

CEMETR-2020-07
JULY 2020

CEME

Technical Report

The Center for Educational Measurement and Evaluation

Differences in Teacher Background and School Structure by Racial/Ethnic Congruence between Teachers and Students

Richard G. Lambert

A PUBLICATION OF
THE CENTER FOR
EDUCATIONAL
MEASUREMENT
AND EVALUATION

Differences in Teacher Background and School Structure by Racial / Ethnic Congruence between Teachers and Students

This investigation is a subset of a larger study (Fitchett et al., 2020; Lambert et al., 2020; McCarthy et al., 2020) of the relationship between a teacher's racial / ethnic congruence with the students in their school and occupational stress. Prior to comparing congruent and incongruent teachers on indicators of stress, the researchers sought to investigate whether teachers working in congruent and incongruent school settings are equivalent with respect to personal characteristics, professional qualifications, and contextual factors.

White children comprise less than 50% of the population of U.S. schools, but White female teachers represent approximately 80% of the U.S. teacher workforce. Black students comprise 16% of U.S. public schools, but only 7% of teachers identify as Black (Villegas et al., 2012). Hispanics make up 20% of students and 19% of teachers (NCES, 2020). However, more than half of U.S. students attend schools that are either 75%+ White or 75%+ students of color (EdBuild, 2019). In schools with 75%+ White students, Black and Hispanic teachers make up 2% of the teaching staff combined, with White teachers comprising 97% (NCES, 2014). Black and Hispanic teachers are much more likely to work in schools with high-concentrations of students from minoritized racial/ethnic backgrounds.

Racial/ethnic congruence refers to the match between the racial/ethnic demographics of students and the teacher's own race/ethnicity (Grissom et al., 2015; Mueller et al., 1999; Villegas et al., 2012). Research examining school settings where congruence exists between minority students and teachers has found positive outcomes for minority students in the areas of achievement, attendance, and satisfaction (Grissom et al., 2015; Gershenson, Holt, & Papageorge, 2016). Racial/ethnic incongruence, especially for White teachers, is linked to many potential sources of teaching demands, such as student discipline (Blake et al., 2016), learning

outcomes (Dee, 2005; Egalite, Kisida, & Winters, 2015), and relationships with colleagues (Coffey & Farinde-Wu, 2016). Since teachers of color have navigated a minoritized experience throughout their lives, research suggests that they are less likely to appraise working conditions in White majority contexts as demanding compared to White teachers in majority minority contexts (Fitchett et al, 2020). The question remains as to whether congruent and incongruent teachers of different race / ethnicities are equivalent with respect to background characteristics.

Methods

Data Source

The teacher data source was the nationally representative 2015-2016 National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS) from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). The Common Core of Data (CCD) was the source of student demographic information in each sampled school. Participants were only eligible for the study if they were full-time teachers, identified as Black, Hispanic, or White, and if student demographic variables for their school were available in the CCD. The final number of participants for this study was 25,420 in 5,500 schools. NTPS teacher responses were first matched with all relevant school-level variables from the CCD to create a variable indicating whether each teacher was racially/ethnically congruent with the predominant student racial group in their school. Over 96% of American teachers self-identified as Black, Hispanic, or White and other ethnicities and races were excluded due to small sample sizes.

The CCD included data on the number of White, Black, and Hispanic students in each school. Previous studies have used a range of cutoffs (e.g. 40% to 70%) to establish racial majority (Renzulli et al., 2011; Fairchild et al., 2012). We examined whether the student body was or was not greater than 50% Black, Hispanic, or White. The school race/ethnicity

concentrations were as follows: 22.5% of schools were Heterogeneous (no majority group), 8.1% of schools were majority Black, 15% were majority Hispanic, and 54.3% were majority White. Approximately 25% of teachers in each racial/ethnic group worked in heterogeneous settings, and the preponderance of teachers in each racial/ethnic group worked in congruent settings (58.8% of White teachers work in predominantly White schools; 59.9% of Hispanic teachers work in predominantly Hispanic schools; 45.8% of Black teachers work in predominantly Black schools).

Analyses

Comparisons between congruent and incongruent teachers within racial/ethnic group were conducted by applying both sampling weights and replicate weights using the jackknife procedure to produce standard errors and significance tests that account for the NTPS complex multi-stage sampling design. Design-based corrected tests of association were conducted for comparisons with categorical dependent variables. The *svyset* and *svy* procedures within Stata (version 14.2) were used to conduct these analyses.

Results

Table 1 shows the results for elementary teachers. There were statistically significant differences between congruent and incongruent Black elementary teachers for five of the 22 background and school structural characteristics. Black incongruent teachers were less likely to be new to their school, served a much higher average percentage of children with LEP (congruent = 4.96%, incongruent = 13.91%), and served a much lower percentage of children living in poverty (congruent = 84.81%, incongruent = 66.56%) and receiving Title I services (congruent = 86.02%, incongruent = 64.56%) than their congruent counterparts. They also worked in schools with larger average enrollments (congruent = 507.65, incongruent = 614.04).

There were statistically significant differences between congruent and incongruent Hispanic elementary teachers for seven of the 22 background and school structural characteristics. Hispanic incongruent teachers were less likely to have alternative certification, more likely to have an advanced degree, and more likely to be new to their school (congruent = 30.89%, incongruent = 42.64%) than their congruent counterparts. Incongruent Hispanic teachers were slightly younger and served students who were less likely to have LEP (congruent = 43.21%, incongruent = 22.90%), live in poverty (congruent = 79.72%, incongruent = 52.59%), and receive Title I services (congruent = 86.04%, incongruent = 42.08%).

There were statistically significant differences between congruent and incongruent White elementary teachers for 17 of the 22 background and school structural characteristics. White incongruent teachers were slightly more likely to be male, have alternative certification, and be a union member when compared to their congruent counterparts. They had fewer average years of experience, were more likely to be new to the teaching profession and new to their school, were slightly younger, and earned an average of almost six thousand dollars more per year. Incongruent White teachers had a slightly lower average percentage of children with an IEP in their classrooms and served a much higher average percentage of children with LEP (congruent = 4.40%, incongruent = 17.47%). Incongruent White teachers worked in larger schools with much higher poverty levels (congruent = 39.81%, incongruent = 66.94%), higher teacher student ratios, and much higher average percentages receiving Title I services (congruent = 37.62%, incongruent = 64.95%). These schools were also much more likely to be urban (congruent = 15.89%, incongruent = 42.82%), more likely to be located in a small town (congruent = 4.56%, incongruent = 8.15%), and much less likely to be rural (congruent = 27.38%, incongruent = 7.32%).

Table 2 shows the results for secondary teachers. There were statistically significant differences between congruent and incongruent Black secondary teachers for nine of the 22 background and school structural characteristics. Black incongruent teachers were less likely to have advanced degrees (congruent = 68.64%, incongruent = 56.15%) and earned an average of almost six thousand dollars more per year than their congruent counterparts. They served a much higher average percentage of children with an IEP (congruent = 6.97%, incongruent = 14.31%) and served in schools with more children with LEP (congruent = 4.65%, incongruent = 8.98%). Incongruent Black teachers served in schools that were less likely to be urban (congruent = 61.47%, incongruent = 37.30%), more likely to be suburban (congruent = 24.30%, incongruent = 44.41%), and had a much lower percentage of children living in poverty (congruent = 76.11%, incongruent = 56.11%). They also worked in schools with much larger average enrollments (congruent = 507.65, incongruent = 614.04) and larger student teacher ratios (congruent = 15.19%, incongruent = 17.00%).

There were statistically significant differences between congruent and incongruent Hispanic secondary teachers for four of the 22 background and school structural characteristics. Hispanic incongruent teachers had slightly less years of experience (congruent = 13.21, incongruent = 11.85). Incongruent Hispanic teachers served students who were less likely to have an IEP (congruent = 15.63%, incongruent = 10.99%), less likely to have LEP (congruent = 21.41%, incongruent = 6.47%), and less likely to live in poverty (congruent = 75.07%, incongruent = 45.16%).

There were statistically significant differences between congruent and incongruent White secondary teachers for 14 of the 22 background and school structural characteristics. White incongruent teachers were more likely to have alternative certification (congruent = 18.82%,

incongruent = 24.89%) or no certification (congruent = 4.58%, incongruent = 7.16%) than their congruent counterparts. They were also less likely to have an advanced degree (congruent = 62.08%, incongruent = 58.68%), more likely to be new to the teaching profession and new to their school, were slightly older, and earned an average of almost six thousand dollars more per year. Incongruent White teachers taught a much higher average percentage of children with LEP (congruent = 2.50%, incongruent = 9.15%). Incongruent White teachers worked in larger schools with much higher poverty levels (congruent = 34.88%, incongruent = 57.22%). These schools were also much more likely to be urban (congruent = 17.71%, incongruent = 43.83%), less likely to be located in a small town (congruent = 16.66%, incongruent = 7.99%), less likely to be rural (congruent = 20.36%, incongruent = 9.41%), and more likely to be charter schools (congruent = 1.79%, incongruent = 4.16%).

We also examined regional differences in how likely a teacher is to work in an incongruent setting by school level and race/ethnicity of teacher. Table 3 illustrates that there were substantial regional differences for both elementary and secondary teachers. For example, White teachers were least likely to teach in incongruent settings in the Midwest (elementary = 24.03%, secondary = 21.14%) and most likely in the West (elementary = 55.13%, secondary = 55.02%). Black teachers were also least likely to teach in incongruent settings in the Midwest (elementary = 33.66%, secondary = 44.34%) and most likely in the West (elementary = 95.70%, secondary = 92.40%). Hispanic teachers were least likely to teach in incongruent settings in the South (elementary = 24.86%, secondary = 39.61%) and most likely in the Northeast (elementary = 59.46%, secondary = 86.14%).

Discussion

Majority White school districts receive 23 billion dollars more in funding than districts that serve mostly students of color (EdBuild, 2019). This study demonstrates that they also employ more qualified teachers given the substantial differences between White congruent and incongruent teachers. These findings illustrate yet another aspect of the systemic inequities in U.S. schools, and have important implications for hiring decisions which result from many factors: preferences of school administrators; varying effectiveness of hiring practices across districts; and teacher preferences about what and where to teach (Lankford et al., 2002).

White incongruent elementary teachers were less qualified than those working in schools with a majority of White students. They were more likely to have alternative certification and be new to teaching. The same pattern of lower qualifications was observed for White incongruent secondary teachers who were more likely to have alternative certification or no certification, less likely to have an advanced degree, and more likely to be new to teaching. There were few differences in teacher qualifications between congruent and incongruent Black teachers. There were also few differences in qualifications between congruent and incongruent Hispanic secondary teachers. However, Hispanic elementary teachers who worked in schools with a majority of non-Hispanic children were somewhat more qualified than their counterparts in majority Hispanic schools, being more likely to have an advanced degree and less likely to have alternative certification.

White elementary and secondary teachers had a financial incentive to work in incongruent settings as indicated by the \$6,000 higher average salary. This is related to the findings that incongruent schools for White teachers are much more likely to be urban and received Title I funding. Black secondary teachers had a financial incentive to work in incongruent settings, also indicated by a \$6,000 higher average salary. This is related to the

findings that incongruent settings for Black teachers are more likely to suburban with a lower concentration of children from economically disadvantaged backgrounds.

References

- Blake, J. J., Smith, D. M., Marchbanks, M. P., Seibert, A. L., Wood, S. M., & Kim, E. S. (2016). Does student–teacher racial/ethnic match impact Black students’ discipline risk? A test of the cultural synchrony hypothesis. In R. J. Skiba, K. Mediratta, & M. K. Rausch (Eds.), *Inequality in School Discipline: Research and Practice to Reduce Disparities* (pp. 79–98). https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-51257-4_5
- Coffey, H., & Farinde-Wu, A. (2016). Navigating the journey to culturally responsive teaching: Lessons from the success and struggles of one first-year, Black female teacher of Black students in an urban school. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 60*, 24–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.07.021>
- Dee, T. S. (2005). A teacher like me: Does race, ethnicity, or gender matter? *The American Economic Review, 95*(2), 158–165.
- EdBuild. (2019). *23 Billion* (pp. 1–12). Retrieved from <http://edbuild.org/content/23-billion>.
- Egalite, A. J., Kisida, B., & Winters, M. A. (2015). Representation in the classroom: The effect of own-race teachers on student achievement. *Economics of Education Review, 45*, 44–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2015.01.007>
- Fairchild, S., Tobias, R., Corcoran, S., Djukic, M., Kovner, C., & Noguera, P. (2012). White and Black teachers’ job satisfaction: Does relational demography matter? *Urban Education, 47*(1), 170–197.
- Fitchett, P. G., Dillard, J. B., McCarthy, C. J., Lambert, R. G., & Mosley, K. (2020). Examining the intersectionality among teacher race/ethnicity, school context, and risk for occupational stress. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 28*(87). <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.28.4999>

- Gershenson, S., Holt, S. B., & Papageorge, N. W. (2016). Who believes in me? The effect of student–teacher demographic match on teacher expectations. *Economics of Education Review*, 52, 209–224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2016.03.002>
- Grissom, J. A., Kern, E. C., & Rodriguez, L. A. (2015). The “representative bureaucracy” in education: Educator workforce diversity, policy outputs, and outcomes for disadvantaged students. *Educational Researcher*, 44(3), 185–192. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X15580102>
- Lambert, R., Moore, C. M., McCarthy, C., & Bottoms, B. (2020). Response differences in appraisals of working conditions among elementary and high school teachers. *Journal of Applied Measurement*, 21(3), 1-14.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737024001037>
- McCarthy, C., Fitchett, P., Dillard, J., Boyle, L., & Lambert, R. (2020). Associations between teacher-student racial/ethnic congruence and public school teachers’ risk for stress, *Urban Education*. DOI: 10.1177/0042085919894049
- Mueller, C. W., Finley, A., Iverson, R. D., & Price, J. L. (1999). The effects of group racial composition on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and career commitment: The case of teachers. *Work and Occupations*, 26(2), 187–219.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2014). Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the 2012–13 Teacher Follow-up Survey (NCES 2014-077).
- National Center for Education Statistics (2017). 2015-16 National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS) Restricted-Use Data Files. NCES Number: 2017156. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2020). Public elementary/secondary school universe survey, 2017–18. See Digest of Education Statistics 2019.

Renzulli, L. A., Parrott, H. M., & Beattie, I. R. (2011). Racial mismatch and school type: Teacher satisfaction and retention in charter and traditional public schools. *Sociology of Education*, 84(1), 23–48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040710392720>

Villegas, A. M., Strom, K., & Lucas, T. (2012). Closing the racial/ethnic gap between students of color and their teachers: An elusive goal. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 45(2), 283–301. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2012.656541>

Table 1

Background characteristics for congruent and incongruent elementary teachers by race / ethnicity

	White Teachers			Black Teachers			Hispanic Teachers		
	Congruent <i>n</i> = 3,712	Incongruent <i>n</i> = 2,379		Congruent <i>n</i> = 246	Incongruent <i>n</i> = 234		Congruent <i>n</i> = 509	Incongruent <i>n</i> = 216	
<u>Teacher Characteristics</u>									
Male %	6.17	7.65	*	7.83	5.95		9.97	11.12	
Alternative certification %	6.49	10.96	***	22.45	19.69		24.45	14.69	**
No certification %	3.76	4.77		8.05	5.33		6.53	7.72	
Advanced degree %	52.88	47.92		59.72	55.93		39.54	49.19	*
Union member %	67.93	72.20	*	68.99	68.76		72.33	64.95	
Mean years of experience	14.31	13.13	***	12.43	12.80		12.63	11.30	
New to teaching %	13.27	17.38	***	20.14	18.95		15.80	22.28	
New to current school %	26.76	33.61	***	43.76	35.23	*	30.89	42.64	*
Mean age	41.82	41.19	*	42.18	42.44		41.77	39.40	*
Teach third grade or higher %	46.62	46.81		46.91	44.28		45.97	45.73	
Mean earnings from school	\$52,988	\$58,750	***	\$50,036	\$54,135		\$57,914	\$56,284	
<u>Classroom Characteristics</u>									
Mean % with an IEP	9.89	8.11	***	6.80	7.63		6.68	7.80	
Mean % LEP	4.40	17.47	***	4.96	13.91	***	43.21	22.90	***
<u>School Characteristics</u>									
NSLAPP %	39.81	66.94	***	84.81	66.56	***	79.72	52.59	***
Urban %	15.89	42.82	***	58.36	50.91		44.09	49.06	
Small town %	4.56	8.15	***	4.72	3.48		6.80	6.73	
Rural %	27.38	7.32	***	8.30	9.70		6.56	11.77	
Suburban %	43.01	41.73		28.64	35.91		42.54	32.44	
School size	509.76	588.81	***	507.65	614.04	***	639.20	645.60	
Charter school %	3.80	4.51		6.43	3.85		6.04	10.13	
Mean student teacher ratio	14.80	15.61	***	14.78	15.28		17.32	16.84	
% receiving Title I services	37.62	64.95	***	86.02	64.56	***	86.04	42.08	***

Note. *** - $p < .001$, ** - $p < .01$, * - $p < .05$.

Table 2

Background characteristics for congruent and incongruent secondary teachers by race / ethnicity

	White Teachers		Black Teachers		Hispanic Teachers				
	Congruent <i>n</i> = 4,591	Incongruent <i>n</i> = 2,896	Congruent <i>n</i> = 287	Incongruent <i>n</i> = 342	Congruent <i>n</i> = 415	Incongruent <i>n</i> = 360			
<u>Teacher Characteristics</u>									
Male %	39.32	40.59		37.59	41.52		42.08	36.00	
Alternative certification %	18.82	24.89	***	41.80	49.20		37.85	33.24	
No certification %	4.58	7.16	***	15.03	11.96		9.16	7.89	
Advanced degree %	62.08	58.68	*	68.64	56.15	**	49.22	56.30	
Union member %	72.86	74.18		67.17	69.44		70.61	67.84	
Mean years of experience	14.59	14.14		12.74	12.84		13.21	11.85	*
New to teaching %	12.63	14.54	*	17.88	17.19		13.84	18.45	
New to current school %	25.32	29.41	**	41.78	34.52		30.41	33.77	
Mean age	43.00	43.77	*	43.86	44.15		41.95	41.50	
Mean earnings from school	\$58,241	\$64,231	***	\$53,348	\$59,496	**	\$63,747	\$60,582	
<u>Classroom Characteristics</u>									
Mean % with an IEP	14.24	14.91		6.97	14.31	**	15.63	10.99	*
Mean % LEP	2.50	9.15	***	4.65	8.98	*	21.41	6.47	***
<u>School Characteristics</u>									
NSLAPP %	34.88	57.22	***	76.11	56.11	***	75.07	45.16	***
Urban %	17.71	43.83	***	61.47	37.30	***	48.69	40.85	
Small town %	16.66	7.99	***	4.94	7.59		9.35	7.35	
Rural %	20.36	9.41	***	9.29	10.71		8.01	8.01	
Suburban %	45.27	38.77		24.30	44.41	**	33.96	43.78	
School size	1237.36	1443.43	***	985.46	1621.28	***	1648.96	1622.54	
Charter school %	1.79	4.16	**	5.77	4.50		10.29	5.42	
Mean student teacher ratio	16.48	16.91		15.19	17.00	**	18.46	18.69	
Middle school %	13.80	14.42		14.39	16.53		13.86	11.29	

Note. *** - $p < .001$, ** - $p < .01$, * - $p < .05$.

Table 3

Racial/ethnic congruence by school level, race/ethnicity of teacher, and region

School Level	Race / Ethnicity	Congruence	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	Total
Elementary	White	Incongruent	44.39	24.03	45.27	55.13	42.34
		Congruent	55.56	75.97	54.73	44.87	57.66
	Black	Incongruent	85.39	33.66	42.56	95.70	51.44
		Congruent	14.61	66.34	57.44	4.42	48.56
	Hispanic	Incongruent	59.46	46.03	24.86	25.10	29.13
		Congruent	40.54	53.97	75.16	74.92	70.87
Secondary	White	Incongruent	45.18	21.14	45.96	55.02	42.30
		Congruent	54.82	78.90	54.04	44.98	57.70
	Black	Incongruent	79.01	44.34	49.65	92.40	55.10
		Congruent	20.99	55.66	50.35	7.60	44.90
	Hispanic	Incongruent	86.14	71.43	39.61	40.18	47.05
		Congruent	13.86	28.57	60.39	59.82	52.95