b) and school contexts

(incorporating aspects of c, d, and e). Moreover, they identify several school context factors that can be leveraged by practitioners and policymakers to reduce teacher attrition. Thus, we rely heavily on Borman and Dowling's results to summarize the research that identifies elements of the framework that guided our review of research on the retention and turnover of teachers of color. We add specific studies that were not included in the meta-analysis or that complicate overall patterns or identify new factors.

Teacher Background

We categorized teachers' personal and professional background factors that bear on retention into four aspects prevalent in the general literature: personal characteristics and experiences, home communities, career phases, and pathways of professional preparation and certification.

Personal background. Personal background includes teachers' experiences and histories beyond the profession, which influence where they choose to work or leave, their practice, and their connections with students and thus shape their work contexts (Delpit, 1995; Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2002; Metz, 1990). Research identifies personal characteristics of teachers that affect retention. Borman and Dowling (2008) noted that women were more likely to leave the profession than men, teachers who were married were slightly more likely to leave the profession, and teachers who had new children were more likely to leave the profession. In addition, some research suggests that teachers' socioeconomic and geographic origins affect attrition rates. Dworkin's (1980) analysis of survey responses from 3,549 public school teachers in a major southwestern city found that teachers who consider quitting are more often from high occupational origins (based on their father's occupation), White, and younger than 36. Teacher retention is also affected by the tendency of teachers to work in schools close to their home communities. Boyd, Lankford, Loeb, and Wyckoff's (2005) analysis of data from New York State revealed that teachers tended to leave more distant schools to move to schools closer to the communities where they were raised.

Professional background. Professional background involves teachers' career phase, educational background, experiences in teacher preparation programs and graduate study, certification, and entry route into the profession, which can influence how teachers respond to conditions in schools and their retention decisions (Darling-Hammond, 2000; S. M. Johnson et al., 2005; Kennedy, 1999). Turnover rates differ across phases of teachers' careers, being highest for new teachers, lower for midcareer teachers, and high for teachers approaching retirement (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Grissmer & Kirby, 1987; Hanushek et al., 2004; Ingersoll, 2001b; Murnane, Singer, & Willett, 1989; Singer, 1993). Approximately 30% of teachers leave the profession within 3 years; up to 50% leave within 5 years (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Ingersoll, 2002; Ingersoll & Connor, 2009; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003).

Turnover is affected by academic attainment and professional preparation. Evidence regarding the impact of teachers' performance on standardized tests is mixed. Teachers who performed well on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) or ACT were slightly more likely to leave the profession (Borman & Dowling,

2008). Murnane, Singer, Willett, Kemple, and Olsen's (1991) analysis of data from North Carolina and Michigan found that teachers who scored high on standardized tests such as the National Teachers Exam were more likely to leave. However, the relationship between teachers' performance on the SAT and turnover was not statistically significant (Borman & Dowling, 2008). Research indicated that credentialed teachers were less likely to leave the profession than teachers who lacked credentials (Borman & Dowling, 2008). Teachers with graduate degrees were more likely to leave, which might not hold for new teachers (Borman & Dowling, 2008). Darling-Hammond (2000) analyzed data from multiple sources, including alternative route program retention rates from the Maryland State Department of Education and New York City Board of Education, and cited Andrew and Schwab's (1995) study. Darling-Hammond reported that 84% of teachers with a subject-matter BA and MA in teaching remained in teaching after 3 years, compared to 53% of teachers with a BA and 34% of teachers with a BA and who attended short-term, alternative certification programs.

School Context

Several school conditions affect teacher retention rates (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Ingersoll, 2001b; S. M. Johnson, 2004; S. M. Johnson et al., 2005; Loeb, Darling-Hammond, & Luczak, 2005). We categorized these conditions, drawing on the literature, to include student body characteristics, the availability of three forms of resources or organizational capital (financial, human, and social), and power structures and relations. No studies examine the impact of cultural capital on the general workforce, which is a topic we take up later. Organizational capital refers to resources that schools possess and that research has documented to affect teachers' work life decisions (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2006; Achinstein, Ogawa, & Speigman, 2004; Ingersoll, 2003; Spillane & Thompson, 1997).

Student body characteristics. Teacher turnover is affected by characteristics of schools' student bodies (Borman & Dowling, 2008). Ingersoll's (2001b) analysis of 1990–1991 SASS and 1991–1992 TFS data found that student discipline problems and lack of motivated students increased the likelihood of teacher turnover. Students' social class and race also matter. Teachers were more likely to leave schools with a majority of students who live in poverty or higher percentages of students who receive free or reduced-price lunches; teachers in schools with a majority of students of color were 3 times more likely to leave than teachers in schools with a majority of White students (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Hanushek et al., 2004; Loeb et al., 2005; Shen, 1997). In a study of "movers" in Philadelphia public schools, Watson (2001) analyzed teacher transfer data over 4 years. The study reported teachers tended to move from lower achieving schools that served lower income students and higher proportions of African American and Latino students to higher achieving, higher income schools with greater proportions of White and Asian students.

Research indicates that conditions in schools other than student characteristics may exert greater influence on teacher turnover (Ingersoll, 1999, 2001b; Loeb et al., 2005). Loeb et al. (2005) reported the strongest predictor of turnover to be teachers' ratings of school conditions, even muting effects of student demographics. The particular school conditions highlighted in the literature include financial, human, and social capital.

Financial capital. Schools' financial capital—salaries and instructional resources—affect teacher retention. Teacher compensation is the source of much policy attention and research on improving retention, which identifies higher teacher pay as an incentive (Murnane & Olsen, 1989, 1990). Borman and Dowling (2008) report on 14 studies that included salary as a moderator of teacher turnover, all of which found that higher salaries correlated with reduced odds of attrition (cf. Hanushek et al., 2004; Imazeki, 2005; Shin, 1995; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Stinebrickner, 2002). Higher teacher salaries reduced attrition, in part because low salaries are a source of teacher dissatisfaction (Ingersoll, 1999, 2001b; Loeb et al., 2005; Shen, 1997; Stinebrickner, 2001). Schools with poor facilities and lacking textbooks suffer higher turnover (Loeb et al., 2005). Borman and Dowling noted that teacher salaries and instructional resources are important because they can be changed, providing leverage points for policymakers and administrators to positively affect teacher retention.

Human capital. Studies suggest that human capital, which includes professional knowledge and skills, commitments, and dispositions of teachers, is a school factor that can affect teacher retention. Ingersoll (2001b) identified the lack of professional competence of colleagues as a factor underlying migration from urban high schools. The human capital of teachers is also reflected in Shen's (1997) finding that schools with higher percentages of inexperienced teachers tend to suffer higher turnover because new teachers generally possess less pedagogical knowledge than their more experienced colleagues. S. M. Johnson and Birkeland's (2003) investigation of 50 new teachers in Massachusetts from 1999 to 2001 identified how the novices' "sense of success" with students informed decisions to stay, move, or leave, which depended on the school's human capital. In particular, the movers "were seeking schools organized for the success of both students and teachers. Such schools had stable faculties and the capacity to initiate and sustain improvement efforts" (p. 599).

Social capital. Research reveals several forms of social capital or opportunities to collaborate and connect with multiple communities that affect teacher retention. Schools that provide teachers with opportunities to network, collaborate, and participate in professional development activities tend to have higher retention rates (Borman & Dowling, 2008; S. M. Johnson & Birkeland, 2003; Loeb et al., 2005). Like financial capital, social capital can be increased, thus providing policymakers and administrators with tools for enhancing retention. Research reveals a link between social and human capital, which is evident in schools that foster collaborative relations between novices and experienced teachers, who possess professional knowledge and skills. S. M. Johnson's (2004) study of 50 first- and second-year teachers in Massachusetts from 1999 to 2003 included interview and follow-up survey data. She reported that new teachers working in "integrated professional cultures" characterized by collaboration and interaction between novices and veterans (as opposed to novice- or veteran-oriented cultures) were more likely to remain in teaching. Kardos's (2005) analysis of survey data from 486 first- and second-year K–12 public school teachers in California, Florida, Massachusetts, and Michigan documented a strong, positive correlation between new teachers' ongoing professional interaction with experienced colleagues and job satisfaction.

Formal induction and mentoring programs for new teachers also provide social capital and a potential policy lever for lowering attrition in the profession. Borman and Dowling (2008) reported that greater participation in early-career mentoring programs reduced the likelihood of teachers leaving the profession. Reviews of research document the positive impact of mentoring on the retention of new teachers (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Strong, 2005). Smith and Ingersoll's (2004) analysis of the 1999–2000 SASS data provided more detail on the impact of teacher induction programs on retention. They identified four induction models, with turnover ranging from 39% in the “basic” model, which included an in-field mentor and communication with an administrator, to 18% in the most elaborate model, which added a support network, reduced teaching preparations, and a teacher aide. However, mentoring did not affect the decision of “movers.”

Power structures and relations. Power structures and relations include norms that define the nature of social relations between organizational roles, including decision making and influencing the behaviors of others. Power structures and relations in schools affect teacher retention. Research indicates that schools with higher levels of administrative support for teachers have higher rates of teacher retention (Borman & Dowling, 2008). This is significant because administrators can change their support for teachers, potentially affecting retention rates. A study of 1st-year teachers by Liu (2007), employing 1999–2000 SASS data found that teachers' influence over school policies positively affected new teacher retention. Two studies connect administrative support and teacher influence. Ingersoll (1999, 2001b) found that teacher turnover increased with the lack of administrative support and a lack of teacher influence in decision making.

Where possible, we consider the *interaction* between teacher background and organizational factors, highlighting how such intersections may influence retention and turnover. For example, we consider how some teachers of color may enter the profession with professional commitments to work with youth who reflect their home communities (and in schools located near their homes), which may result in their retention in urban school contexts that serve youth from nondominant communities but also raise challenges to retention because of limited physical and human capital and a lack of teacher control often found in such organizational contexts.

Findings

We report the findings of our review of research on turnover and retention of teachers of color: (a) We assess the relative magnitude of turnover and retention rates for teachers of color, and (b) we examine factors that affect the turnover and retention of teachers of color, with a particular focus on new teachers, who tend to have the highest rate of turnover.

Overall, the studies reveal a significant challenge, with most recent analyses identifying higher turnover for teachers of color (particularly African Americans and Latinos) than for White teachers. The review points to possible interactions between teacher background and organizational factors associated with retention and turnover that are distinct to studies of teachers of color, including humanistic teacher commitments, teacher preparation programs and pathways, student body characteristics, and the cultural capital of schools. More surprising is the finding that higher proportions of

teachers of color work and remain in urban schools serving nondominant communities compared to White colleagues, which points to a promising solution to solving the problem of hard-to-staff schools. Alternatively, it calls for reexamining the kinds of organizational capital (financial, social, human, and cultural) needed to sustain and develop teachers of color in urban schools.

Turnover Among Teachers of Color

Teachers of color are underrepresented in the profession and experience high turnover. In the 2003–2004 school year, although 32% of the nation's population were people of color and 38% of K–12 students were people of color, 16% of the nation's teaching force in all schools (not just public schools) were teachers of color, which is up from previous years, including 12% in 1987–1988, 13% in 1990–1991, 13% 1993–1994, and 15% in 1999–2000 (Ingersoll & Connor, 2009).

Although research generally indicates that national teacher turnover rates have not differed across racial or ethnic groups, the most recent studies, which analyzed 2004–2005 TFS data, revealed higher turnover among teachers of color (Ingersoll & Connor, 2009; Marvel et al., 2007). Previously, several studies and a meta-analysis revealed little difference in turnover rates for teachers of color and White teachers (Borman & Dowling, 2008). Whitener and Gruber (1997) analyzed 1994–1995 TFS data and found attrition to be slightly higher for teachers of color than for White teachers (6.8% vs. 6.5%). This was explained in part by higher turnover of Latina/o teachers (9.1%), who entered teaching at a higher rate that year. Analysis of the 1999 TFS documented similar attrition rates among all racial/ethnic groups (7.5%) except Asians (2.1%) (Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). Ingersoll (2001b) analyzed the 1990–1991 SASS and 1991–1992 TFS and found that minority teachers were less likely to depart than were White teachers (although coefficients were small and not statistically significant). When research distinguished between moving and leaving, turnover rates did not vary by race or ethnicity. Shen's (1997) analysis of 1990–1991 SASS and 1991–1992 TFS data revealed no differences among stayers, movers, and leavers because of teacher race/ethnicity. No studies examined whether race and ethnicity affected the rates at which teachers returned or shifted, indicating that this is a topic for future research.

In contrast to these trends, the most recent studies reported different turnover rates for teachers of color and White teachers. Although these findings do not necessarily indicate a trend, they are troubling because teachers of color are underrepresented in the workforce and attrition only weakens their presence. Ingersoll and Connor's (2009) analysis of turnover among minority and Black teachers drew on five cycles of the SASS and TFS from 1987 to 2005, disaggregating turnover (by movers and leavers) for minority, Black, and White teachers. Their analysis of the 2004–2005 TFS revealed that turnover rates for teachers of color (19.4%) and Black teachers (20.7%) were higher than turnover rates for White teachers (16.4%). They noted that 104,688 teachers of color newly entered schools at the beginning of the 2003–2004 school year and that 105,086 left by the following year, reflecting more than 200,000 job transitions by teachers of color (with 48,842 movers and 56,244 leavers). This represented almost one third of the 604,749 K–12 teachers of color in 2003–2004. An even larger proportion (36.0%) of the 283,050 Black teachers were in job transition in the same period, and the 56,081 departures at the end of that year greatly exceeded the 44,783 entrants at the beginning of the year

(with 25,157 movers and 30,924 leavers). Marvel et al. (2007) analyzed the same data from 2004–2005 TFS but developed the analysis further by breaking out other subgroups. They reported similar results with higher turnover, including both movers and leavers, among Blacks (20.7%), Latinos (19.4%), and Asians or Pacific Islanders (18.2%) than among Whites (16.1%). Exceptions to this pattern were Native American (6.9%) and Multiracial (11.9%) teachers.

In sum, although attrition is expected in every profession, the studies revealed the following: (a) a pattern of increasing attrition in the general teacher workforce since 1988, (b) a variety of forms of turnover—including movers, leavers, and shifters—which are often not clearly distinguished in research on teacher turnover, (c) the substantial underrepresentation of teachers of color in the workforce, and (d) a disturbing recent finding that teachers of color have higher turnover rates than White colleagues, with African American and Latina/o teachers turning over at the highest rate. Given the current cultural gap between teachers and students, the growing population of students of color, and the recent decline in teachers of color, we are seeing a widening of the cultural gap. Together, these findings indicate that research is needed to discern whether the most recent findings constitute the beginning of a new and troubling trend and to determine the prevalence and causes of the different types of turnover among teachers of color.

Factors Affecting the Retention of Teachers of Color

Which factors affect the turnover and retention of teachers of color? We pay particular attention to the retention of new teachers because they suffer the highest rate of turnover. Because very few studies explicitly address this question, this review identifies a small number of teacher background and organizational factors, many of which correspond to factors that affect retention in the overall teacher workforce, with some important departures.

A more substantial body of research documents a pattern that may have important implications for the retention of teachers of color: Teachers of color are more likely than White teachers to work in urban schools that serve high proportions of students from low-income and racially and culturally nondominant communities. The potential importance of this pattern is reflected in two other research findings: (a) Urban schools often present conditions that reduce teacher retention rates, and (b) despite these challenges, teachers of color are more likely than White teachers to work and remain in urban, hard-to-staff schools. This topic is addressed in greater depth in a later section.

Teacher Background

Research provides little evidence on the impact of the personal and professional backgrounds of teachers of color on their turnover and retention. Indeed, we located no studies that address the following characteristics of teachers of color that are identified by research as affecting retention in the overall teacher workforce: marriage and parental status, proximity to home community, career phase, performance on standardized tests, and educational background. Research suggests that three background factors that affect overall teacher retention rates might also affect the retention of teachers of color: gender, class, and career pathway. Some studies also suggest that a factor not emphasized by studies of the general teacher workforce might affect the retention of teachers of color—their humanistic commitments.

Personal background. The few studies that examine the influence of the personal characteristics of teachers of color on their retention identify two: gender and an interaction of social class and race. Research indicates that, in the general teacher workforce, women are more likely to leave the profession (although reports do not distinguish between temporary leavers or returners and those who leave the profession permanently). Among teachers of color, two studies suggest that the opposite might hold. Kissel, Meyer, and Liu (2006) analyzed the 1999–2000 SASS and 2000–2001 TFS considering the relative influence of 21 predictor variables on minority teacher turnover. The authors reported that only two predictors were statistically significant: gender and certification in main teaching field. They found that, among teachers of color, men were more than twice as likely as women to leave the profession (they did not identify shifters, and movers were clustered with stayers). Kirby et al. (1999) analyzed a statewide longitudinal data set from 1980 to 1995 on public school teachers in Texas, which was gathered by the Texas State Department of Education. They reported that African American males and White females had the highest attrition rates of all the groups; African American males had consistently higher attrition rates than did African American females. They reported little or no difference by gender among Latinos.

One earlier study suggested that the interaction of social class and race affected the retention of teachers of color. Dworkin (1980) surveyed all teachers in a major southwestern city, with slightly more than half responding. The study found that teachers who considered quitting the profession were more often White, from high occupational origins, and younger than 36. However, when class background was introduced as a control variable, race no longer played out as a factor in attitudes toward quitting. Furthermore, Dworkin described demographic changes in urban settings (albeit the study is somewhat dated, representing trends of the 1970s). Younger Black and White teachers more often than older teachers came from professional and white-collar families, whereas young Mexican American teachers more often came from lower income and farming backgrounds than did their older counterparts. Such findings call for future research to investigate whether this pattern remains a trend, when the intersection of race and class among subgroups of teachers of color may have shifted from the 1970s (e.g., because of immigration patterns, generational differences, and socioeconomic class differences).

Professional background. A handful of studies suggest that the retention of teachers of color may be affected by three aspects of their professional backgrounds. Two reflect their professional preparation: subject-matter certification and type of preparation program. The third concerns teachers' humanistic orientations.

One study indicated that whether or not teachers of color were certified to teach the subjects to which they were assigned can affect their retention. Kissel et al.'s (2006) analysis of SASS and TFS data from 1999 to 2001 found that minority teachers certified in their main teaching field were twice as likely to stay in the profession compared to those certified outside their main teaching field.

Retention rates in the overall teacher workforce tend to be lower for teachers who attended short-term, alternative certification programs (Darling-Hammond, 2000; S. M. Johnson & Birkeland, 2003; NCTAF, 2003). Although no study directly examined if this pattern held for teachers of color, research revealed that higher proportions of teachers of color than White teachers received their preparation in alternative programs

(Shen, 1998; Villegas & Geist, 2008; Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). For example, Shen's (1998) analysis of 1993–1994 SASS data found that 21% of alternatively certified teachers were minorities compared to 13% of traditionally certified teachers. Shen reported that teachers of color prepared through alternative programs planned to stay in teaching for shorter periods than did those who attended traditional programs. Furthermore, a lower percentage of teachers of color who completed alternative certification programs planned to remain in the profession until retirement than traditionally certified teachers of color and both traditionally and alternatively certified White teachers. Villegas and Geist (2008) compared pathways of new teachers of color and new White teachers (in their first 3 years) utilizing SASS 2003–2004 data and reported statistically higher rates of new teachers of color entering the profession through alternative programs. In comparing preparation for teaching, Villegas and Geist found nearly 30.0% of the new minority teachers indicated having had no practice teaching at all prior to assuming their teaching responsibilities, compared to 13.7% for new White teachers. They raised concerns when certain programs allow teaching prior to coursework in pedagogy and without student teaching experience, which may ultimately affect teacher efficacy and retention. Still other alternative routes have explicit short-term retention goals (e.g., 2-year commitment).

However, quality varies between and among university-based and alternative preparation programs resulting in different outcomes for graduates (cf. Grossman & McDonald, 2008). There is some evidence that this might have particular salience for programs that focus on recruiting and preparing teachers of color.⁴ A longitudinal study of UCLA's Center X Teacher Education Program, which focuses on urban educators and targets teachers of color, revealed that its graduates (of whom 59% are teachers of color) remained as teachers in urban settings at rates significantly higher than the national average (Cochran-Smith, 2004a; Quartz & TEP Research Group, 2003). They associated the success of their program with a nontraditional approach to multicultural, urban teacher education and induction that supports "social justice" educators, engages a diverse group of faculty and teacher candidates in long-term learning communities, integrates technical dimensions of teaching with cultural and political dimensions, and provides learning that builds on the strengths of urban communities and schools.

Haberman (1999, 2001) reported that 94% of the teachers who completed a program in the Milwaukee public schools that recruited teachers of color remained in teaching over the 10 years of the study. Lau, Dandy, and Hoffman (2007) report on the Pathways Program at Armstrong Atlantic State University and Savannah-Chatham County Public School District, which provided a pathway to teaching for a pool of paraprofessionals to increase the number of teachers of color. Lau and colleagues found that 85% of the 105 graduates of the program were African American, and the graduates had a retention rate of 95% over 10 years. Clewell and Villegas's (2001) evaluation of the Pathways to Teaching Careers Program, which targeted culturally and linguistically diverse teachers to work in high-need public schools, reported that 81% of the graduates who were surveyed (with a 63% response rate) remained in teaching after 3 years. The program included precollege, undergraduate, paraprofessional, noncertified teacher, and Peace Corps strands. Particularly notable was an 88% retention rate among paraprofessionals who completed the program. Clewell and Villegas associate program success with the following factors: strong collaboration between a teacher education program

and high-need school districts; careful recruitment and selection of participants; rigorous, innovative, and culturally sensitive teacher education curriculum; and varied support services that continued beyond graduation. The authors also acknowledged that retention may have been because of the nonbinding agreement signed by participants to remain in teaching for a specified period of time.

Thus, research highlights an interesting and potentially important anomaly. Teachers, generally, and teachers of color, specifically, are more likely to leave the profession if they completed alternative certification programs. For teachers of color, this is exacerbated by the greater likelihood that they entered the profession through alternative pathways. However, research on a handful of programs, which include both university-based and alternative preparation, that explicitly recruit and support new teachers of color indicates that their alumni have higher retention rates than the overall teacher workforce. Further research on preparation programs focused on supporting and retaining teachers of color is needed.

Research suggests that a factor not emphasized by studies of the general teacher workforce might affect the retention of teachers of color: the *humanistic commitments* of teachers of color. Lewis (2006) surveyed 147 new male African American teachers in three urban districts in Louisiana about their views of factors that affected recruitment and retention. Although the teachers rated “job security” as the most important retention factor, this was closely followed by “contributions to humanity.” Kottkamp, Cohn, McCloskey, and Provenzo (1987) surveyed 2,718 teachers in Dade County, Florida, and similarly found that although intrinsic rewards related to “reaching” students were primary for all teachers, African American teachers perceived their importance at higher rates than Whites.

Humanistic commitments are also evident in Su’s (1997) case study of 56 teacher education candidates who were Asian American, African American, Hispanic, and White. Su reported significant differences between teachers of color and White teachers, with teachers of color wanting to teach in urban schools and make a difference in the lives of low-income students of color. Teachers of color also had different understandings of being a “change agent” than White teachers, with teachers of color focused on reducing social and structural inequalities. Other studies concurred that preservice teachers of color, compared to White teacher candidates, were more likely to report their primary motivation for joining the profession was their desire to improve the educational opportunities and lives of students of color (Belcher, 2001; Kauchak & Burbach, 2003; Rios & Montecinos, 1999; Villegas & Irvine, 2009). Furthermore, other research identified a community ethos as part of the humanistic orientation of some teachers of color. For example, Dixson and Dingus’s (2008) ethnographic study of five Black female teachers (including a novice) identified teaching as “community work” and giving back to their community and highlighted how the decision to enter teaching allowed them to remain connected to Black communities and students. McCray, Sindelar, Kilgore, and Neal (2002) examined African American women’s decisions to become teachers and found that mothers, women in the community, and female teachers were significant influences on participants’ decisions to teach. These experiences and interpretations shaped their images of good teaching as shared, culturally responsive mothering in their community.

Achinstein, Ogawa, Sexton, and Freitas’s (2009) case studies of 21 new teachers of color (Latina/o, African American, Asian American, and Mixed Race) in California over a 5-year period connected teachers’ humanistic commitments to

retention. The study drew on extensive interviews and focus groups with the new teachers, interviews with administrators and support providers, and observations of teaching practice. The teachers attended preservice programs focused on diversity and culturally relevant teaching and worked in urban high schools with large proportions of students from low-income and nondominant cultural backgrounds. A primary reason that teachers gave for remaining in their schools through the 5th year of teaching was a commitment to working in schools with students from nondominant cultural and linguistic communities. These teachers saw themselves as cultural and linguistic resources to youth and their families and wanted to give back to their communities by making a difference in the lives of students of color. In earlier studies from a subset of the same data base, Achinstein and Ogawa (2008a, 2008b) report that the Latina/o teachers on whom the cases studies focus became teachers and worked in urban schools to enhance educational opportunities for students of color. Some teachers reported remaining at their schools, despite challenges, out of loyalty to Latina/o students.

These studies thus suggest that some teachers of color are drawn to the profession to act on their commitments to serve students from nondominant racial and cultural communities by enhancing opportunities to achieve academic success. If additional research validates this pattern, it suggests that the ranks of teachers of color can be bolstered by policies and programs that call on their commitment to serve and that provide support and opportunities to advance the educational interests of students of color.

New teachers of color who may come to the profession motivated by humanistic commitments to work with communities of color and who may even receive targeted preparation that supports them will then enter schools that may, or may not, promote their retention. Thus, we turn next to organizational context factors and their impact on retention.

School Context

An emerging body of research suggests that school context can affect the retention of teachers of color. Ingersoll and Connor's (2009) analysis of the two most recent cycles of TFS (2000–2001, 2004–2005) revealed that dissatisfaction with school conditions was the largest factor in explaining turnover for minority teachers. The few studies that directly examined factors contributing to turnover among teachers of color identified the following characteristics of schools: student body characteristics, the availability of financial, human, social, and cultural capital, and power structures and relations. Cultural capital is a resource not discussed in the literature on the general teacher workforce but is highlighted below in relation to teachers of color.

Student body characteristics. One study suggested that teachers of color, like White teachers, were more likely to leave schools where students lacked discipline and were not motivated. Kottkamp et al. (1987) reported that the second most important reason given by African American and Cuban teachers in Dade County, Florida, for leaving a school was student discipline problems. The fifth most important reason for African American teachers was frustration with students who were unmotivated and uninterested in school.

Research indicates that in the general teaching force higher rates of teacher turnover are associated with higher proportions of students from low-income and nondominant racial and cultural backgrounds (Borman & Dowling, 2008). However, several studies revealed that teachers of color were less likely than White colleagues to leave these schools (e.g., Connor, 2008; Dworkin, 1980; Hanushek et al., 2004; Horng, 2005; Kirby et al., 1999; Scafidi, Sjoquist, & Stinebrickner, 2007; Texas Educational Agency, 1995). As we discuss in detail below, this pattern is suggestive of a potential solution to hard-to-staff schools but also raises equity concerns about people of color relegated to schools with lower levels of multiple forms of capital.

Financial capital. Like the retention of teachers generally, the retention of teachers of color is affected by the amount of financial capital in a school or district. Teacher salaries are one manifestation of financial capital that affects the retention of teachers of color more than White teachers. Ingersoll and Connor (2009) reported from 2004–2005 TFS data that teachers of color, who moved or left teaching, were more likely than White teachers to report that a major reason was to pursue a better salary. Leukens et al. (2004) analyzed 2000–2001 TFS data and also concluded that African Americans were more likely than Whites to leave schools for higher salaries. Kirby et al. (1999) included an analysis of work history data from the 1987–1988 through 1995–1996 cohorts of new teachers in Texas public schools, which were gathered by the Texas State Department of Education and linked to district data. They reported that a \$1,000 increase in salary was associated with reduced teacher attrition of approximately 2.9% overall and 5.0% to 6.0% among Latina/o and African American teachers. Race may be interacting with socioeconomic status (SES) factors. Within the teaching force, African American teachers generally have come from lower socioeconomic backgrounds than White teachers (Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). Moreover, parents' educational attainment is often a proxy for SES, and White teachers are more likely to have both parents with at least some college education (Sedlak & Schlossman, 1986). One study indicated that other resources also matter. Ingersoll and Connor's (2009) analysis revealed that, compared to White teachers, higher percentages of teachers of color and African American teachers cited poor school resources and facilities as contributing to their dissatisfaction and turnover. More research is needed to examine the interaction between SES and race and how that interaction shapes the importance of salary as an incentive for retention.

Human capital. For the most part, research has not attended to the impact of schools' human capital on the retention of teachers of color. One study indicated that retention of teachers of color was affected by human capital. Ingersoll and Connor (2009) reported that Black teachers were more likely than Whites to report feeling unprepared to implement new reforms (or not agree with the reforms) as a major reason for turnover. Teachers of color are more likely to work in hard-to-staff schools that face accountability policy pressures to reform and experience higher teacher turnover. Both conditions may confront teachers of color with human resource challenges. More studies are needed to examine the impact of a school's level of human capital on the retention of teachers of color.

Social capital. There is emerging evidence that various types of social capital in schools, including collaboration with colleagues and relations with students' parents, affect the retention of teachers of color. Research provides some evidence that various forms of collaboration with colleagues—including professional development, mentoring, and formal induction programs for new teachers—can affect retention rates for teachers of color. One study documented the impact of professional development. Ingersoll and Connor (2009), based on predicted probabilities from the 2004–2005 TFS, reported that Black teachers were more likely than White teachers to report that an absence of opportunities for professional development was a major reason for leaving schools.

Lau et al. (2007) surveyed 65 teachers to study alternative pathways to teaching for people of color. They identified several factors, including forms of social capital that affected the retention of teachers of color: mentoring and emotional and social support systems (e.g., formal mentoring, training, support group, parent involvement) and leadership from different groups (colleges, districts, schools, communities) that diminished discrimination against novices of color by providing resources and encouragement.

One study examined the impact of formal induction and mentoring programs on the retention of new teachers of color. L. Johnson (2007) analyzed survey and interview data to examine the induction of 15 novice teachers of color and develop case studies of 4 teachers in urban and racially and linguistically diverse schools in California. She reported that teachers who received more support and support matching the challenges posed by their schooling contexts continued in the profession and reported being better able to improve their teaching practice.

Two studies suggested that relations with community and parents influenced retention rates for teachers of color. Ingersoll and Connor (2009) identified schools' lack of community support as one reason that Black teachers gave for leaving their schools. Similarly, Kottkamp et al. (1987) reported that the African American teachers ranked lack of support from parents as the fourth most important reason teachers left their jobs.

These studies reveal the need for more research that examines the impact of the amount and quality of professional development, support, and community and parent relations on retention. There is an emerging body of research on the importance of social capital for students of color that may guide further studies of social capital for teachers of color (cf. Conchas, 2006; Stanton-Salazar, 2001; Valenzuela, 1999).

Cultural capital. Cultural capital, or cultural knowledge, which confers power and status (Bourdieu, 1977) to determine what is considered legitimate school knowledge, curriculum, and teaching practices, may also influence teachers' decisions to remain at a school. We consider cultural capital in relation to both dominant *and* nondominant cultures, thus identifying “multicultural capital” that affirms diverse cultural contexts (Achinstein & Aguirre, 2008).⁵ This kind of organizational capital was not referenced in the research on the general teacher workforce.

One study examined the influence of schools' cultural capital on the retention of teachers of color. Achinstein et al.'s (2009) study found that the new teachers of color went into their initial schools with commitments to serving students of color through culturally relevant teaching and attended preservice programs focused on

such practices. The predominant reason that “movers” gave for changing schools related to unsupportive organizational contexts, which included a lack of multicultural capital as reflected in low expectations or negative attitudes about students of color, lack of support for culturally relevant or socially just teaching, and limited dialogue about race and equity in the school. Interestingly, all of the movers went to other schools serving nondominant communities. This suggests that the retention of teachers of color may be affected by the interaction of the humanistic orientation of some teachers of color and the presence of multicultural capital in the schools where they work. Future research will be needed to verify whether a match between teachers’ commitments to serve students from nondominant racial and ethnic communities and schools’ orientations to advancing the educational interests of students of color result in higher retention rates among teachers of color.

Power structures and relations. Research sheds some light on the impact of schools’ power structures and relations on the retention of teachers of color. Ingersoll and Connor’s (2009) analyses of 2000–2001 TFS and 2004–2005 TFS data indicated that teachers of color and Black teachers, like their White colleagues, were more likely to leave schools where they lacked administrative support. Their predicted probabilities of minority teacher turnover by school working conditions from the 2004–2005 TSF went further, revealing that the retention rates of teachers of color were negatively affected by low levels of the following: teacher classroom autonomy, administrative support, and faculty influence in decision making. Their model predicted 30% turnover among teachers of color in schools with low levels of teacher autonomy compared to 15% turnover in schools with high autonomy, 24% turnover in schools with low administrative support compared to 16% in schools with high administrative support, and 22% turnover in schools with low faculty influence compared to 13% in schools with high faculty influence. Issues of teacher control may be particularly salient for teachers of color who may enter teaching with commitments to communities of color and are teaching in school settings that historically have underserved such communities. Such teachers may seek greater control over instructional and schoolwide decision making, and require administrative support if they plan to “teach against the grain” (Cochran-Smith, 1991).

Similarities and Telling Differences in Factors Affecting Retention

Studies indicate that factors affecting the retention of teachers in general, with some notable differences, also affect the retention of teachers of color. These common factors include several conditions in schools: financial capital in the form of teacher salaries and instructional resources; human and social capital in the form of professional development opportunities, mentoring, and social support; and power structures that afford administrative support and provide teachers with classroom autonomy and influence in school-level decision making.

Given the purpose of this review, potentially more telling are differences that a small body of research identifies between factors affecting the retention of teachers generally and those affecting the retention of teachers of color specifically. Three differences involve teachers’ personal backgrounds and professional preparation. First, although women are more likely to leave the overall teacher workforce, two

studies indicate that, among teachers of color, men are more likely to leave. This is potentially important because research documents that the academic performance of male students of color lags that of their female classmates. Research is needed to determine if there is a connection between the failure to retain male teachers of color and the academic performance of male students of color.

Second, teachers who complete alternative preparation programs are more likely to leave the profession than graduates of university-based programs, and teachers of color are more likely to receive their preparation in alternative programs. Although a handful of studies document high retention rates among graduates of innovative and exemplary programs, including university-based and alternative programs, that prepare and support people of color to teach in urban schools, the broader pattern bears close scrutiny to derive strategies for increasing retention rates among teachers of color.

Finally, a potentially important difference between teachers of color and teachers in general is suggested by the findings of a few studies, which propose that the retention of teachers of color is affected by the humanistic commitments of teachers of color, particularly toward working with students from low-income and non-dominant cultural backgrounds.

In examining differences of school context factors, several studies report differences in financial capital such that teachers of color, who move or leave teaching, are more likely than White teachers to report that a major reason was to pursue a better salary. Although no studies investigated the influence of cultural capital on retention of the general teacher workforce, a study on new teachers of color found that a rationale for movers was a lack of multicultural capital as reflected in low expectations or negative attitudes about students of color, lack of support for culturally relevant teaching, and limited dialogue about race and equity in the school. Several studies reveal another condition of schools that affect the retention of White teachers and teachers of color differently: demographic profiles of schools' student bodies. Teachers of color are less likely than White colleagues to leave schools serving high proportions of students from low-income and racially and culturally nondominant communities. It is this striking pattern on which we focus the remainder of our review of research.

Teachers of Color in Hard-to-Staff Schools

Although few studies focus on the experiences of teachers of color and the factors that affect their retention, a substantial body of research reveals an important pattern: A high percentage of new teachers of color teach in hard-to-staff, urban schools (Murnane et al., 1991; National Collaborative on Diversity in the Teaching Force, 2004; Villegas & Lucas, 2004). This pattern has implications for how and why policymakers and educators approach the issue of retaining teachers of color. On one hand, these schools present a substantial challenge because they often possess conditions that negatively affect teacher retention. On the other hand, despite these challenges, teachers of color are more likely to remain in these schools than are their White colleagues. This is perhaps attributable to an interaction of teacher background factors, such as humanistic commitments (and possibly the tendency of teachers to work in schools near their home communities) and the school context factor of student bodies with high proportions of youth from low-income and culturally and linguistically nondominant communities.

Where teachers of color work

Studies over nearly 30 years identify a pattern that teachers of color tend to work in schools with high proportions of students from low-income and racially and culturally nondominant communities. Richards (1986) reported that growth rates of students of color interacting with school segregation patterns were significant predictors of employment patterns of teachers of color in California public schools. The analysis of statewide teacher employment patterns was estimated from data derived from the 1981–1982 personnel surveys conducted as part of the California Basic Education Data System, which canvassed the entire population of elementary and secondary personnel. Controlling for teacher sex, experience, and credential status, Richards estimated the likelihood of teachers of color being employed in schools with high concentrations (70% to 100%) of African American or Latina/o students. Newly hired teachers of color were most likely to work in rapidly expanding schools with high minority populations. Latina/o teachers employed between 1979 and 1981 were most likely to work in schools with rapidly growing Latina/o student populations and declining Anglo populations of students and teachers. In an earlier analysis of these data, Richards (1982) explained, “This employment pattern persists because the combination of fiscal, demographic and political pressures which keep schools racially and ethnically segregated are stronger than the existing institutional remedies to overcome segregation” (p. 19).

More recent studies indicate that teachers of color continue to be more likely than White teachers to work in urban districts with high percentages of students from low-income and racially and culturally nondominant communities. Loeb et al.’s (2005) study in California and Murnane et al.’s (1991) study in North Carolina and Michigan indicated that Black teachers were more likely than Whites to work in large, urban districts. Zumwalt and Craig’s (2005) synthesis of research on teacher demographics concluded that teachers of color were more likely to teach in central cities and in schools serving high proportions of students from low-income and nondominant racial and cultural backgrounds. Although more than two thirds of African American teachers and 79% of Latinos taught in schools where students of color were the majority, 67% of White teachers taught in schools with fewer than 30% students of color (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1999; Henke, Choy, Geis, & Broughman, 1997). Henke, Chen, and Geis (2000) analyzed national data from the 1993 and 1997 Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study; they reported that teachers of color were more likely than Whites to teach in schools with high proportions of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, with 51.0% Black and 63.0% Latina/o teachers compared to 21.0% White. Villegas and Geist’s (2008) analysis of the 2003–2004 SASS found that 53.6% of new teachers of color (in the first 3 years) were concentrated in urban schools, as compared to just 27.0% of their White peers. Furthermore, Villegas and Geist profiled schools employing new teachers of color. These schools tended to be larger and have larger percentages of students of color; 80.0% of new teachers of color and 35.0% of White novices worked in schools where at least 50.0% of the students were people of color. In addition, a greater percentage of new teachers of color (44.0%) than new White teachers (6.0%) worked in schools with at least 50.0% teachers of color.

Challenging school conditions

Urban schools where many teachers of color work often present challenging conditions that, according to the research, contribute to low teacher retention rates.

Schools with higher proportions of students from low-income and racially and culturally nondominant communities tend to have higher teacher turnover (Guin, 2004; Hanushek et al., 2004; Ingersoll, 2001a, 2001b; Kelly, 2004; Lankford et al., 2002; NCES, 2005; Shen, 1997). In terms of financial capital, teachers are more likely to leave schools that lack high-quality facilities and instructional materials (Loeb et al., 2005). Carroll, Fulton, Abercrombie, and Yoon's (2004) analysis of survey data from 3,336 teachers in California, Wisconsin, and New York documented a "two-tiered educational system," where schools with large numbers of low-income students and students of color suffered, among other conditions, inadequate and unclean facilities and inadequate textbooks and instructional materials. In terms of power relations, several studies revealed that teacher turnover tended to be higher in schools where teachers exerted little influence in decision making, particularly over instructional matters (Ingersoll, 1999, 2001b). Darling-Hammond's (1997) analysis of 1993 to 1995 SASS and TFS data found that, among other patterns, teachers in high-poverty schools, as compared to teachers in more affluent schools, reported having less influence in making decisions about curriculum, instructional materials, and instructional policies.

Consequently, turnover is predictably higher in the types of urban schools in which many teachers of color are working. Murnane et al. (1991) reported that teachers who worked in large urban districts tended to have shorter teaching careers than did teachers working in smaller suburban districts. Darling-Hammond (1997) reported higher teacher attrition rates in high-poverty schools. According to NCTAF (2003), "The turnover rate for teachers in high-poverty urban schools is almost a third higher than the rate for all teachers in all schools" (p. 10). Carroll et al. (2004) found that schools with large numbers of students from low-income and racially nondominant communities suffer high teacher turnover and, thus, large numbers of unfilled teaching vacancies.

Higher retention rates among teachers of color

Despite the challenges presented by many urban schools serving low-income and high proportions of students of color, research reveals that teachers of color are more likely to remain in these schools than are their White colleagues. Connor's (2008) analysis of the 2000–2001 TFS found the likelihood of turnover decreased for Latina/o and African American teachers as the number of students of color increased.

Studies conducted in different regions of the United States replicate this finding. A study of 2,327 first-year elementary teachers over a 6.5-year period in a large urban district in Texas that served 88% minority students found that Whites were 4 times more likely to leave the district than Blacks and 57% more likely to leave than Latinos (Adams, 1996; Adams & Dial, 1993). Murnane et al. (1991) reported that after controlling for district-level fixed effects in data from North Carolina and Michigan, Black teachers were less likely than White teachers to leave teaching. Horng's (2005) analysis of a 2003–2004 survey of teachers in a large urban elementary district in California (547 respondents; 57.3% response rate) found that Latina/o teachers were more likely than White teachers to remain at schools with large concentrations of students of color. Scafidi et al. (2007) analyzed administrative data over 7 years (1994–2001) on teachers in Georgia and their elementary schools. This study examined the relative impact of salary, sex, race, test scores, student poverty, student race, and the interaction between

proportions of Black students and teachers and found that Black teachers were significantly less likely to leave schools with high proportions of Black students than were White teachers.

Three studies conducted in Texas suggested that teachers of color, particularly African Americans and Latinos, had higher retention rates than did White teachers in urban schools and districts. The Texas Educational Agency (1995) conducted a survival analysis in the 1992–1993 school year to study the careers of 10,381 teachers who started teaching in Texas public schools during the 1988–1989 school year. The study reported higher retention rates for Black and Latina/o teachers than for Whites when taking into account school characteristics, with Latinos having the highest retention rates and Native Americans and Asians having the lowest. African Americans reflected 84.1% stayers, 8.1% movers, and 7.7% leavers; Latinos 82.0% stayers, 11.3% movers, and 6.7% leavers; Whites 81.3% stayers, 10.4% movers, and 8.3% leavers; Asians 77.8% stayers, 11.7% movers, and 10.5% leavers; and Native Americans 77.7% stayers, 9.0% movers, and 13.3% leavers. Kirby et al. (1999) analyzed work history data from the 1987–1988 to 1995–1996 cohorts of new teachers in Texas public schools, distinguishing between “high-” “medium-” and “low-risk” districts (by percentages of economically disadvantaged students, as those on free or reduced-price lunch). To check the validity of this measure, the researchers correlated it with measures of student achievement and racial/ethnic composition and found that “high-risk” districts had lower achievement and higher proportions of minority students. Accounting for district characteristics, Kirby et al. found marked differences in retention patterns by race. White teachers in “high-risk” districts had much lower retention rates (almost 25%) than did those in “low-risk” districts. Latinos in “high-risk” districts had about a 10% higher retention rate than those working in “low-risk” districts. Retention rates for African American teachers did not vary by type of district. Moreover, Latina/o teachers had attrition rates 16% lower than White teachers. Hanushek et al.’s (2004) study of teacher retention in Texas revealed the complexities of retaining teachers, particularly for early-career teachers, in schools serving large proportions of students from low-income and racially and culturally nondominant communities. The authors reported that higher percentages of students of color increased the probability that White teachers would exit a school. However, increases in the proportion of African American and Latina/o students reduced the probability that African American and Latina/o teachers, respectively, would leave. This study also revealed that African American teacher movers tended to move to schools with higher proportions of African American students. This stands in stark contrast to White teachers, who tended to move to schools with fewer students of color.

Elfers, Plecki, and Knapp’s (2006) analyses of a longitudinal state database of all teachers from 1996 to 2003 and teacher surveys from a representative sample in Washington State provided more mixed results. Overall, they reported no sizeable differences in retention rates by race or ethnicity. However, in a few districts where people of color represented at least 15% of the teacher workforce, retention rates varied by race. In Seattle, teachers of color, with the exception of Asians, had lower retention rates than did Whites. However, in Tacoma, teachers of color, with the exception of Native Americans, had higher rates of retention than did Whites, and in Yakima, teachers of color, with the exception of African Americans, had higher retention rates than did Whites. These findings suggest the need for further

study of the impact of local community context on the retention of teachers of color, including specific subgroup populations.

We recognize that these studies do not explain why teachers of color work and remain in schools with high percentages of students from low-income and racially and culturally nondominant communities, nor do they explain why White teachers are more likely to leave such schools. This pattern might reflect teachers' preferences and commitments, including the general tendency for teachers to gravitate toward their home communities, it might reflect the humanistic commitments of teachers of color described above or a lack of mobility for certain sectors of the teacher workforce, or it might result from district policies that place teachers of color in schools with high proportions of students of color. Whatever the causes, this pattern may point to a strategy that could contribute to solving the critical policy problem of employing high-quality teachers in hard-to-staff schools because teachers of color might provide a talent pool that these schools can tap. However, research makes it clear that attracting teachers alone will not be enough; these teachers must be retained. Thus, it will be important for research to determine both why teachers of color are working in hard-to-staff schools and what it will take for these schools to retain and develop teachers. Furthermore, as we discuss below, the current conditions and lack of resources in hard-to-staff schools may reproduce inequalities for people of color, and thus equity issues need to be addressed.

Discussion

Based on our review of research on retention and turnover among teachers of color, we draw three principal conclusions. First, some findings of studies on the retention of teachers of color parallel some results of research on the retention of teachers in the overall workforce. Second, a striking pattern documents the promise and challenges of having a relatively higher proportion of teachers of color than White teachers working and remaining in hard-to-staff, urban schools with high proportions of students from low-income and racially and ethnically nondominant communities. Third, a handful of studies suggest three interrelated factors that might have a particular influence on the retention of teachers of color and thus might provide strategies that can be employed to increase the retention rates of teachers of color in hard-to-staff, urban schools: teachers' humanistic commitments, the multicultural capital of schools, and innovative approaches in the professional preparation of teachers of color.

Common Patterns

Three important similarities exist between studies on retention of teachers of color and those on the overall workforce. First, turnover among teachers of color, like turnover among all teachers, is a serious problem. Overall, teacher turnover rates are high; recent studies indicate that turnover rates for teachers of color are even higher than for White teachers, highlighting the urgency of this problem. Teacher turnover might compromise the quality of the overall workforce because "there is somewhat more evidence suggesting that it is the more talented rather than less talented teachers" (Borman & Dowling, 2008, p. 396) who leave the profession. Given the current cultural gap between teachers and students, the growing population of students of color, and the recent decline in teachers of color, we are seeing a widening of the cultural gap. Turnover among teachers of color

threatens the nation's capacity to increase the racial and cultural diversity of its teacher workforce and thus might contribute to the failure of schools to serve the educational needs of students of color.

Second, the current body of work on the retention of teachers of color, like the research literature on turnover in the overall workforce, is inadequate. Studies on overall teacher retention provide insufficient evidence to "guide potential initiatives to help ameliorate it" (Borman & Dowling, 2008, p. 401). Far fewer studies examine turnover among teachers of color, providing even less empirical evidence on the impact of personal backgrounds and school conditions and the interaction of these two factors. Most notably, past inquiry is inadequate to verify the influence of an interaction between the humanistic commitments of some teachers of color and school conditions, including student body composition and the availability of multicultural capital.

Third, many factors that affect retention in the overall teacher workforce also affect the retention of teachers of color. Most notable are several school conditions: financial capital in the form of teacher salaries and other resources, including instructional materials and facilities; social capital in the form of professional development opportunities, mentoring, and participation of new teachers in induction programs; and power relations in the form of administrative support and teachers' classroom autonomy and influence in decision making. All of these conditions can be changed by policymakers or local administrators and thus potentially provide mechanisms for increasing the retention of teachers of color (Borman & Dowling, 2008).

Distinctive Patterns for Teachers of Color

This research review points to patterns that may be distinctive in their relationship to and influence on the retention of teachers of color. First, higher proportions of teachers of color, as compared to White colleagues, work in hard-to-staff, urban schools with high proportions of students from low-income and nondominant racial and cultural communities. Second, these schools often present conditions that undermine teacher retention, including low levels of financial, human, and social capital and power relations characterized by an absence of administrative support, teacher classroom autonomy, and teacher involvement in decision making. Third, despite these conditions, higher proportions of teachers of color than White teachers remain in these schools. Together, these three patterns present a complex puzzle whose solution holds promise for contributing to solving an important policy issue: staffing urban schools with high-quality teachers. The solution will require that we identify factors that enhance the likelihood that teachers of color will want to teach over time in urban schools and then devise strategies that positively manipulate these factors.

The review further identified three related factors that have particular effects on the retention of teachers of color and thus might serve as the focus of strategies to support diversity in the teacher workforce. First, a number of studies offer evidence that many teachers of color are motivated by "humanistic commitments." These studies reveal that these teachers are committed to making a difference in the lives of low-income students of color by improving their educational opportunities. Toward this end, teachers of color employed strategies that ranged from serving as cultural and linguistic resources to reducing structural inequalities in schools. For some teachers of color, their humanistic commitments caused them to view teaching as work through which they could "give back" to the communities

with which they racially or culturally identified. If additional research validates a pattern of humanistic commitments linked to retention, it would suggest that diversity in the profession can be bolstered by policies and programs that call on these commitments to serve and that provide support and opportunities to advance the educational interests of students of color. But conditions within school organizations would need to be in place to affirm teachers of color to enact their commitments to support youth of color and redress inequities in schooling.

Second, the findings of one study suggest that schools' multicultural capital may affect the retention of teachers of color. The most common reason that teachers gave for moving from their schools was that their schools were characterized by the following: low expectations or negative attitudes about students of color, lack of support for culturally relevant or socially just teaching, and limited dialogue about race and equity. That is, they left schools that lacked multicultural capital. It is telling that all of the "movers" transferred to other schools that served nondominant racial and cultural communities. This suggests that the retention of teachers of color may be affected by the interaction of the humanistic orientation of some teachers of color and the presence of multicultural capital in the schools where they work. A mismatch between the humanistic commitments of teachers of color and schools' capacity to affirm nondominant and dominant cultures may result in deep conflicts for teachers of color. Bascia's (1996) study identifies a professional conflict for teachers of color who were drawn to support students of color but faced challenges of status and organizational access. The empathy of teachers of color for students of color, which was reported to be rooted in a common experience, resulted in teachers feeling isolated, having few colleagues with whom they shared the same orientation toward students, and being excluded from certain professional and social encounters that could foster a sense of belonging, help their teaching, and affect organizational decision making. Foster (1994) described how African American teachers committed to being agents of change can be undermined by those in power. Teachers of color may find that schools do not recognize their cultural resources and thus experience alienation from their schools' goals, particularly concerning issues of diversity, antiracism, and social justice (Feuerverger, 1997; Foster, 1994). Thus, it will be critical to examine the interaction between a teacher background factor—a commitment to serve students of color—and a school condition—the presence of multicultural capital—and its impact on the retention of teachers of color in hard-to-staff schools with high proportions of students of color.

A third retention factor that may be unique to teachers of color involves innovative approaches in the professional preparation of teachers of color. Although the quality of different pathways and programs varies significantly, some studies highlight how preparation programs that explicitly focused on preparing and supporting teachers of color positively affected retention. Some innovative programs are countering the "overwhelming presence of whiteness" found in much of teacher education (Sleeter, 2001), focusing instead on cultural resources of candidates, engaging a diverse group of faculty and teachers in learning communities, and providing alternative pathways for entry for teachers of color. Yet there is much controversy about some alternative programs. Although such programs serve as an entry point for teachers of color, in some forms they may leave teachers inadequately prepared for high-quality teaching, ultimately undermining their performance and retention in the profession.

We began this article with reference to two critical rationales for diversifying the teacher workforce. The importance of retaining teachers of color and thus addressing the “demographic imperative” by increasing their numbers in hard-to-staff schools is reinforced by the “democratic imperative,” which highlights the failure of schools to provide opportunities to learn for students from nondominant cultural and linguistic communities who are disproportionately represented in hard-to-staff schools (Haycock, 2001). We noted earlier how some studies indicate that teachers of color can produce more favorable academic results for students of color than White colleagues by setting and maintaining high academic expectations, engaging in culturally relevant pedagogy, developing caring and trusting relationships, serving as advocates, mentors, and cultural brokers, and working for social reform (Villegas & Davis, 2008; Villegas & Irvine, 2009). Although we do not mean to suggest that White teachers cannot be effective teachers of students of color, that employment segregation should be promoted, or that all teachers of color are effective with students of color, we cannot ignore the possibility that schools can better serve the academic needs of students of color by increasing the presence of teachers of color through policies and practices that bolster their retention.

Implications

The findings of this review of research have clear implications for researchers and more guarded implications for educational practitioners and policymakers. One implication of this review’s findings is obvious: More research must be conducted on the retention of teachers of color and subgroups within that population. Although numerous gaps in the research are apparent, three are particularly important because they concern factors that some studies suggests may exert a distinctive influence on the retention of teachers of color. First, although studies suggest that the retention of teachers of color is affected by their commitments to serving students of color, research on retention generally overlooks this possible factor. Second, research largely ignores the impact of schools’ multicultural capital, which affirms resources of both dominant and nondominant cultural communities, on teachers generally and teachers of color specifically. In addition, research must examine the relationship between teachers’ humanistic orientations and the multicultural capital of schools. The findings of a handful of studies suggest that the degree to which teachers’ orientations to serve students of color are matched by opportunities and support provided by schools to enact these commitments may significantly contribute to retaining teachers of color, particularly in hard-to-staff, urban schools with high proportions of students of color. Third, studies on a handful of innovative preparation programs, including both university-based and alternative pathways, that explicitly prepare and support teachers of color to work in urban schools indicate that teachers who complete these programs enjoy retention rates that are significantly higher than those for the overall teacher workforce. More research is needed to verify the impact of these programs and to specify the program characteristics that contribute to the retention of teachers of color.

We have noted that the limitations of research on the problem of retaining teachers of color make it risky to derive solutions. However, because the retention of teachers of color has the potential to contribute to addressing the critical problem of stabilizing and enhancing the quality of the teacher workforce in hard-to-staff schools, we hazard a discussion of the implications of the findings of our review of research for practice and policy.

Research on the overall teacher workforce and on teachers of color identifies several retention factors that are policy-amenable, including financial, human, and social capital and power structures and relations in schools. In addition, this review identifies retention factors that might be distinctive in their influence on the retention of teachers of color: humanistic commitments, multicultural capital, and innovative preparation programs. The implications for policymakers and local school officials would seem clear: Bolster the financial capital of urban, hard-to-staff schools by increasing teacher salaries and providing high-quality instructional materials and facilities. Provide high-quality professional development, collaboration, mentoring, and social support for teachers of color and concentrate on providing induction programs for new teachers of color that offer comprehensive forms of support. Develop policies and governance structures that afford teachers of color in urban schools the support of site administrators, professional autonomy in determining instructional practices, and influence in making decisions that affect pedagogy and curriculum. Provide opportunities for teachers of color to act on humanistic commitments to support students of color. Instill schools with norms, programs, and policies that provide students from diverse backgrounds with challenging academic standards and instruction, value students' cultural and linguistic resources, and encourage talk about racial and cultural issues. Provide teachers of color with career pathways that prepare and support them to work in urban schools with high proportions of students from low-income and nondominant racial and cultural communities.

However, the ability of policymakers and educators to enact strategies that positively affect school conditions that influence the retention of teachers of color is complicated and compromised by the conditions present in the urban, hard-to-staff schools in which teachers of color disproportionately work. It is well documented that such schools possess the lowest amounts of all forms of capital. Their facilities are often run-down, they lack adequate amounts and quality of instructional materials, their teachers have few opportunities for high-quality professional development, new teachers are not mentored nor involved in formal induction programs, and decision making is often highly centralized. Moreover, many urban schools where high proportions of teachers of color work face challenges from federal and state accountability and testing policies. This often results in the adoption of scripted instructional programs and pacing guides that place administrators in the role of ensuring teacher compliance, reduce teachers' instructional autonomy, limit teachers' influence in decision making, and reduce opportunities to bolster multicultural capital by engaging the cultural and linguistic resources of students from diverse cultural backgrounds (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2006, 2008c; McNeil, 2000; Ogawa, Sandholtz, Martinez-Flores, & Scribner, 2003). The findings from this review about retaining teachers of color in urban, hard-to-staff schools thus raise a social justice dilemma for practice and policy. Is it problematic to promote retention policies so that teachers of color continue to work and remain in such schools longer than White teachers, when these are the very schools that are often characterized as low resourced with poor working conditions? How can policies support the retention of teachers of color, particularly in high-need schools, without reproducing patterns that can be associated with unequal access to learning opportunities for both students and teachers of color? How can educational leaders and policymakers build on humanistic commitments of teachers of color while simultaneously supporting improved schooling conditions that allow teachers of color to develop and support youth of color?

This reveals the magnitude of the challenges that the education system in the United States must overcome. Retaining teachers of color, particularly in schools that most need them, will require both teachers who are committed to serving students from low-income and nondominant racial and cultural communities and schools that provide financial, social, human, and cultural resources and power structures and relations that support and empower teachers rather than constrain and control them.

Notes

We would like to thank the editor of this journal, Gaea Leinhardt, and the anonymous reviewers for their feedback on this article. We acknowledge the Flora Family Foundation and Sally Hewlett for their support of this review and the initial work of the National Collaborative on Diversifying Teaching and Schooling. We appreciate the scholars involved in the collaborative and particularly thank Ana María Villegas, Jacqueline Jordan Irvine, Richard Ingersoll, and Robert Connor, whose recent work deeply informed our approach to the review. We also acknowledge the New Teacher Center, Ellen Moir, its executive director, and Michael Strong, Lisa Johnson, Anthony Villar, and Ayuri Tereda for their support of this work.

1. Although the “demographic imperative” can be more broadly construed to include a number of elements (e.g., the disparity between student and teacher demographics, the increasingly diverse student population in schools, and a divide in educational opportunities, resources, and achievement among students from different racial or cultural, linguistic, and class backgrounds), we highlight here the first critical element that is most linked to teacher workforce concerns that speaks to the retention issues of this article (Cochran-Smith, 2004b). We revisit the third element of the divide in educational opportunities, identifying this as a “democratic imperative.”

2. Students of color reflect 17.7% Hispanic, 16.8% Black, 3.9% Asian or Pacific Islander, and 1.3% American Indian or Alaska Native in all public schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2004).

3. The American Educational Research Association’s (AERA) standards for reporting on empirical social science research in AERA publications highlight two overarching principles: sufficiency of warrants and transparency of the report. The standards further specify seven relevant criteria: (a) clear problem formulation that contributes to knowledge; (b) clear design and logic of inquiry; (c) well-described sources and methods of gathering evidence; (d) clear description and relevance of measurement and classification for analysis; (e) clear statement of the process and outcomes of data analysis, interpretation, and conclusions and a discussion of how they address research questions; (f) contexts, scope, and justifications of generalizations indicated; and (g) ethics in research and reporting addressed (AERA, 2006).

4. In a recent review, Villegas and Davis (2008) described policies and programs that recruit and support new teachers of color through various routes. Sleeter and Thao (2007) highlighted innovative teacher education programs fostering the development of teachers of color. For example, there are programs such as the Call Me MISTER Program focused on recruiting, training, certifying, and securing employment for African American males (Norton, 2005).

5. We distinguish our use of multicultural capital from Bryson’s (1996) conceptualizations. Bryson, extending the work of Bourdieu (1984), focused on cultural tastes (e.g., music) and found that the primary form of status distinction among the more

advantaged class in modern societies was an openness to a wide variety of cultural forms and expressions of cultural tastes (e.g., high- and low-status musical activities). Bryson identified how this new cultural currency might be a type of “multicultural capital.”

References

- Achinstein, B., & Aguirre, J. (2008). Cultural match or cultural suspect: How new teachers of color negotiate socio-cultural challenges in the classroom. *Teachers College Record*, 110(8), 1505–1540.
- Achinstein, B., & Ogawa, R. T. (2006). (In)fidelity: What new teacher resistance reveals about professional principles and prescriptive educational policies. *Harvard Educational Review*, 27(1), 30–63.
- Achinstein, B., & Ogawa, R. T. (2008a, March). *Beyond retaining new teachers of color: Survival and the loss of vision for culturally relevant teaching*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Achinstein, B., & Ogawa, R. T. (2008b, March). *Change(d) agents: New teachers of Mexican descent as role models, culturally relevant teachers and agents of change*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Achinstein, B., & Ogawa, R. T. (2008c, March). *A double-bind: Teaching with cultural relevance in an era of educational accountability*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Achinstein, B., Ogawa, R. T., Sexton, D., & Freitas, C. (2009, April). *The socialization and retention of new teachers of color: Promises and challenges*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- Achinstein, B., Ogawa, R. T., & Speigman, A. (2004). Are we creating separate and unequal tracks of teachers? The impact of state policy, local conditions, and teacher background on new teacher socialization. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(3), 557–603.
- Adams, G. J. (1996). Using a Cox regression model to examine voluntary teacher turnover. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 64(3), 267–285.
- Adams, G. J., & Dial, M. (1993). Teacher survival: A Cox regression model. *Education and Urban Society*, 29(1), 90–99.
- American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. (1999). *Teacher education pipeline IV: Schools and departments of education enrollments by race, ethnicity, and gender*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Educational Research Association. (2006). *Standards for reporting on empirical social science research in AERA publications*. Retrieved January 20, 2008, from <http://www.aera.net/opportunities/?id=1850>
- Andrew, M. D., & Schwab, R. L. (1995). Has reform in teacher education influenced teacher performance? An outcome assessment of graduates of an eleven-university consortium. *Action in Teacher Education*, 17(3), 43–53.
- Banks, J. (1995). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. Banks & C. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 3–24). New York: Macmillan.
- Bascia, N. (1996). Inside and outside: Minority immigrant teachers in Canadian schools. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 9(2), 151–165.
- Belcher, R. N. (2001, March). *Predictive factors for the enrollment of African American students in special education preservice programs*. Paper presented at the meeting of Partnership for Rural Special Education, San Diego, CA.

- Borman, G. D., & Dowling, N. M. (2008). Teacher attrition and retention: A meta-analytic and narrative review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(3), 367–409.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In J. Karabel & A. H. Halsey (Eds.), *Power and ideology in education* (pp. 137–153). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the stratification of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Boyd, D., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2005). The draw of home: How teachers' preferences for proximity disadvantage urban schools. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 24(1), 113–132.
- Bryson, B. (1996). "Anything but heavy metal": Symbolic exclusion and musical dislikes. *American Sociological Review*, 61(5), 884–899.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Carroll, T. G., Fulton, K., Abercrombie, K., & Yoon, I. (2004). *Fifty years after Brown vs. Board of Education: A two-tiered education system*. Washington, DC: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.
- Clewell, B. C., Puma, M. J., & McKay, S. A. (2005, April). *Does it matter if my teacher looks like me? The impact of teacher race and ethnicity on student academic achievement*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.
- Clewell, B. C., & Villegas, A. M. (2001). *Evaluation of the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund's pathways to teaching careers program*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Learning to teach against the grain. *Harvard Educational Review*, 61(3), 279–310.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2004a). Stayers, leavers, lovers and dreamers: Insights about teacher retention. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(5), 387–392.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2004b). *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Conchas, G. (2006). *The color of success: Race and high-achieving urban youth*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Connor, R. (2008, March). *Factors that impact satisfaction and retention of teachers of color: A national profile*. Paper presented at that annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *Doing what matters most: Investing in quality teaching*. New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). *Solving the dilemmas of teacher supply, demand, and standards: How we can ensure a competent, caring, and qualified teacher for every child*. New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Dilworth, M. E., & Bullmaster, M. (1996, January). *Educators of color*: Background paper for the Recruiting, Preparing and Retaining Persons of Color in the Teaching Profession conference, Washington, DC.
- Dee, T. (2004). Teachers, race, and student achievement in a randomized experiment. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(1), 195–210.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press.
- Dilworth, M. (1992). *Diversity in teacher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dixon, A. D., & Dingus, J. E. (2008). In search of our mothers' gardens: Black women teachers and professional socialization. *Teachers College Record*, 110(4), 805–837.

- Dworkin, A. (1980). The changing demography of public school teachers: Some implications for faculty turnover in urban areas. *Sociology of Education*, 53(2), 65–73.
- Ehrenberg, R. G., & Brewer, D. J. (1995). Did teacher's verbal ability and race matter in the 1960s? Coleman revisited. *Economics of Education Review*, 14(1), 1–21.
- Elfers, A., Plecki, L., & Knapp, M. (2006). Teacher mobility: Looking more closely at "the movers" within a state system. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 81(3), 94–127.
- England, R. E., & Meier, K. J. (1986). From desegregation to integration: Second generation school discrimination as an institutional impediment. *American Politics Quarterly*, 13(2), 227–247.
- Evans, M. O. (1992). An estimate of race and gender role-model effects in teaching high school. *Journal of Economic Education*, 10, 209–227.
- Feuerverger, G. (1997). "On the edges of the map": A study of heritage language teachers in Toronto. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(1), 39–53.
- Foster, M. (1994). Effective Black teachers: A literature review. In E. R. Hollins, J. E. King, & W. C. Hayman (Eds.), *Teaching diverse populations: Formulating a knowledge base* (pp. 225–241). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Gay, G., Dingus, J. E., & Jackson, C. W. (2003). *The presence and performance of teachers of color in the profession* (Paper commissioned by the National Collaborative on Diversity in the Teaching Force). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Grissmer, D. W., & Kirby, S. N. (1987). Teacher turnover and teacher quality. *Teachers College Record*, 99(1), 45–56.
- Grossman, P., & McDonald, M. (2008). Back to the future: Directions for research in teaching and teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(1), 184–205.
- Guin, K. (2004). Chronic teacher turnover in urban elementary schools. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 12(42), 1–25.
- Haberman, M. (1999). Increasing the number of high-quality African American teachers in urban schools. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 26(4), 208–212.
- Haberman, M. (2001). The creation of an urban normal school: What constitutes quality in alternative certification. *Educational Studies*, 32(3), 278–288.
- Hanushek, E. A. (1992). The trade-off between child quantity and quality. *Journal of Political Economy*, 100(1), 84–117.
- Hanushek, E., Kain, J. F., O'Brien, D. M., & Rivkin, S. G. (2005). *The market for teacher quality* (NBER Working Paper 11154). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Hanushek, E. A., Kain, J. F., & Rivkin, S. G. (2004). Why public schools lose teachers. *Journal of Human Resources*, 39(2), 326–354.
- Harris & Associates. (1998). *The Metropolitan Life Survey. The American teacher 1988: Strengthening the relationship between teachers and students*. New York: Met Life.
- Haycock, K. (2001). Closing the achievement gap. *Educational Leadership*, 58(6), 6–11.
- Henke, R. R., Chen, X., & Geis, S. (2000). *Progress through the teacher pipeline: 1992–93 college graduates and elementary/secondary school teaching as of 1997*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Henke, R. R., Choy, S. P., Geis, S., & Broughman, S. P. (1997). *School and staffing in the U.S.: A statistical profile, 1993–94*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Hong, E. L. (2005, April). *Teacher tradeoffs: Poor working conditions make urban schools hard-to-staff*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.
- Imazeki, J. (2005). Teacher salaries and teacher attrition. *Economics of Education Review*, 24(4), 431–449.

- Ingersoll, R. M. (1999). The problem of underqualified teachers in American secondary schools. *Educational Researcher*, 28(2), 26–37.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001a). *A different approach to solving the teacher shortage problem* (Teacher Quality Policy Brief Number 3). Seattle: University of Washington, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001b). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499–534.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2002). The teacher shortage: A case of wrong diagnosis and wrong prescription. *NASSP Bulletin*, 86(631), 16–31.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2003). *Who controls teachers' work: Power and accountability in America's schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2004). *Why do high-poverty schools have difficulty staffing their classrooms with qualified teachers?* Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Connor, R. (2009, April). *What the national data tell us about minority and Black teacher turnover*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Kralik, J. M. (2004). *The impact of mentoring on teacher retention: What the research says* (ECS Research Review). Denver, CO: Educational Commission of the States.
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 30–33.
- Irvine, J. J. (1988). An analysis of the problem of the disappearing Black educator. *Elementary School Journal*, 88(5), 503–514.
- Johnson, L. (2007, April). *Overcoming novice challenges: How fitting, clicking, and teacher voice influence teacher motivation, satisfaction and retention in urban schools*. Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Johnson, S. M. (2004). *Finders and keepers: Helping new teachers survive and thrive in our schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Johnson, S. M., Berg, J. H., & Donaldson, M. L. (2005). *Who stays in teaching and why: A review of the literature in teacher retention*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education, Project on the Next Generation of Teachers, AARP.
- Johnson, S. M., & Birkeland, S. (2003). Pursuing “a sense of success”: New teachers explain their career decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(3), 581–617.
- Kardos, S. (2005, April). *The importance of professionalism in new teachers' job satisfaction*. Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.
- Kauchak, D., & Burback, M. D. (2003). Voices in the classroom: Case studies of minority teacher candidates. *Action in Teacher Education*, 25(1), 63–75.
- Kelly, S. (2004). An event history analysis of teacher attrition: Salary, teacher tracking, and socially disadvantaged schools. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 72(3), 195–220.
- Kennedy, M. (1999). The role of preservice teacher education. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 54–85). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- King, S. H. (1993). Why did we choose teaching careers and what will enable us to stay? Insights from one cohort of the African American teaching pool. *Journal of Negro Education*, 62(4), 475–492.
- Kirby, S. N., Berends, M., & Naftel, S. (1999). Supply and demand of minority teachers in Texas: Problems and prospects. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 21(1), 47–66.

- Kissel, H., Meyer, J. P., & Liu, X. (2006, April). *Successful retention of new and minority teachers: Results from the SASS and TFS*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Klopfenstein, K. (2005). Beyond test scores: The impact of Black teacher role models on rigorous math-taking. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 23(3), 416–428.
- Kottkamp, R. B., Cohn, M. M., McCloskey, G. N., & Provenzo, E. F. (1987). *Teacher ethnicity: Relationships with teaching rewards and incentives*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2002). Teacher sorting and the plight of urban schools: A descriptive analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 24(1), 37–62.
- Lau, K. F., Dandy, E. B., & Hoffman, L. (2007). The Pathways Program: A model for increasing the numbers of teachers of color. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 34(4), 27–40.
- Leukens, M. T., Lyter, D. M., & Fox, E. E. (2004). *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the Teacher Follow-up Survey, 2000–01*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Lewis, C. W. (2006). African American male teachers in public schools: An examination of three urban school districts. *Teachers College Record*, 108(2), 224–245.
- Liu, X. S. (2007). The effect of teacher influence at school on first-year teacher attrition: A multilevel analysis of the Schools and Staffing Survey for 1999–2000. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 13(1), 1–16.
- Loeb, S., Darling-Hammond, L., & Luczak, J. (2005). How teacher conditions predict teacher turnover in California Schools. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 80(3), 44–70.
- Marvel, J., Lyter, D. M., Peltola, P., Strizek, G. A., & Morton, B. A. (2007). *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the teacher follow-up survey, 2004–05, first look*. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.
- McCray, A. D., Sindelar, P. T., Kilgore, K. K., & Neal, L. I. (2002). African-American women's decisions to become teachers: Sociocultural perspectives. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 15(3), 269–290.
- McNeil, L. M. (2000). *Contradictions of school reform: Educational costs of standardized testing*. New York: Routledge.
- Metz, M. H. (1990). How social class differences shape teachers' work. In M. McLaughlin, J. Talbert, & N. Bascia (Eds.), *The contexts of teaching in secondary schools: Teachers' realities* (pp. 40–107). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Murnane, R. J., & Olsen, R. J. (1989). The effects of salaries and opportunity costs on length of stay in teaching: Evidence from Michigan. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 71(2), 347–352.
- Murnane, R. J., & Olsen, R. J. (1990). The effect of salaries and opportunity costs on duration in teaching: Evidence from Michigan. *Journal of Human Resources*, 25(1), 106–124.
- Murnane, R. J., & Schwinden, M. (1989). Race, gender, and opportunity: Supply and demand for new teachers in North Carolina, 1975–1985. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11(2), 93–108.
- Murnane, R. J., Singer, J. D., & Willett, J. B. (1989). The influences of salaries and “opportunity costs” on teachers' career choices: Evidence from North Carolina. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(3), 325–346.
- Murnane, R. J., Singer, J. D., Willett, J. B., Kemple, J. J., & Olsen, R. J. (1991). *Who will teach? Policies that matter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). *Characteristics of schools, districts, teachers, principals, and schools libraries in the United States, 2003–04: Schools and Staffing Survey*. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2006/2006313.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). *1999–2000 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and 2000–2001 Teacher Follow-Up Survey (TFS) DC-ROM: Public-use data with electronic codebook*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Collaborative on Diversity in the Teaching Force. (2004). *Assessment of diversity in America's teaching force: A call to action*. Washington, DC: National Educational Association.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2003). *No dream denied: A pledge to America's children summary report*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Norton, R. (2005). Call Me MISTER. *Black Collegian*, [April], 27–28.
- Ogawa, R. T., Sandholtz, J. H., Martinez-Flores, M., & Scribner, S. P. (2003). The substantive and symbolic consequences of a district's standards-based curriculum. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(1), 147–176.
- Quartz, K., & TEP Research Group. (2003). Too angry to leave: Supporting new teachers' commitment to transform urban schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54(2), 99–111.
- Quartz, K., Thomas, A., Anderson, L., Masyn, K., Lyons, K. B., & Olsen, B. (2008). Careers in motion: A longitudinal retention study of role changing among early-career urban educators. *Teachers College Record*, 110(1), 218–250.
- Quioco, A., & Rios, F. (2000). The power of their presence: Minority group teachers and schooling. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(4), 485–528.
- Richards, C. E. (1982). *Employment reform or pupil control? Desegregation, bilingualism and Hispanic employment in the California public schools*. Stanford: Stanford University, California Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance.
- Richards, C. E. (1986). Race and demographic trends: The employment of minority teachers in California public schools. *Economics of Education Review*, 5(1), 57–64.
- Rios, F., & Montecinos, C. (1999). Advocating social justice and cultural affirmation: Ethnically diverse preservice teachers' perspectives on multicultural education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 32(3), 66–76.
- Scafidi, B., Sjoquist, D. L., & Stinebrickner, T. R. (2007). Race, poverty, and teacher mobility. *Economics of Education Review*, 26(2), 145–159.
- Sedlak, M., & Schlossman, S. (1986). Who will teach? Historical perspectives on the changing appeal of teaching as a profession. *Review of Research in Education*, 14(1), 93–131.
- Shen, J. (1997). Teacher retention and attrition in public schools: Evidence from SASS91. *Journal of Educational Research*, 91(2), 81–88.
- Shen, J. (1998). Alternative certification, minority teachers, and urban education. *Education and Urban Society*, 31(1), 30–41.
- Shields, P. M., Humphrey, D. C., Wechsler, M. E., Riehl, L. M., Tiffany-Morales, J., Woodworth, K., Young, V. M., & Price, T. (2001). *Teaching and California's future: The status of the teaching profession 2001*. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.
- Shin, H. (1995). Estimating future teacher supply: Any policy implications for educational reform? *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 4(4), 422–433.
- Singer, J. (1993). Are special educators' career paths special? Results from a 13-year longitudinal study. *Exceptional Children*, 59(3), 262–279.
- Sleeter, C. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2), 94–106.

- Sleeter, C., & Thao, Y. (2007). Guest editors' introduction: Diversifying the teaching force. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 34(4), 3–8.
- Smith, T. M., & Ingersoll, R. M. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(3), 681–714.
- Spillane, J. P., & Thompson, C. L. (1997). Reconstructing conceptions of local capacity: The local education agency's capacity for ambitious instructional reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 19(2), 185–293.
- Stanton-Salazar, R. D. (2001). *Manufacturing hope and despair: The school and kin support networks of U.S.–Mexican youth*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Stinebrickner, T. R. (2001). A dynamic model of teacher labor supply. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 19(1), 196–230.
- Stinebrickner, T. R. (2002). An analysis of occupational change and departure from the labor force: Evidence of the reasons that teachers leave. *Journal of Human Resources*, 37(1), 192–216.
- Strong, M. (2005). Teacher induction, mentoring, and retention: A summary of the research. *New Educator*, 1(3), 181–198.
- Su, Z. (1997). Teaching as a profession and as a career: Minority candidates' perspectives. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(3), 325–340.
- Texas Educational Agency. (1995). *Texas teacher retention, mobility, and attrition: Teacher supply, demand, and quality policy research project* (Report No. 6). Austin: Author.
- Torres, J., Santos, J., Peck, N. L., & Cortes, L. (2004). *Minority teacher recruitment, development, and retention*. Providence, RI: Brown University, Educational Alliance.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.–Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Villegas, A. M., & Davis, D. E. (2008). Preparing teachers of color to confront racial/ethnic disparities in educational outcomes. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook on research in teacher education* (pp. 583–605). New York: Routledge.
- Villegas, A. M., & Geist, K. (2008, March). *Profile of new teachers of color in U.S. public schools: A look at issues of quantity and quality*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Villegas, A. M., & Irvine, J. J. (2009, April). *Arguments for increasing the racial/ethnic diversity of the teaching force: A look at the evidence*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Conference, San Diego, CA.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2004). Diversifying the teacher workforce: A retrospective and prospective analysis. In M. A. Smylie & D. Miretky (Eds.), *Developing the teacher workforce: 103rd yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education Part 1* (pp. 70–104). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Watson, S. (2001). *Recruiting and retaining teachers: Keys to improving the Philadelphia public schools*. Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
- Whitener, S. D., & Gruber, K. (1997). *Characteristics of stayers, movers, and leavers: Results from the Teacher Follow-Up Survey: 1994–95*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Zumwalt, K., & Craig, E. (2005). Teachers' characteristics: Research on the demographic profile. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 111–156). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Authors

BETTY ACHINSTEIN is a researcher at the University of California, Santa Cruz, 1156 High Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95064; e-mail: bettyach@ucsc.edu. Her areas of specialization are new teacher socialization, teachers of color, induction, and equity.

RODNEY T. OGAWA is professor of education at the University of California, Santa Cruz, 1156 High Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95064; e-mail: rtogawa@ucsc.edu. His areas of specialization are school organization, teachers of color, educational reform, and leadership.

DENA SEXTON is a doctoral candidate at the University of California, Santa Cruz, 1156 High Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95064; e-mail: denasexton@me.com. Her areas of specialization are teacher identity, teaching contexts, and cultural diversity.

CASIA FREITAS is a researcher at the New Teacher Center, 725 Front St., Suite 400, Santa Cruz, CA 95060; e-mail: casia@newteachercenter.org. The focus of her work is on teacher induction, teachers of color, and school working conditions.