

Article

Teaching and Playing? A Survey on Young Musicians' Well-Being and Motivations

Silvia Sacchetti ¹ and Andrea Salustri ^{2,*} 

¹ Department of Sociology and Social Research, University of Trento, 38014 Trento, Italy; silvia.sacchetti@unitn.it

² Department of Legal and Economic Studies, Sapienza University of Rome, 00185 Rome, Italy

* Correspondence: andrea.salustri@uniroma1.it

Abstract: The aim of this study is to analyze the well-being of young music teachers working in Trentino Music Schools (TMS). Specifically, we assess (i) the extent to which the interaction between teaching and playing affects the well-being of young musicians using a satisfaction measure for their overall professional path as teachers and musicians, and (ii) what extrinsic and intrinsic drivers may guide their involvement in teaching activities in the early stages of their careers. To this end, we analyze original survey data on young musicians teaching in TMS to estimate their relative satisfaction and identify their motivational drivers. Specifically, we estimate from elementary items six constructs concerning material work conditions, immaterial welfare (i.e., the capabilities activated by the schools), and initial monetary and non-monetary motivations to become a music teacher, then we run two ordered logit regressions to test whether a set of variables of interest and the estimated constructs contribute to explaining junior teachers' satisfaction. Our findings highlight that junior teachers are satisfied if they can preserve the desired proportion of artistic activity and can teach a consistent number of hours so as to leave the desired space and time for making music independently of school activities. They consider teaching to be one of the components of their professional activities and can be expected to try to maintain sufficient space to be able to also develop the independent artistic sphere of their career as musicians.

Keywords: musicians' work preferences; Trentino music schools; extrinsic and intrinsic motivation



Citation: Sacchetti, S.; Salustri, A. Teaching and Playing? A Survey on Young Musicians' Well-Being and Motivations. *Merits* **2023**, *3*, 521–537. <https://doi.org/10.3390/merits3030031>

Academic Editors: Enrico Marelli and Marcello Signorelli

Received: 4 May 2023

Revised: 2 August 2023

Accepted: 4 August 2023

Published: 8 August 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Music schools are often characterized by a significant presence of musicians–teachers, that is, “performing musicians who work as licensed music teachers in school settings” [1]. However, as being a teacher in a school may not require that the teacher is also a performing musician, teachers' aspirations may be fully absorbed by teaching or rather by mixed motivations towards teaching and playing [2]. A large stream of literature investigates the interplay between music-making and music teaching. As an example, Bernard [1] reports how six elementary general musicians–teachers speak about their music-making and their music teaching. Ballantyne [3] finds that beginning music teachers feel a “passion” for music and teaching music, and view themselves as musicians, musicians–teachers or teachers. Triantafyllaki [4] explores the interrelationship between musicians'–teachers' professional identities and the various forms of professional knowledge they bring to their work. Parkes and Jones [5] examine some of the motivational constructs that may drive musicians to choose a career in classroom music teaching or music performance. Pellegrino [6,7] explores the benefits of music-making as a professional development activity for music teachers and the intersections of music-making and teaching.

Also, a wide stream of literature analyzes the motivations that drive students and early career musicians to allocate at least part of their working time to teaching activities within music schools. As an example, Madsen and Kelly [8] try to identify the factors that lead students to become music teachers in the early stages of their careers. Thornton

and Bergee [9] study what factors music education students at major schools of music considered influential in their decision to become a music teacher. Rickels et al. [10] surveyed prospective undergraduate music education majors to learn what motivated them to aspire to a career in music education. Jones and Parkes [11] study the drivers that lead undergraduate music students to become music teachers. Henry [12] studies the musical experiences and motivating factors that may lead outstanding high school musicians to pursue a career in music education.

Finally, music schools employ a combination of experienced (seniors) and junior teachers, and the mutual exchange of knowledge potentially stimulates interaction, contamination, and fresh thinking. Notwithstanding the mitigating impact of intergenerational cooperation and music schools' enabling role, some studies indicate the difficulties of being an early career music teacher. Schlechty and Vance [13] report how half of the junior teachers leave the profession in the first seven years, mostly due to isolation from experienced faculty, unmotivated students, and lack of assistance in developing effective teaching skills. Based on an interview plan involving thirty music teachers in their first ten years of public school teaching Krueger [14] further investigates job satisfaction and attrition factors. Building on a study involving nine students and their mentor teachers, Youn [15] investigates how beginning music teachers learn to be teachers and address concerns that arise from their teaching experience. Based on an interview with 15 early career music teachers, Conway [16] provides a literature overview of the challenges faced by beginning music teachers.

Overall, the literature suggests that teachers may have multiple aspirations, as educators as well as musicians. Being in this role is challenging, and there may be differences between senior and younger teachers in terms of how multiple motivations are combined and job-related features respond to motivational diversity. The studies we have reviewed raise these issues in the context of qualitative interviews with small groups, seldom considering the specificities of the organization of work or contractual conditions. Moreover, from the point of view of work organization, teaching and doing music are two aspects of the profession that are not often studied together. This may be in part due to sector classifications. While teaching belongs to the educational sector, doing music is part of the so-called orange economy, or creative economy (2.2% of young employment in 2020—[17] (p. 148)), where very young people (15–29 years) are slightly more likely to be employed than those aged over 30 (ILO's age categories).

Against this backdrop, we study the context of Trentino (an autonomous province located in Northern Italy), and its system of 13 music schools (TMS hereon) which are either worker cooperatives or nonprofit associations, highly subsidized by the local administration as a strategy to increase job stability for music teachers, access to music education and produce music culture locally. The TMS system was created in 1987 with the institution of a public registry and the definition of common pedagogical standards which needed to be agreed if schools wanted to access public funding (between EUR 5 and 6 million per year) [18]. In 2022 TMS provided jobs to 301 teachers and has experienced continuity and some degree of renewal, e.g., with two major revisions of shared teaching guidelines, with younger musicians being recruited in recent years, and with the average age of teaching musicians falling to 46. We have introduced the nature of the organization of work since the more schools represent an environment where teachers, and young teachers in particular, are enabled to maintain their desired mix of motivations and achievements, the higher their satisfaction, which we use as a proxy of their welfare. Several differences, however, may exist in the way schools represent an enabling environment for young teachers. In terms of salary, younger teachers earn less per hour taught, since the older ones enjoy a seniority premium. More importantly, however, young teachers may get to teaching directly following their education or following an experience of performing musicians [19] or contextually.

Based on these premises, the research has two objectives: (i) to measure how the interaction between teaching and music performance affects the well-being of young musicians, and

(ii) to evaluate to what extent extrinsic and intrinsic drivers may guide them toward teaching during the early stages of their careers.

With respect to both questions, our goal is to assess the subjective well-being at the individual level, for each teacher [20]. We do so using data from an original survey with 140 responses from TMS teachers. Our main independent variable is a satisfaction variable related to the teacher's overall career path, which we assume to be determined by her/his capability to reach the desired balance between teaching and doing music, which is our main predictor. The reason for this choice is that, where they coexist, teaching and artistic activity seem to be subject to an inverse relationship, where if one increases the other decreases, mainly for opportunity cost reasons related to the use of the available working time and the existence of a minimum standard of living [2,21]. This may be more so for young musicians who may start teaching while still aspiring to develop their artistic careers.

Our approach is in line with more general life satisfaction studies and happiness economics, critically summarized in World Happiness Report 2016 [22]. It also belongs to job satisfaction studies. Well-established motivators that relate to job satisfaction have been identified in labor psychology by Herzberg [23] as the possibility to advance to a better job position, the work itself (the nature of activities), personal growth opportunities, being given responsibility and autonomy to make decisions, recognition from peers, achievements such as completing tasks. Moreover, Herzberg [23] points also to elements that reduce dissatisfaction or unpleasantness at work. These are called "hygiene factors" (against motivators that relate directly to satisfaction) and include among others work conditions, fair pay, and job security. Others, such as Oldham and Hackman [24], have evidenced that job satisfaction is associated with specific job characteristics, including the consistency between jobholders' motivations and organizational goals, as well as relational characteristics such as the capacity to interact within and outside the organization, thus improving one's knowledge, opportunities, and empathy [25,26].

The utility of our approach is that it provides systematic information on the preferences of young music teachers, whose aspirations and motivations may well go beyond school activities (although not necessarily), and if disattended may affect their subjective well-being. It provides us with insights on multifaceted aspirations beyond observed choices, such as the number of hours thought, and the effort placed in artistic pursuits. As it is well known, the position of young people on the labor market is unsatisfactory even for those who succeed in finding a job, because of the precariousness of the position obtained, the low wages, and the lower desirability of the tasks performed [17]. A focus on aspirations hence allows us to comment on the effectiveness of music schools to contribute to multiple aspects of teachers' well-being, pointing at aspects that may have been left behind.

Our research covers a potential research gap in the current debate, as our satisfaction indicator combines two aspects of the musician profession: teaching and music making. This measure of well-being differs from the usual notion of job satisfaction since it encompasses both the achievements as a teacher and as an artist. It hence includes elements of variety and creativity of work [27] and relates it to the overall accomplishment perceived not just as a teacher but as a musician. To the best of our knowledge, a focus on the achievements of musicians-teachers enriched with elements of variety and creativity at work introduces elements of novelty in the current debate on musicians' well-being.

2. Materials and Methods

The quantitative analysis is based on the results of a survey conducted among music schools in Trentino in December 2021–January 2022. The purpose of this survey was to gather information on the motivations, satisfaction, and resilience of teachers within the provincial music education system in Trentino. The survey was conducted in adherence to ethical guidelines to protect the privacy and confidentiality of the participants. Informed consent was obtained from all teachers before their participation, and they were assured that their responses would remain anonymous and used only for research purposes.

Teacher data are sourced via an original questionnaire administered through Limesurvey after a pilot test to 11 of the 13 schools who agreed, through their directors' consent, to take part in the research (hereon named TS, teacher survey). The questionnaire was made of six sections concerning occupational profiles, teaching activities, artistic activities, participation in organizational activities, networking activities outside the school, and the demographic profiles of musicians. The questionnaire included both closed-ended and open-ended questions to allow for a comprehensive understanding of the teachers' perspectives. The questions covered areas such as initial motivations for teaching (see, as an example, items A21–A29 in Appendix A), satisfaction with the provincial music education system (see as an example, item B10 in Appendix A), perceptions of the school's role in fostering creativity and empowerment (see as an example, items A141–145 in Appendix A), and the teachers' experiences with event organizers and gatekeepers (see as an example C133, C15, C20 in Appendix A).

While every effort was made to ensure the reliability and validity of the survey, there are certain limitations to consider. The data set is built on teachers' self-reported measures, which raise issues of common method bias (CMB) and upward regression estimates since we use self-reported evaluations as dependent and independent predictor variables (Podsakoff et al. 2003; Spector 2006 for a critical perspective). Despite these limitations, the survey results have been flanked by extended conversations with teachers and directors and provide valuable insights into the motivations and experiences of music teachers within the provincial education system.

In this paper, we focus on a subset of the themes and variables addressed through the TS. In particular, we have extracted a dataset of 58 variables (out of 362) which are useful to answer our specific research questions. Data are analyzed with Excel, R Studio, and Stata to obtain descriptive statistics and estimate the parameters of ordered logit regression models [28–30].

Sample Description

The research design and methods were explained by the research coordinator during a kick-off workshop where all schools were invited. Few teachers from one school whose director did not commit to the research filled out the questionnaire. Overall, out of 215 returned questionnaires, 140 were fully completed from 10 out of the 13 music schools, with an average response rate of 62%, ranging from 7% to 100%. Table 1 shows, for each music school, the number of musicians employed in 2021, the number of young and senior teachers based on declared age, and the overall respondent rates.

Table 1. Respondents by music school (year 2021).

Music School	Nr. of Teachers	Valid Cases for Comparison	Nr. Young Teachers	Nr. Senior Teachers	Age not Known
Il Diapason, Trento	33	23 (69.7%)	14	9	1
Eccher, Di Non and Di Sole Valleys	35	20 (57.1%)	10	10	3
CDM—Rovereto	21	14 (66.7%)	8	6	1
Minipolifonici, Trento	31	14 (45.2%)	4	10	
SMG—Scuola Musicale Giudicarie	22	12 (54.5%)	6	6	2
Pentagramma, Fiemme and Fassa	23	11 (47.8%)	7	4	2
Moser, Pergine Valsugana, Baselga Di Pinè	20	10 (50.0%)	9	1	1
SIM, Borgo, Levico and Caldonazzo	26	8 (30.8%)	3	5	3
Primiero	14	8 (57.1%)	2	6	
Opera Prima, Ala, Avio, Brentonico, Mori e Ronzo-Chienis	15	3 (20.0%)	0	3	
Civica Scuola Musicale R. Zandonai, Rovereto	2	1 (50.0%)	0	1	1
Novak, Villalagarina	29	2 (6.9%)	2	0	
Total	301	140 (46.5%)	65	61	14

Source: music school data and teacher survey data.

We now present some descriptive statistics for young and senior teachers, as they emerge from the TS, and most of them will be used in the design and implementation of the empirical analysis. With respect to gender, 59.5% of the respondent teachers are male, 37.3% are female, while the remaining 3.2% prefer not to answer or declare other. As per their age, 52% of respondents are junior teachers, while seniors are 48.4%. Table 2 shows the distribution of respondents by gender and age.

Table 2. Teachers (valid cases) by gender and age.

	Junior	Senior	Total
Female	29	18	47
Male	34	41	75
Other/not responding	2	2	
Total	65	61	126

As per their education, out of the total number of teachers, 9% prefer not to state their educational qualification. A total of 1.4% hold a junior school diploma, 17.1% hold a high school diploma, 17.9% hold a bachelor's degree or equivalent, 39.3% hold a master's or single-cycle degree, 1.4% hold a Ph.D., and 13.6% answered other. This evidence is summarized in Table 3. It is worth noting how 83.6% of musicians have studied at the conservatory in the past. Also, 67.1% of teachers have other musicians in their families (parents, brothers, or sisters).

Table 3. Teachers' educational attainment.

	Junior	Senior	Total
Other	8	10	18
PhD	2		2
Master/Laurea	35	20	55
Bachelor or equivalent	9	16	25
Junior school		2	2
High school	11	13	24
Total	65	61	126

Finally, to provide a more comprehensive account of material and immaterial work conditions, we describe some general work and contractual conditions, although these are not included in our models. Most teachers joined working in Trentino music schools between 1990 and 2020, with a peak in the decade 2000–2009. Only a few teachers were employed in the 1980s, while a relatively large share of teachers started their work in 2020–2021. Admittedly, schools have contributed to more stable employment in music education. Data from the survey conducted with teachers in 2021 indicate that prior to school entry, only 17% of music teachers had stable employment. Most of the teachers were employed on temporary contracts (28.57%) or with their own VAT-registered activities (12.14%), others were students ((15.71%), unemployed with experience (10.71%), or seeking first employment (8.57%) (see Table 4).

Consistently, more than 85% of musicians have a permanent employment contract. In addition, more than 92% of musicians have a formalized contract according to the standard of the Trentino Music Schools. Only 44.3% of musicians have a full-time contract, while the remaining 55.0% have a part-time contract, which in only 40.2% of cases corresponds to a specific employment choice shared with the school.

Table 4. What was your activity at the time you were employed by the school? (All teachers).

Employment Status	n	%
Student	22	15.71
Military conscript/ conscientious objector/ civilian service	1	0.71
In search of first employment	12	8.57
Unemployed with previous work experience	15	10.71
Seasonal, casual or occasional employee	40	28.57
Self-employed person (VAT number)	17	12.14
Stable employee	24	17.14
Other	9	6.43
Total	140	100.0

3. Results

The empirical analysis builds on the idea that considering both aspects of musicians' preferences (teaching and doing music), and the extent to which teachers have reached the desired balance between the two, can help to improve the explanation of their overall professional satisfaction as musicians (not only as teachers).

Our two main variables are:

(a) Overall satisfaction as a musician (dependent variable): The relevant questionnaire item was extracted out of a multiple-item question on aspects of teachers' job satisfaction (item "A20.14"). The specific question was "Think about your work as a musician within the school. How satisfied are you with your overall career path as a musician, considering also what you have done outside of school?" The answer was measured along a seven points Likert scale (1 = very unsatisfied, 7 = very satisfied).

(b) Balance between teaching and artistic activities (main predictor): The relevant questionnaire item was extracted out of a three-item question on aspects of teachers' satisfaction with teaching, artistic activities, and their balance (item "C13.3"). The specific question was "Are you satisfied with the balance you have achieved between artistic musical activity and teaching activity?". The Likert scale was specified as above.

Furthermore, we have included in the analysis a list of items to measure:

- Teachers' material welfare, using items related to employment and contractual conditions (given on a 1–7 scale or asking specific numerical inputs on salary and hours worked);
- Teacher immaterial welfare, using items on the teaching and artistic capabilities activated by schools (five items), teachers' satisfaction with artistic activities within and outside the school, as well as the balance reached with teaching (four items, the fifth is used as our main predictor, C13.3), teachers' subjective vitality (six items);
- Teachers' initial motivations when entering the school (six items) (given on a 1–7 scale). A further element defining subjective satisfaction is initial motivations [20,31]. The question included monetary (the need for employment, salary) and non-monetary motivations, including motivations that relate to the teacher's collaborative activity and artistic activity as a musician (nonmonetary individual motives), and those that relate to teaching and to the creation of music culture (non-monetary prosocial motives).

Demographic controls include gender, age, educational attainments, presence of musicians in the family, and marital status. The main descriptive statistics of the subset of variables included in the models presented in this article are reported in Table 5.

Table 5. Dependent and independent variables: summary statistics for junior teachers (n = 65).

	Mean	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A2014	4.8		3 (0.046)	6 (0.092)	3 (0.046)	7 (0.108)	22 (0.338)	18 (0.277)	6 (0.092)
C133	4.523		5 (0.077)	4 (0.062)	8 (0.123)	14 (0.215)	13 (0.200)	11 (0.169)	10 (0.154)
A7	1.231	19 (0.292)	12 (0.185)	34 (0.523)					
C15	4.385		2 (0.031)	6 (0.092)	10 (0.154)	17 (0.262)	12 (0.185)	13 (0.200)	5 (0.077)
C20	3.308		12 (0.185)	9 (0.138)	12 (0.185)	17 (0.262)	10 (0.154)	4 (0.062)	1 (0.015)
D106	5.831		1 (0.015)	0	0	8 (0.123)	12 (0.185)	22 (0.338)	22 (0.338)
F7	0.939	4 (0.062)	61 (0.939)						
F8	0.754	16 (0.246)	49 (0.754)						
				min	Q1	median	Q3	Max	
A8	13.47			1.5	9	14	19	24	

N.W. “A2014” = Satisfaction with the overall career as a musician, also taking into account activities performed outside school. “C133” = achieved balance between artistic musical activity and teaching activity. “A7” = full-time, voluntary part-time, involuntary part-time work. “A8” = number of working hours per week stipulated in the employment contract. “C15” = Trentino audience appreciation for the music genre played. “C20” = inspiration received from the cultural offerings of the Trentino region for the musician’s activity. “D106” = self-pride in one’s work. “F7” = attendance at the conservatory. “F8” = other musicians in the family.

3.1. Teachers’ Material Welfare: Work and Contractual Conditions

A total of 20% of musicians work between 2 and 10 h per week, 27.1% work between 11 and 15 h per week, 37.9% work between 16 and 19 h per week, and 15% work more than 20 h per week (we use working hours as a model item, A8, see also Table 5). Notwithstanding disparities in working hours, about 8% of musicians earn less than EUR 500 monthly, 26% of musicians earn between EUR 500 and EUR 1000 monthly, 45% of musicians earn between EUR 1000 and EUR 1500 monthly, and 21% of musicians earn between EUR 1500 and EUR 2500 monthly. Comparing monthly wages with hours worked yields (by excess) hourly wages ranging between EUR 11 and 26.7, with a median value (very close to the mean value) of EUR 19.7. Overall, 63% of musicians do not seem to feel that the wages they receive are adequate in relation to the cost of living, and the percentage drops below 50% when referring to personal and family needs. On the other hand, seniors have higher material welfare, as indicated by the average hourly wage of EUR 20.03 and EUR 18.68 for senior and junior teachers, respectively. The number of juniors’ monthly teaching hours is on average more than ten hours less (54 h compared to 64.45 of the seniors).

In terms of dependency from teaching, for 47.1% of musicians, the salary received from school is the almost exclusive source of income (share greater than 90%), for 32.8% it is the predominant source (share between 50 and 90%), and for the remaining 25.7% it is an incidental source of income (share less than 50%). Against the projected picture, overall, 48.6% of musicians consider their financial situation to be satisfactory, while 28.6% of musicians express some degree of dissatisfaction.

The construct we use in the model to take into account material work conditions refers to items that describe some of Herzberg’s job hygiene factors, including work organization, flexibility, welfare, and security (A9, Table 6). Considering all respondents, the majority of teachers say they are satisfied with respect to organization and flexibility of working hours (79 and 57%, for A91 and A92, respectively), job stability (72, A93%), physical working environment (73%, A94), and guaranteed social security and welfare protections (82%, A95). Table 6 below shows the mean values for each item of work organization and welfare. Differences, however, are not significant.

Table 6. Work organization and flexibility for young and senior teachers (descriptives).

Vars	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
A91	5.51 (5.59)	1.23 (1.62)	−0.52 (−1.17)	−0.29 (0.58)
A92	4.82 (4.56)	1.79 (2.06)	−0.34 (−0.43)	−0.93 (−1.19)
A93	5.05 (5.33)	1.64 (1.69)	−0.63 (−0.98)	−0.47 (0.18)
A94	5.31 (5.64)	1.40 (1.61)	−0.38 (−1.10)	−1.04 (0.30)
A95	5.57 (5.85)	1.29 (1.40)	−0.61 (−1.78)	−0.52 (3.29)

Values in brackets are for senior teachers. (Two sample mean-comparison *t*-test). A brief description of variables A91–A95 is provided in Appendix A.

3.2. Teachers' Immaterial Welfare: Capabilities, Satisfaction, Vitality and Motivations

The first construct we consider in the model to represent immaterial welfare is defined by the capabilities activated by the school (A14, Table 7). The possibilities activated by the work environment are identified as motivators and associated with greater satisfaction [23,32]. Overall, teachers consider the school as an environment that improves their teaching skills (84%, A141), the ability to collaborate and work in groups (64%, A142), and teaching projects (59%, A144), while a lower consensus is observed with reference to improving artistic skills (38%, A143) and musicianship (46%, A145). Also, for capabilities, mean comparison does not indicate significant differences between junior and senior teachers.

Table 7. The capabilities activated by schools for young and senior teachers (descriptives).

Vars	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
A141	5.77 (5.82)	1.16 (1.38)	−0.57 (−1.39)	−0.75 (1.62)
A142	4.88 (5.07)	1.42 (1.73)	−0.24 (−0.82)	−0.54 (0.23)
A143	3.88 (4.15)	1.84 (2.04)	0.04 (−0.03)	−0.97 (−1.37)
A144	4.66 (4.95)	1.71 (1.68)	−0.46 (−0.57)	−0.75 (−0.66)
A145	3.78 (4.31)	1.93 (1.85)	−0.04 (−0.23)	−1.25 (−1.10)

Values in brackets are for senior teachers. (Two sample mean-comparison *t*-test). A brief description of variables A141–A145 is provided in Appendix A.

About 72% of musicians say they are satisfied with their career as a musician overall (A20.14, our dependent variable in the model presented in the next section), taking into account what they do outside of school, while only 16% express dissatisfaction. With respect to their artistic activities in particular, taking into account what teachers do within the school mostly with their students as well as independently, results from a four-items question (C13) indicate that overall, only 47% of teachers are satisfied with in-school arts activity, while 32% are dissatisfied. A total of 67% of teachers are satisfied with the artistic activity carried out outside the school, while only 17% are dissatisfied. Our main predictor in the model below is the third item (C13.3), which indicates that 59% of in-school teachers are satisfied with the balance achieved between artistic and didactic activities, while 21% are not. Only 36% of teachers are satisfied with the artistic activity carried out with school colleagues, while 42% are not.

Measures of subjective vitality, as defined in 'On Energy, Personality, and Health: Subjective Vitality as a Dynamic Reflection of Well-Being' [33] as the positive energy that individuals put into their work indicate that, overall, 78% of teachers feel fully energized by their work (D101), 83% are enthused by it (D102), 84% are inspired (D103), 63% wish to go to work when they wake up (D104), 74% are happy when working intensively (D105), 89% are proud of their work (D106). The mean comparison indicates that young teachers report lower scores for subjective vitality. Significant differences in particular are for work inspiration (D103), desirability of going to work (D104), and proudness (D106) (Table 8).

Table 8. Subjective vitality for young and senior teachers (descriptives).

Vars	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
D101	5.18 (5.56)	1.37 (1.30)	−0.80 (−1.45)	0.76 (2.81)
D102	5.31 (5.69)	1.46 (1.18)	−1.07 (−1.38)	0.91 (2.75)
D103	5.26 (5.72) *	1.45 (1.20)	−1.00 (−1.46)	0.68 (3.18)
D104	4.60 (5.07) *	1.64 (1.55)	−0.70 (−0.69)	0.00 (−0.15)
D105	5.23 (5.41)	1.47 (1.39)	−0.63 (−1.14)	−0.20 (1.33)
D106	5.83 (6.28) **	1.18 (1.13)	−1.25 (−2.20)	2.40 (6.21)

Values in brackets are for senior teachers. (Two sample mean-comparison *t*-test, ** when $0.01 < t \leq 0.05$, * when $0.5 < t \leq 0.10$). A brief description of variables D101–D106 is provided in Appendix A.

Initial motivations to enter the school indicate that overall, the most important motives are nonmonetary and in particular related to teaching and transmitting the passion for music to others (A23), contributing to culture creation locally (A27). The mean comparison shows that junior teachers are less motivated than senior teachers with respect to their willingness to teach and transmit passion (A23). Comparatively, juniors are not especially driven to join the school by aims of professional realization (A22), working with other musicians (A24), gaining artistic visibility (A26), and salary (A28) (Table 9).

Table 9. Monetary and non-monetary motivation for young and senior teachers (descriptives).

Vars	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
A21	5.09 (5.41)	1.71 (1.75)	−0.58 (−1.08)	−0.49 (0.24)
A22	5.12 (5.80) **	1.58 (1.47)	−0.58 (−1.37)	−0.54 (1.64)
A23	6.05 (6.57) ***	1.20 (0.81)	−1.41 (−2.31)	1.48 (5.89)
A24	4.89 (5.38) *	1.40 (1.43)	−0.64 (−0.74)	0.07 (0.05)
A25	4.02 (4.16)	1.78 (2.15)	0.04 (−0.13)	−0.89 (−1.39)
A26	3.20 (3.80) *	1.84 (2.01)	0.48 (0.11)	−0.85 (−1.13)
A27	5.49 (5.84)	1.38 (1.55)	−0.67 (−1.39)	−0.06 (1.41)
A28	3.83 (4.48) **	1.63 (1.81)	0.05 (−0.23)	−0.50 (−1.08)
A29	2.65 (3.10)	1.74 (1.89)	0.77 (0.43)	−0.35 (−0.95)

Values in brackets are for senior teachers. Two sample mean-comparison *t*-test, *** when $t < 0.01$, ** when $0.01 < t \leq 0.05$, * when $0.5 < t \leq 0.10$). A brief description of variables A21–A29 is provided in Appendix A.

3.3. Model Results

To reduce complexity, we have aggregated (i) the five items measuring contractual terms and conditions into two constructs (working time flexibility (named FLX) and other job “hygiene factors” (named HGY), (ii) the five items measuring the enabling characteristics of TMSs through two constructs (teaching capabilities named TCH, and artistic capabilities, named ART), and the six non-monetary items into two constructs: extrinsic monetary (named EXT) and intrinsic non-monetary motivations (named INT).

We build our model considering only young teachers, falling below the median age of 46. Test statistics for the good fit of the factor analyses are briefly reported in Table 10. All test statistics suggest the good fit of the models, except that the RMSEA for CFA2 which, however, is close to the threshold of acceptability. Specifically, the KMO tests provide middling to meritorious measures of sampling adequacy for all CFA models, the RMSEA indicates excellent model fit for CFA1 and CFA3, and the TLI and CFI indicate good fit for all CFA models.

Table 10. Goodness of fit of the estimated FCFA models.

	KMO	RMSEA	TLI	CFI
CFA1	0.75	0.000	1.000	1.021
CFA2	0.8	0.141	0.893	0.957
CFA3	0.78	0.029	0.989	0.994

Also, Table 11 reports test statistics for evaluating the consistency and the reliability of factor analyses. Cronbach’s alphas are all above 0.7 indicating a good internal consistency of the estimated factors. Also, omega coefficients are all above the recommended minimum of 0.7, indicating a good composite reliability of the estimated factors. Finally, the values of the average variance extracted suggest a good convergent validity, except that for the “INT” factor (intrinsic motivation).

Table 11. Reliability of the estimated factors.

Model	Construct	Cronbach Alpha	Omega	AVEVAR
CFA1	FLX	0.738	0.758	0.617
	HGY	0.752	0.760	0.517
CFA2	TCH	0.781	0.795	0.580
	ART	0.806	0.808	0.678
CFA3	EXT	0.794	0.795	0.564
	INT	0.721	0.727	0.472

Based on these preliminary analyses, we have built a baseline ordered logit model of A20.14 (overall satisfaction, as a proxy of well-being) over C13.3 (teaching–performing balance), contractual terms and conditions, and school’s enhancing capabilities, measured using the four constructs obtained from the first two CFAs. We have followed a backward stepwise regression to isolate the best regressors. Results are reported in Table 12.

Table 12. The baseline model (Dep. Var. = A20.14).

	OLOGIT1	OLOGIT1a	OLOGIT1b	OLOGIT1c	OLOGIT1d
C133	0.8750 *** (0.1645)	0.7288 *** (0.2006)	0.6979 *** (0.1911)	0.6448 *** (0.1791)	0.6251 *** (0.1746)
FLX		−0.2311 (0.2187)	−0.2007 (0.2115)		
HGY		0.2499 (0.2471)	0.2572 (0.2455)	0.1662 (0.2243)	
TCH		0.1668 (0.3114)			
ART		0.5660 ** (0.2738)	0.6673 *** (0.2016)	0.6374 *** (0.1980)	0.6905 *** (0.1839)
Obs.	65	65	65	65	65

A brief description of variables A2014 and C133 is provided in Appendix A. (***) when $t < 0.01$, (**) when $0.01 < t \leq 0.05$.

We observe how, while the balance between teaching and playing is always significant, among the constructs only “ART” (that is, the school as an enhancer of musicians’ artistic capabilities) influences young musicians’ overall satisfaction.

Second, we try to refine this baseline model by separately adding each group of items including the short list in the ordered logit model and we use a backward stepwise procedure to isolate those that result significant. Then, we select the significant additional regressors for each group of items and we estimate an unrestricted model to identify addi-

tional regressors and improve the estimate of the beta coefficient of C13.3. The regressors added to our list of items are:

- Contractual conditions (A7: full time, part time desired, part time unwilling; A8: number of hours taught);
- Cultural context, demand, and supply (C15: the extent to which the local public likes your music; C20: the extent to which the local supply of cultural events is adequate, both are measured on a 1 to 7 scale);
- Subjective vitality (D10.6, the extent to which the teacher is proud of the work she does, 1 to 7 scale);
- Conservatory education (F7, dummy);
- Other musicians in the family (F8, dummy).

The output of the fully ordered logit model and of the final model obtained following a backward stepwise approach is briefly illustrated in Table 13. It is worth noting how the final unrestricted model (OLOGIT6a) is rather parsimonious, as the only additional significant coefficients are those related to the level of subjective vitality (D10.6) and to have achieved a conservatory education (F7).

Table 13. Unrestricted ordered logit model: initial and final version (Dep. Var. = A20.14).

Name	OLOGIT2	OLOGIT3	OLOGIT4	OLOGIT5	OLOGIT6	OLOGIT6a
C133	0.63476 *** (0.18056)	0.6271 *** (0.1807)	0.6430 *** (0.1769)	0.4191 ** (0.1766)	0.42714 ** (0.18991)	0.4331 * (0.1787)
ART	0.74120 *** (0.19232)	0.7698 *** (0.2087)	0.6969 *** (0.1850)	0.7500 *** (0.1908)	0.83530 *** (0.23357)	0.7599 *** (0.1926)
A7	−0.73757 * (0.38695)				−0.83640 ** (0.41220)	
A8	−0.10009 (0.06194)				−0.09877 (0.06316)	
C15		0.3516 * (0.2064)			0.25061 (0.21206)	
C20		−0.3323 (0.2077)			−0.15044 (0.22274)	
D106				0.17594 *** (0.2530)	0.76641 *** (0.26188)	0.7847 *** (0.2533)
F7			1.2697 (0.8657)		1.93072 * (0.99417)	1.5867 * (0.9525)
F8					−0.36536 (0.61017)	
Obs	64	64	64	64	65	65

A brief description of variables A2014, C133, A7, A8, C15, C20, D106, F7, F8 is provided in Appendix A. *** when $t < 0.01$, ** when $0.01 < t \leq 0.05$, * when $0.05 < t \leq 0.10$.

To answer the second research question, we estimate an ordered logit model using the two constructs and two variables obtained from question A2 (What initially motivated you to join the school?). Results are illustrated in Table 14. Specifically, the additional regressors extracted from our list of items are: EXT, extrinsic non-monetary motivations; INT, intrinsic motivations; “ice”, the need for income and employment; “wge”, salary. The final model obtained following a backward stepwise approach (OLOGIT7c) suggests that junior musicians are driven by intrinsic motivations and that the level of wage is generally considered unsatisfactory. Finally, we try to merge the two models OLOGIT6a and OLOGIT7c to test whether the unrestricted model improves the estimates. However, it seems that the unrestricted model does not provide better estimates of model OLOGIT6a.

Table 14. Unrestricted ordered logit model for initial motivations and encompassing model (Dep. Var. = A20.14).

	OLOGIT7a	OLOGIT7b	OLOGIT7c	OLOGIT8
C133				0.40467 ** (0.19530)
art				0.69456 *** (0.22061)
D106				0.72723 *** (0.28143)
F7				1.87086 * (0.05433)
EXT	0.2132 (0.2156)	0.2153 (0.2134)		0.14025 (0.24885)
INT	0.7506 ** (0.2977)	0.6860 ** (0.2862)	0.8803 *** (0.2142)	0.04585 (0.35015)
ice	0.1419 (0.1675)			0.01874 (0.19405)
wge	−0.5746 *** (0.1846)	−0.4939 *** (0.1574)	−0.4590 *** (0.1524)	−0.20595 (0.21491)
Obs	65	65	65	65

A brief description of variables A2014, C133, D106, and F7 is provided in Appendix A. *** when $t < 0.01$, ** when $0.01 < t \leq 0.05$, * when $0.5 < t \leq 0.10$.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

With respect to our first question, overall, taking into account our basic model and models with additional variables, our results support the view that the satisfaction of young teachers for their overall path, as educators and musicians, is increased:

1. By the extent to which they can strike the desired balance between teaching and playing;
2. If they work in a school that enhances their artistic capabilities;
3. The proudest they are of their work;
4. If they are able to teach for the desired number of hours. In fact, holding a part-time contract when this is not reflecting the teachers' preferences (when they would like to teach more) reduces their satisfaction;
5. If they have conservatory education.

Except for the type of contract, work flexibility, and other hygiene factors are not significant, consistent with the theory which identifies the main drivers of job satisfaction not as much in hygiene factors but in motivators associated with the nature of the job and its relational features [32]. Cultural contextual factors and in particular the extent to which the local public appreciates the music genre played by the young teacher is significant only when the model includes basic predictors, that is teaching-playing balance, and support to artistic capabilities. A possible explanation is that the effect of appreciation from the public is subsumed by the effect of pride in one's work.

With respect to our second question, our results indicate that young teachers' satisfaction is supported by a mix of motivations, which include non-monetary intrinsic motivations as well as monetary motives, related to wage levels. This is consistent with evidence from workers in the nonprofit sector, where monetary and nonmonetary motives are jointly present at the same time [31,34]. Still, the significance of these constructs disappears when we include them in the full model. Hence, despite the nature of motivations that drive young teachers to initially join the school, what matters the most to achieve satisfaction for the overall path remains related to the organizational context and its capacity to support young teachers' will to balance both educational and artistic goals. This may find an

obstacle in the institutional settings that regulate the TMS system, which has been created mostly with educational goals and does not include teachers' artistic activities in its system of incentives [18]. Consistency between motivations and organizational goals, as suggested by Oldham and Hackman [24], is in fact associated with job satisfaction. Improving the alignment between teachers' motivations and the aims of schools by including more time for the promotion of artistic activities would benefit junior teachers' overall satisfaction with their path as musicians.

In synthesis, junior teachers are satisfied if they can preserve the desired proportion of artistic activity and can teach a consistent number of hours so as to leave the desired space and time for making music independently of school activities. Consistent with Ballantyne [3], junior teachers consider teaching to be one of the components of their professional activities at this stage of their career, and it can be expected to try to maintain sufficient space to be able to develop their independent artistic activity as well. Suggestions for schools and young teachers are to dedicate more time to the integration of artistic activities in their teaching, so as to combine the two objectives from a substantive point of view, possibly collaborating with teachers from different schools within and outside the province (consistent with Kilduff and Brass [26], for instance). This would also support the creation of new connections, open to artistic collaborative projects, as well as peer training and support. Since well-being and creativity are associated with a mixed role, the suggestion for music schools is to incentivize "mixed positions" (musicians-teachers) by developing organizational models that promote this duality of roles (e.g., limiting teachers' participation in administrative and organizational activities, offering contracts that leave sufficient time to devote to performances. . .).

Suggestions for future research go in at least two directions: to develop other empirical analyses with the same data (aimed, for example, at highlighting possible gender gaps, or differences in approach among schools) and to extend the research to other categories of artists (e.g., painters, writers, etc.). Also, given the effectiveness of the approach developed to adhere to territorial specificities, the research is suitable to be extended to other local, provincial, and regional contexts. The aim could be to highlight the operational specificities of music schools, depending on whether they are in rural or urban contexts, or more simply, to verify the robustness and generality of the results achieved. Moreover, given the rather copious literature on the subject, it would be interesting to link the research more closely to similar studies carried out at the international level.

Finally, the issue of workers' and young people's well-being and motivation goes beyond the music sphere, so it would be interesting to carry out comparative analyses with other contexts, to identify the mix of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations that lead individuals to choose and to be motivated by a certain career path (e.g., doctors, lawyers, engineers, economists, journalists, etc.).

Author Contributions: This is a joint and collaborative work where authors have been involved as follows: Conceptualization, S.S., A.S.; methodology, S.S.; software, S.S., A.S.; validation, S.S., A.S.; formal analysis, S.S., A.S.; investigation, S.S.; resources, S.S.; data curation, S.S., A.S.; writing—original draft preparation, S.S., A.S.; writing—review and editing, visualization, S.S., A.S.; supervision, S.S.; project administration, S.S.; funding acquisition, S.S. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was funded by Fondazione Caritro, Trento and Rovereto, Italy, grant number 2020.0246, and by the Department of Sociology and Social Research, University of Trento, Italy. Project title: "The music education system in the Trentino Province. Developing a creative space for schools, communities and musicians through collaboration and networking".

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of The University of Trento, June 2021.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: Due to privacy or ethical restrictions data cannot be shared outside the research team. The data subset used in this study can be made available to the editor of this journal only and for a limited time, if requested.

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank Miriam Fiorenza for support in the administration of the questionnaire and throughout the research project, all the project participants, school directors, and teachers for ongoing conversations which stimulated the rise and development of the research questions. Early results were presented at DiMMI Conference, Trento, November 2022, and at SIDE Conference, Palermo, December 2022.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Appendix A

Table A1. A brief description of the items used in the research.

Code	Label	Question	Measure
A21	Initial motivations: income and employment	What initially motivated you to join the school? The need for income and employment.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “not at all”, 7 “very much”).
A22	Initial motivations: professional fulfillment	What initially motivated you to join the school? To be professionally fulfilled.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “not at all”, 7 “very much”).
A23	Initial motivations: teaching and transferring passion for music	What initially motivated you to join the school? Having the opportunity to teach and transfer my passion for music.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “not at all”, 7 “very much”).
A24	Initial motivations: work with other musicians	What initially motivated you to join the school? Having the opportunity to work with other musicians.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “not at all”, 7 “very much”).
A25	Initial motivations: work with valued and already-known musicians	What initially motivated you to join the school? To have the opportunity to work with musicians that I already knew and valued before entering the school.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “not at all”, 7 “very much”).
A26	Initial motivations: greater visibility and opportunity as an artist	What initially motivated you to join the school? To have greater visibility and opportunities as an artist.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “not at all”, 7 “very much”).
A27	Initial motivations: creating culture	What initially motivated you to join the school? To contribute to creating culture in the area.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “not at all”, 7 “very much”).
A28	Initial motivations: remuneration	What initially motivated you to join the school? The remuneration.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “not at all”, 7 “very much”).
A29	Initial motivations: joining an association or cooperative	What initially motivated you to join the school? The possibility of joining an association or cooperative.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “not at all”, 7 “very much”).
A7	Full-time, voluntary part-time, involuntary part-time work	Please indicate, based on your employment contract, whether you work: full-time, part-time, by your own choice in agreement with the school, part-time, not by your own choice but due to external or organizational circumstances.	Multiple choice
A8	Number of working hours per week stipulated in the employment contract.	Please indicate the number of weekly hours specified in the employment contract.	Two-digit integer number

Table A1. Cont.

Code	Label	Question	Measure
A91	Satisfaction with work schedule	How satisfied are you with work schedule organization?	Lickert 1–7 (1 “very dissatisfied”, 7 “very satisfied”).
A92	Satisfaction with working time flexibility	How satisfied are you with flexibility of working hours?	Lickert 1–7 (1 “very dissatisfied”, 7 “very satisfied”).
A93	Satisfaction with employment stability	How satisfied are you with employment stability?	Lickert 1–7 (1 “very dissatisfied”, 7 “very satisfied”).
A94	Satisfaction with physical working environment	How satisfied are you with physical working environment (safety, hygiene, comfort, etc.)?	Lickert 1–7 (1 “very dissatisfied”, 7 “very satisfied”).
A95	Satisfaction with social security and protection	How satisfied are you with social security and social protection guaranteed?	Lickert 1–7 (1 “very dissatisfied”, 7 “very satisfied”).
A141	School as an enhancing environment for teaching skills	To date, which of the following statements do you agree with? At the school I have further developed my teaching skills.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “completely disagree”, 7 “completely agree”).
A142	School as a collaborative environment	To date, which of the following statements do you agree with? At the school I have improved my ability to collaborate and work in a team.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “completely disagree”, 7 “completely agree”).
A143	School as an incubator of art projects	To date, which of the following statements do you agree with? The school has facilitated and promoted my art projects.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “completely disagree”, 7 “completely agree”).
A144	School as an incubator of teaching projects	To date, which of the following statements do you agree with? The school facilitated and promoted my teaching projects.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “completely disagree”, 7 “completely agree”).
A145	School as an enhancing environment for teaching skills for music skills	To date, which of the following statements do you agree with? At the school I have further developed my skills as a musician.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “completely disagree”, 7 “completely agree”).
A2014	Overall satisfaction as a musician	Think about your work as a musician within the school. How satisfied are you with your overall career as a musician, also taking into account what you have completed outside the school.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “very dissatisfied”, 7 “very satisfied”).
B10	Satisfaction with the basic music education system in Trentino	How satisfied are you, overall, with the current set-up of the basic music education system in Trentino?	Lickert 1–7 (1 “very dissatisfied”, 7 “very satisfied”).
C133	Satisfaction with teaching/playing balance	Are you satisfied with the balance you have achieved between artistic musical activity and teaching activity?	Lickert 1–7 (1 “very dissatisfied”, 7 “very satisfied”).
C15	Trentino audience appreciation for the music genre played	To what extent do you think that the Trentino audience appreciates and is sensitive to the music genre you play?	Lickert 1–7 (1 “not at all”, 7 “very much”).
C20	Inspiration received from the cultural offerings of the Trentino region for the musician’s activity	Do you think that the cultural offer of the Trentino region, in general, is stimulating for your activity as a musician?	Lickert 1–7 (1 “not at all”, 7 “very much”).

Table A1. Cont.

Code	Label	Question	Measure
D101	Energetic at work	Think about your work and evaluate each statement: I feel very energetic in my work.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “completely disagree”, 7 “completely agree”).
D102	Enthusiastic at work	Think about your work and evaluate each statement: I am enthusiastic about my work.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “completely disagree”, 7 “completely agree”).
D103	Inspired	Think about your work and evaluate each statement: my work is inspiring to me.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “completely disagree”, 7 “completely agree”).
D104	Satisfied to go to work	Think about your work and evaluate each statement: when I get up, I feel like going to work.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “completely disagree”, 7 “completely agree”).
D105	Happy to work hard	Think about your work and evaluate each statement: I feel happy when I work hard.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “completely disagree”, 7 “completely agree”).
D10.6	Self-proudness in one’s work.	Think about your work and evaluate each statement: I am proud of my work.	Lickert 1–7 (1 “completely disagree”, 7 “completely agree”).
F7	Attendance at the conservatory.	In the past, did you study at the Conservatory?	Y/N
F8	Other musicians in the family.	Are there other musicians in your family?	Y/N

References

- Bernard, R. A dissonant duet: Discussions of music making and music teaching. *Music Educ. Res.* **2004**, *6*, 281–298.
- Sacchetti, S.; Salustri, A. Musicians’ work preferences: Teaching or playing? In Proceedings of the DiMMI Research Proceedings, University of Trento, Trento, Italy, 25–26 November 2022.
- Ballantyne, J. Identities of music teachers: Implications for teacher education. *Teach. Educ. Local Glob.* **2005**, 39–44.
- Triantafyllaki, A. Performance teachers’ identity and professional knowledge in advanced music teaching. *Music Educ. Res.* **2010**, *12*, 71–87.
- Parkes, K.A.; Jones, B.D. Motivational constructs influencing undergraduate students’ choices to become classroom music teachers or music performers. *J. Res. Music Educ.* **2012**, *60*, 101–123.
- Pellegrino, K. Exploring the benefits of music-making as professional development for music teachers. *Arts Educ. Policy Rev.* **2011**, *112*, 79–88.
- Pellegrino, K. Becoming music-making music teachers: Connecting music making, identity, wellbeing, and teaching for four student teachers. *Res. Stud. Music Educ.* **2015**, *37*, 175–194.
- Madsen, C.K.; Kelly, S.N. First remembrances of wanting to become a music teacher. *J. Res. Music Educ.* **2002**, *50*, 323–332.
- Thornton, L.; Bergee, M. Career choice influences among music education students at major schools of music. *Bull. Counc. Res. Music Educ.* **2008**, 7–17.
- Rickels, D.A.; Councill, K.H.; Fredrickson, W.E.; Hairston, M.J.; Porter, A.M.; Schmidt, M. Influences on career choice among music education audition candidates: A pilot study. *J. Res. Music Educ.* **2010**, *57*, 292–307.
- Jones, B.D.; Parkes, K.A. The motivation of undergraduate music students: The impact of identification and talent beliefs on choosing a career in music education. *J. Music Teach. Educ.* **2010**, *19*, 41–56.
- Henry, M.L. The musical experiences, career aspirations, and attitudes toward the music education profession of all-state musicians. *J. Music Teach. Educ.* **2015**, *24*, 40–53.
- Schlechty, P.C.; Vance, V.S. Recruitment, selection and retention: The shape of the teaching force. *Elem. Sch. J.* **1983**, *83*, 469–487.
- Krueger, P.J. Beginning music teachers: Will they leave the profession? *Update Appl. Res. Music Educ.* **2000**, *19*, 22–26.
- Yourn, B.R. Learning to teach: Perspectives from beginning music teachers. *Music Educ. Res.* **2000**, *2*, 181–192.
- Conway, C. The experiences of first-year music teachers: A literature review. *Update Appl. Res. Music Educ.* **2015**, *33*, 65–72.
- ILO. *Global Employment Trends for Youth 2022: Investing in Transforming Futures for Young People*; ILO: Geneva, Switzerland, 2022.
- Sacchetti, S.; Marchesin, G. Il sistema delle scuole musicali in Trentino e la produzione di valore collettivo. *Impresa Soc.* **2020**, *2*, 63–77.
- Isbell, D.S. Musicians and teachers: The socialization and occupational identity of preservice music teachers. *J. Res. Music Educ.* **2008**, *56*, 162–178.

20. Deci, E.L.; Ryan, R.M. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development and well-being. *Am. Psychol.* **2000**, *55*, 68–78.
21. Throsby, D. A work-preference model of artist behaviour. In *Cultural Economics and Cultural Policies*; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 1994; pp. 69–80.
22. Sachs, J.D.; Becchetti, L.; Annett, A. *World Happiness Report 2016*; Special Rome Edition; Sustainable Development Solutions Network: New York, NY, USA, 2016.
23. Herzberg, F. One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harv. Bus. Rev.* **2003**, *81*, 86.
24. Oldham, G.R.; Hackman, J.R. Not what it was and not what it will be: The future of job design research. *J. Organ. Behav.* **2010**, *31*, 463–479.
25. Grant, A.M. Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* **2007**, *32*, 393–417.
26. Kilduff, M.; Brass, D.J. Job design: A social network perspective. *J. Organ. Behav.* **2010**, *31*, 309–318.
27. Sacchetti, S.; Tortia, E.C. Satisfaction with creativity: A study of organizational characteristics and individual motivation. *J. Happiness Stud.* **2013**, *14*, 1789–1811.
28. McCullagh, P. Regression Models for Ordinal Data. *J. R. Stat. Soc.* **1980**, *42*, 109–142.
29. DeMaris, A. A tutorial in logistic regression. *J. Marriage Fam.* **1995**, 956–968.
30. Christensen, R.H.B. Cumulative link models for ordinal regression with the R package ordinal. *Submitt. J. Stat. Softw.* **2018**, *35*, 1–46.
31. Sacchetti, S.; Tortia, E.C. Governing cooperatives in the context of individual motives. *Int. J. Soc. Econ.* **2021**, *48*, 181–203.
32. Alshmemri, M.; Shahwan-Akl, L.; Maude, P. Herzberg's two-factor theory. *Life Sci. J.* **2017**, *14*, 12–16.
33. Ryan, R.M.; Frederick, C. On Energy, Personality, and Health: Subjective Vitality as a Dynamic Reflection of Well-Being. *J. Personal.* **1997**, *65*, 3.
34. Borzaga, C.; Tortia, E. Worker motivations, job satisfaction, and loyalty in public and nonprofit social services. *Nonprofit Volunt. Sect. Q.* **2006**, *35*, 225–248.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.