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Purpose

The purpose of the study was to determine if teacher turnover in elementary grades could be predicted by classroom teaching performance scores, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, and selected school and teacher demographic variables.

Methods and Procedures

The sample for this study consisted of 256 teachers, 128 departing teachers and 128 remaining teachers in 20 elementary schools with the highest turnover ratios in the Dekalb County School System.

Data on the teachers' classroom teaching performance
were collected from Georgia's annual teacher evaluation process on the Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments (TPAI) and Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI). In addition, the teachers provided selected demographic data on their perceptions of principals instructional leadership in teacher evaluation by completing a 54-item questionnaire that was designed by the researcher.

Correlation analysis, factor analysis, and regression analysis were used to analyze the data. Null hypotheses were rejected at the p = .05 level of confidence.

**Results**

An analysis of the data indicated that classroom teaching performance scores and teacher race were factors which were significantly related to teacher turnover. Teacher age, experience, education, travel distance, and place of residence were significantly related to teacher turnover in the Pearson product-moment correlational analysis. However, when these variables were interacting simultaneously, with teacher race and classroom teaching performance scores on teacher turnover, their separate effects were small and insignificant as compared to the more dominant effects of race and classroom teaching performance scores.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

When school bells ring this fall (1989-90) signaling time for over 20 million American elementary school children to return to school, some classrooms in growing regions of the South, West, and metropolitan areas will not have enough professionally trained teachers to teach in them (Darling-Hammond, 1988).

In recent years, there has been a trend of decline in both quality and quantity of teachers for American schools. Moreover, the low number of students choosing teaching as a career, even with the recent moderate increase in students who select education as a major, indicates the existence of a teacher shortage problem (Schlechty & Vance, 1982; Darling-Hammond, 1988).

In addition to the teacher-shortage problem, many school systems, especially large urban inner-city systems, are experiencing an increase in teacher turnover. School and teacher demographics, work performance, working conditions, legal mandates, spouse's job transfer, low salary, low morale, and family responsibilities are some of the most salient factors that impact teacher turnover (Darling-Hammond,
1988; Darden, 1981; Duttweiler, 1987; Dworkin, 1980; Schlechty & Vance, 1982). Croft (1983) asserts that teacher turnover will continue to increase because of the social forces of the urban scene, changing demographics, and the legal aspects of desegregation.

This increase in teacher turnover and the growing shortage of teachers make it extremely challenging for school systems to employ an adequate supply of teachers.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the study was to determine if teacher turnover could be predicted by teacher classroom teaching performance, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, and selected school and teacher demographic variables. The main premise of the study was that if specific system-related factors and other controllable teacher turnover factors could be identified, then the school system could take manipulative steps to minimize or eliminate those factors. This identification-implementation process is crucial because of current teacher shortages, projected increase in demand for teachers, a decline in the number of students selecting teaching as a career, and increase in teacher turnover.
Research Questions

In an attempt to analyze the relationship among the variables of classroom teaching performance, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, school demographic variables, teacher demographic variables, and teacher turnover in elementary grades, the following research questions were addressed:

1. Is there a relationship between classroom teaching performance scores and teacher turnover?

2. Is there a relationship between teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process and teacher turnover?

3. Is there a relationship among school demographic variables of socio-economic status of schools, racial composition of students, race of the principals, and teacher turnover?

4. Is there a relationship among teacher demographic variables of race, age, experience, education level, grade level taught, travel distance, location of residence, and teacher turnover?

5. Can teacher turnover be predicted by teacher classroom teaching performance scores, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in
the evaluation process, and selected school and teacher demographic variables?

Background to Problem

One of the most challenging problems facing school systems today is that of reducing or eliminating teacher turnover. Research studies indicate that teacher turnover is one of the major causes of teacher shortages. Although there is not total agreement on the extent of teacher shortages, there is general agreement that shortages exist and are escalating. It is essential that teacher turnover be minimized and, if possible, eliminated. Linda Jordan (1988), Coordinator of Recruitment for the State of Georgia Department of Education, reported that 5,000 new school teachers are needed each year in Georgia, but state colleges and universities produce only 3,000 teacher graduates annually. Additionally, she reported that Georgia, as well as the nation, is facing a serious shortage in ethnic minority teachers. Because of federal court mandates, competition for this limited number of minority teachers is very keen. Holt (1989) reported that in 1980, one U.S. teacher out of eight was minority. By the year 2000, he reported that that proportion will fall to one out of 20.
The Effective Schools Research indicated that quality teachers are vital to student achievement (Steadman, 1985). The Educational Research Service (1985) reported that school personnel measures have shown a more direct relationship to student achievement than have measures of facilities and supplies. After reviewing 19 studies, Guthrie (1970, cited in the Educational Research Service, 1983) summarized that "the strongest findings by far are those which relate to the number and quality of the professional staff, particularly teachers." Fifteen of the 19 studies that he investigated revealed various characteristics of teachers to be associated closely with one or more measures of pupil academic performance. Hence, selection and retention of highly qualified teachers are central to schools being able to provide for the academic needs of students. This concern is greatly magnified when attention is drawn to the growing increase in teacher shortage in almost every academic area.

Duttweiler (1987) reported that there has been a steady decline in both the quantity and quality of the teaching force. The research reveals that the most academically talented students are not entering the
teaching profession in large numbers. Test scores for education majors, measured by college entrance exams and grade-point averages, have shown a noticeable decline since the late seventies. According to Schlechty and Vance (1982), education attracts and retains a proportionate share of individuals in the middle range of academic ability. However, education attracts more than a proportionate share of students from the lower-ability range and less than a proportionate share of students from the upper-ability range.

There are many reasons why teachers stop teaching or leave a particular school system. Some studies divide reasons into categories of controllables and uncontrollables, individual and organizational, or internal and external, in order to denote causes that are due primarily to individual needs as opposed to failures related to the education enterprise. Factors such as pregnancies, relocations related to spouse's career, transfers to other states, illnesses and disabilities, job terminations and nonrenewals denote uncontrollables which are factors that are related to the individual (Georgia's Teacher Attrition Study, 1981). Factors such as low salary, poor administration,
student discipline problems, school and personnel resources denote controllables which are factors that are, to some extent, external to the employee and more directly related to the education enterprise (Georgia's Teacher Attrition Study, 1981).

Most studies generally list causes of teacher turnover under one or a combination of all four of the following broad categories: salary and working conditions, school characteristics, teacher characteristics, and legislative/legal mandates. These categories include primarily two dimensions of teacher turnover—individual factors and work-related factors. Some factors seem to impact teacher turnover more than others.

Exit interviews of approximately 100 departing employees conducted by the elementary employment administrator in the DeKalb County School System (1989), Georgia's largest school system, revealed that:

1. A high percentage of departing elementary teachers listed problems associated with classroom teaching performance as one of the primary reasons for leaving the school system.

2. When new teachers are employed, especially after the school year has begun, the teachers as well
as the principals frequently expressed concern related to classroom teaching expectations.

3. New teachers often requested placement in middle to upper socio-economic status schools based on their concern about student control and student discipline.

4. Many of the teachers listed poor leadership by the principal as a major factor that influenced them to leave the system.

5. Inadequate salary and benefits were listed by almost all of the departing teachers, but not significantly independent of the other reasons given. Their usual comment was, "Sure, I would like to earn more money; anyone would."

6. Distance traveled to workplace was often cited.

7. Many of the departing teachers who were assigned to low socio-economic status schools indicated that they felt inadequately prepared to be instructionally effective in such schools.

The federal court case (Pitts v. Freeman, 1988) revealed that the DeKalb County School System has a growing majority black student population with a majority white teaching staff; a majority of the departing teachers were white assigned to predominantly
minority schools. In most cases, many of these departing teachers indicated that they were unable to, and in a few cases lacked the necessary commitment to, teach severely at-risk children. Lack of commitment may have been related to their inability to adapt to cultural and social differences.

Kozol (1985) postulated that many white teachers intrinsically do not commit fully to teaching low socio-economic status black children because they feel that black children are limited socially and intellectually. Williams (1988) related this feeling to the slave era. He stated that the actions of whites and blacks today are a carry-over from "slavery times" where whites "naturally" felt superior to blacks and blacks were conditioned to feel inferior. Whites provided custodial care for blacks, i.e., care they determined blacks needed and care that was "commensurate with being black." Kozol (1985) stated that some white teachers provide only custodial care for their minority students today.

This researcher recognizes that racial issues in public education may be controversial and highly sensitive. Therefore, the strong views expressed by Kozol, Williams and others should be recognized as
individual views. However, research studies indicate that a trend has developed in many of today's large metropolitan school systems, including the DeKalb County School System, in which the majority black student population is taught by a majority white teaching staff. Solutions to problems related to teachers' understanding their students' backgrounds and needs are essential to meeting the goal of the schools—high student achievement.

Hill (1988) supported this assessment in his book, *Effective Strategies for Teaching Minority Students*. He stated that:

> Educators need to improve the quality of education for all students, regardless of their economic level or race. . . . In achieving this nationally accepted goal, a major challenge to be considered is the development and distribution of sensitive, knowledgeable, and qualified teachers among the various schools (urban and rural) that service the poor and/or minority students. (pp. 8-9)

Additionally, he states that teachers who are least prepared to work effectively with poor and/or minority students are usually assigned to minority schools. Hill continues by asking the question, "Who, then, will
teach the growing majority poor and/or minority public school students in their communities?" He explains, if what many research studies indicate is true, many minority teachers will leave teaching within five years; it is of paramount importance that caring and sensitive, non-minority teachers be assigned to classrooms where poor and/or minority students attend in large numbers.

Rationale

The DeKalb County School System, Georgia's largest system, employs a large number of teachers each year. The system has a history in Georgia and other southeastern states of being a school system of excellence. It is renowned for quality resources and strong, traditional support from its communities and businesses. Today, however, because of teacher shortages, demographic changes in the county, the Metropolitan Atlanta teacher job market, and federal court mandates, teacher turnover is eroding the foundation of the school system's strength--an adequate supply of highly-qualified teachers.

This study focused on the problem of teacher turnover in elementary schools in the DeKalb County
School System and its relationship among variables such as classroom teaching performance, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, and selected demographic variables of schools and teachers.

As an elementary and secondary classroom teacher, a secondary assistant principal and an elementary principal, respectively, this researcher is acutely aware of the impact that teacher turnover has on program stability and continuity and student achievement. As the personnel administrator for elementary employment, this researcher has experienced the impact of teacher turnover as reflected in the number and length of time of vacancies. In the past five years, in the DeKalb County School System, the number and length of time that vacancies exist have increased and the trend appears to be continuing. In some certification fields, vacancies have existed for as much as five months (DeKalb County School System Board Report, 1988). This situation has necessitated the use of noncertified substitute teachers in increasing numbers. Obtaining substitute teachers when needed in some schools is very challenging.

Although a plethora of research studies shows that
the causes of teacher turnover are numerous and varied, with salary and poor working conditions predominating, exit interviews in the DeKalb County School System reveal causes related to classroom teaching performance, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, school demographics, and teacher demographic variables.

A thorough examination of the literature revealed limited research on the relationship among the variables of classroom teaching performance, principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, school demographics, teacher demographics, and their impact on teachers' decisions to leave their school systems. Many studies are available on teacher turnover and salary, teacher turnover and working conditions, and teacher turnover and administrative leadership. No studies were found that related teacher turnover to the grouped variables of classroom teaching performance, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, school demographic variables, and selected demographic variables of teachers.
Teacher Turnover in the DeKalb County School System

As in many school systems throughout the nation, teacher turnover in the DeKalb County School System has gradually grown to a point of major concern. This problem is amplified by a combination of factors such as low supply-high demand for teachers and alarming statistics on the quantity and quality of college students who select teaching as their career choice.

The DeKalb County School System, since the early 1950s, has always employed a number of teachers each year--either because of phenomenal population growth or the recent relatively high turnover rates. DeKalb County's population increased from less than 100,000 residents in the early 1950s to more than one-half million residents in the late 1980s (Pitts v. Freeman, 1988). In the 1970s, student population growth required construction of one new classroom per day (Horne, 1979). This trend continued through the early 1980s, at which time student population growth leveled off and actually declined. However, the employment of a relatively large number of teachers continued primarily because of educational innovations, expanded educational programs, federal court mandates, and a gradual but steady increase in teacher turnover.
Additionally, dramatic changes in the racial composition of the student population in the school system occurred during this period. The minority student population increased from almost 8,000 students in 1979 to over 35,000 students in 1988. More than 64,000 black citizens moved to DeKalb County during the 1970s and 1980s. The increase in minority student population is projected to continue into the year 2000.

The systemwide turnover rate of professional staff in the DeKalb School System, since the 1960s, has generally ranged from 10 to 20 percent (DeKalb School Study, 1968). During the 1960s, 1970s, and early 1980s, teacher turnover did not create a great amount of concern because of an abundant supply of teachers eager to work in the school system. Today, however, because of teacher shortages and other changes in the county, reducing or eliminating turnover is highly emphasized, especially in schools where the turnover rate exceeds the average turnover of the system.

In the past five years teacher turnover in the DeKalb County School System has been strongly impacted by the following: (a) increased efforts to implement finally and fully the Federal Court requirements to remove all "vestiges of segregation" from the DeKalb
County School System (Pitts v. Freeman, 1988); (b) an open "job market" due to very rapid population growth in neighboring counties, especially Cobb and Gwinnett Counties; and (c) residential patterns of white teachers in the Metropolitan Atlanta area.

The Federal Court Order

In 1968, the DeKalb County School System was ordered by the Federal Court to desegregate its schools (Pitts v. Freeman, 1988). DeKalb County, working with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), developed a final and terminal plan for desegregating its schools. The plan was approved by Judge Newell Edenfield in June 1969. The court maintained jurisdiction over the desegregation case and today, although the school system has filed a motion for dismissal of the case, the school district still operates under the court order (Pitts v. Freeman, 1988).

In January 1986, the DeKalb County School System declared that it had achieved unitary status and filed for final dismissal of the case. A school system has achieved unitary status if it has not operated segregated schools for a period of several years and has eliminated the vestiges of its previous racial
discrimination practices and has been adjudicated as such through the proper judicial procedures (cited in Pitts v. Freeman, 1988).

The court, in June 1988, found that the DeKalb County School System had achieved maximum practical desegregation as of the 1986-87 school year. However, in desegregation cases, the goal is to achieve the absolute maximum degree of actual desegregation, taking into account the practicalities of the situation (United States v. Desota Parish School Board, 1978, cited in Pitts v. Freeman, 1988). The court ruled that the DeKalb County School System eliminated most of the vestiges of racial segregation. However, the court found that the school system had not complied with one of Singleton's requirements as stated in Singleton v. Jackson Municipal Separate School District (1969, cited in Pitts v. Freeman, 1988). The plaintiffs argued that the DeKalb County School System did not comply with the requirement that "principals, teachers, teacher aides and other staff who work directly with children at a school shall be so assigned that in no case will the racial composition of a staff indicate that a school is intended for Negro students or white students" (Singleton, 1969, cited in Pitts v. Freeman, 1988).
Therefore, the court, in ruling that the DeKalb County School System has not complied with Singleton with regard to assignment of minority staff, did not grant unitary status to the school system. Its desegregation efforts will remain under the jurisdiction of the court until full compliance with Singleton is achieved. Judge William C. O'Kelly, in June 1988, ordered the DeKalb County School System to implement a plan by September 1989 to achieve total compliance with Singleton's requirements.

"Open Job Market" in Metropolitan Atlanta Due to Population Growth in Cobb and Gwinnett Counties

According to Murnane (May, 1987), teachers and prospective teachers make thoughtful employment decisions within the context of the labor market. A variety of incentives, he stated, influence the labor market decisions that teachers and potential teachers make. For example, the decision to leave or to remain with a school system is influenced by the availability of employment opportunities. Employment opportunity in the job market strongly influences a teacher's decision to leave one school system for another system that has "desirable characteristics" (Croft, 1983).
Many teachers who leave the DeKalb County School System are employed by other metropolitan Atlanta school systems. Exit interviews with many departing teachers reveal that they have secured a teaching position in one of the metropolitan Atlanta counties. Cobb and Gwinnett counties are two such metropolitan Atlanta counties that are experiencing rapid population growth and, therefore, have needs for more teachers.

Cobb County, located in the northwestern quadrant of metropolitan Atlanta, has and continues to experience population growth. It is a predominantly white middle to high socio-economic status county. In 1960, Cobb County's population had reached 413,600 citizens (Cobb County Data Report, 1988). The Data Report projects continued, significant growth for Cobb into the year 2000.

Cobb County's school population indicates similar growth. The student population has increased by more than 2,000 students each year for the past five years. The enrollment has grown from 58,000 students in 1982 to almost 70,000 students in 1989 (Cobb County School Board Report, 1989). More teachers have been employed each year to teach this growing student population. In 1985, the system employed 439 teachers, while in 1989
the system is projected to employ over 700 teachers (Cobb County Department of Personnel, 1989). Many of the DeKalb County teachers are being employed by Cobb County to meet its increasing teacher demand.

Similarly, Gwinnett County School System, a system with many of the same demographic factors as Cobb County, will continue to need additional teachers. The county has experienced phenomenal population growth in the past ten years. Gwinnett's population increased from 166,000 citizens in 1980 to almost 350,000 citizens in 1989 (Gwinnett School System Planning Department, 1989). The school enrollment increased from 41,000 students to over 62,000 students during the same period of time (Gwinnett Personnel Department, 1989). In 1985, the Gwinnett School System employed 378 teachers; in 1988-89, the school system employed 818 teachers (Gwinnett County Board of Education, Personnel Department, 1989). This growth pattern is projected to continue into the year 2000. This population trend will continue to provide an excellent job market where employment opportunity will be very good and many DeKalb teachers who in the absence of other employment opportunity would remain with DeKalb, will leave (Croft, 1983).
Teacher Residential Patterns

The 1980 United States Census indicates that urban areas have greater concentrations of minority populations in the inner cities while the majority of the white population is located in the suburbs and farther away from inner cities (See Figure 1). This residential pattern of white teachers in the DeKalb County School District is quite evident as revealed by both selection and exit interviews.

DeKalb's veteran teachers indicate their residential preference by requesting transfers to schools as near their residential areas as possible (DeKalb County School System Personnel Department, 1989). Many of these teachers have moved to Cobb and Gwinnett Counties and seek transfers to north DeKalb County schools (See Figure 1). New teacher prospects almost always request schools located as close to DeKalb's northern border as possible because many of them tend to reside in the Northern metropolitan areas. Some teachers and teacher prospects have even requested that DeKalb County "move the school system northward."

The impact of white teachers' residential patterns, as reflected in the growing number of these teachers accepting positions in their residential areas, is
FIGURE 1. Metropolitan Atlanta Counties
becoming very crucial to the DeKalb County School System's ability to maintain its teaching staff.

The future appears even less encouraging and the loss of teachers will continue, especially with increased restrictions on the "teacher transfer program" because of DeKalb's efforts to comply fully with its desegregation court order and the expanding job market in Cobb and Gwinnett Counties.

**Significance of the Study**

Teacher turnover is the loss and subsequential replacement of teachers in a school year. The replacement of departing teachers each year is becoming more and more difficult. Studies by Schlechty and Vance (1982), and Frankel (1982) indicated that fewer college students select teaching as their career choice, and the number that actually graduates and becomes teachers is low and continues to decline.

Frankel (1982) and Fiestritzter (1983), in their studies found a growing teacher shortage problem and a need for additional teachers in the future. Similarly Darling-Hammond (1988) reported that newly graduated teacher candidates are expected to satisfy only about 60 percent of the demand over the next five years.
Frankel (1982) and Fiestritzer (1983) reported that student enrollment in preschool, elementary school and secondary school is expected to increase during the 1990s. Nursery school and kindergarten enrollments are projected to increase from 5.2 million to 6.9 million students in the early 1990s (Frankel, 1982).

Georgia school districts continue to lose teachers due to controllable and uncontrollable factors. Controllable factors include salary, administrative leadership, classroom management problems, and job satisfaction. Uncontrollable factors consist of spouse job transfers out-of-state, disabilities, pregnancies, job termination/nonrenewals, and teacher certification problems. Reducing uncontrollable factors and eliminating controllable factors must become a major goal for school systems in Georgia and other systems across this nation. Teacher turnover, when analyzed in combination with teacher shortages and increasing demands for more teachers, is a major problem for many public school systems. Research studies indicate that the demand for more teachers will continue to increase while the supply will continue to decrease (Center for Education Statistics, 1987).

Therefore, it is crucial for school systems to
identify specific reasons for teacher turnover. Specific causes related to teacher turnover, if identified, have implications for staff development activity, teacher and administrator assessment programs, differentiated staffing, allocation of resources, personnel procedures related to screening, employment, and assignment of teachers to schools. Additionally, improved strategies for teacher retention may be developed.

Summary

This introductory chapter focused attention on the problem of teacher shortages in the DeKalb County School System. Teacher turnover was identified as the major cause of the teacher shortage problem. Research questions were developed to focus on the factors that contributed to teacher turnover and hence teacher shortages.

As indicated in the Background, Rationale, and Significance of this Problem, factors that contributed to teacher turnover included significant demographic changes in the community/school population, legal/court mandates, inability to manage students in the classroom, inadequate administrative leadership, poor salary and
benefits, long travel distances, and an expanded job market in the Metropolitan Atlanta area.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Teacher turnover is currently an area of major concern for school systems across this nation. This problem becomes sharply focused when viewed in terms of the general decrease in the supply of teachers and the increase in the demand for more and more teachers created by factors such as increased student enrollment, educational reform movements and continued expanded services assigned to public schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 1986).

Cassetter (1986) indicates that a major part of the personnel function is that of recruiting and employing the highest quality staff available. Personnel departments in many of today's public school systems are finding it more and more challenging, if not impossible, to adequately staff schools with top quality teachers.

Estimates indicate that by 1993, approximately 211,000 teachers will be needed; however, our colleges and universities will graduate only about 138,000 teachers (National Center for Education Statistics, 1986). If these projections are remotely correct, then
the teacher shortage problem will reach the crisis level in this time period.

Reducing and, if possible, eliminating teacher turnover is a practical means of impacting the growing teacher shortage problem. School systems must determine specifically why "their" teachers are leaving.

The literature on teacher turnover is varied and extensive; however, the major focus of this study was to analyze the relationship between teacher turnover and the variables of classroom teaching performance, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, school and teacher demographics.

Therefore, the review of the literature focused on studies related to: (a) teacher turnover, (b) classroom teaching performance, (c) selected demographic variables of schools and teachers, and (d) administrative evaluation of teachers.

**Teacher Turnover**

Teacher turnover refers to the decision of teachers to leave or to remain with the DeKalb School System, measured in terms of those who actually left or remained during the 1988-89 school year. Controlling teacher
turnover is imperative in our schools because of growing teacher shortages in almost every teaching field. Levin (1982) stated that "forty-three states reported shortages or critical shortages of physics teachers and 38 states reported similarly about chemistry teachers" (p. 21). Additionally, the teacher shortage problem is impacted by regional population shifts. Population shifts will account for teacher shortages in the southwest and south while an oversupply of teachers will exist in the northeast and midwest (Applegate, 1982; Feistritzer, 1983). It is projected that by 1990, 33 percent of Americans will be living in the South and 17 percent in the West (Feistritzer, 1983). In the United States, student enrollment is expected to increase by 600,000 students in 1990 (Frankel, 1982). This increase in enrollment will require more teachers which will add to the teacher shortage crisis. Darling-Hammond (1988) reported that the newly graduated teacher candidates are expected to satisfy only about 60 percent of the demand over the next five years.

Linda Jordan (1988), recruitment coordinator for the Georgia Department of Education Recruitment Division, reported that although Georgia needs 5,000
new teachers each year, its colleges and universities graduate only 3,000 teacher candidates each year.

Chapman and Hutcheson (1982) in their study, "Attrition from Teaching Careers: A Discriminatory Analysis," revealed that about one out of every four teachers eventually changes to other careers. They found that teachers who left teaching and those who did not leave teaching differed significantly in both their self-assessed skills and abilities as well as in the importance they assigned to selected criteria of success. These results support hypotheses developed from Holland's theory that vocational satisfaction, stability, and achievement depend on the congruence between one's personality and the environment in which one works.

Grissmer, Haggstrom, and Darling-Hammond (1988) reported that many college graduates who are qualified to teach take nonteaching jobs or remain unemployed for a year or more.

Murnane (1987), in a speech on "Understanding Teacher Attrition" stated that a study on the survival rate of 13,000 teachers in Michigan during the early 1970s indicated that a relatively large percentage of the teachers leave the profession after only a few
years of teaching. The study revealed that 15 percent of the teachers stopped teaching within two years, 9 percent left before completing three years and 56 percent, slightly more than half, were still teaching six years after they had begun. This teacher turnover pattern, Murnane explained, is not atypical. A number of studies on teacher turnover in different states and in different time periods revealed similar turnover patterns. For example, a dissertation study in 1928 revealed a similar turnover pattern for teachers in New York State during the 1920s.

Fewer students are selecting teaching as their career choice. Twenty percent of the bachelor's degrees earned in 1971 were education compared to under 12 percent in 1981 (Darling-Hammond, 1984). In 1972, approximately 191,172 students in the United States earned bachelor's degrees in education compared to 118,102 in 1980 (Feistritzer, 1983).

In addition to inadequate numbers of college graduates selecting teaching as a career, Schlechty and Vance (1982), in their study on "The Structure of the Teaching Occupation and the Characteristics of Teachers: A Sociological Interpretation" found that teacher
entrants and veteran teachers were less able academically. Furthermore, they concluded that:

1. Characteristics of the teaching corps are determined by social forces such as:

- Teachers are disproportionately drawn from among those college graduates who were born in small towns and rural communities.

- Education disproportionately attracts persons from the lower ranges of academic ability and socio-economic status (SES) and these persons also seem more likely to stay in the occupation.

- Recruits to education are generally less academically able than nonrecruits, but those who are recruited to education are more academically able than those who are committed to staying in teaching.

- Persons from low and medium SES backgrounds are over-represented among the recruits, but low and medium SES persons are even more over-represented among those who choose to stay in teaching.

- Persons who consider it very important to be able to find steady work are somewhat over-represented in the recruits to education; they
are even more over-represented in the committed teachers.

2. If teacher education and teaching were to deny access to college students who scored in the lowest 20 percent on the SAT, between 10 and 15 percent of all persons who now graduate from college would be denied an accessible academic major in education. This denial would have more of an impact on females and blacks than it would on white males.

3. If schools of education and public school employers were to require verbal SAT scores of 496 (the mean for nonrecruits), almost 70 percent of those in the sample would be denied access to the teaching occupation.

4. Those who remain in teaching tend to have more limited career options available to them.

5. Teaching will become the exclusive domain of the academically inferior white females if minimum competency tests are mandated that will exclude the lower fifty percent and if students from the upper half continue to leave teaching in increasingly large numbers.

6. In order to reverse these trends, policymakers and legislators must substantially increase salaries and other incentives.
Teachers continue to leave the teaching profession in some school districts in increasing numbers. The Metropolitan Life Insurance Company commissioned Harris (1985) to conduct a nationwide survey on teacher turnover with former teachers who left public schools within the past five years. Results from the survey revealed that former teachers left because of poor salaries, poor working conditions, job stress and low personal prestige. The survey also indicated that poor student discipline and lack of administrative support influenced their decision to leave. In 1981, the Darden Research Corporation (Darden, 1981) conducted a teacher attrition study on teachers who left or changed schools/systems in Georgia within the past year. The results revealed low salary, poor administration, poor working conditions, low job satisfaction and student discipline problems as the primary reasons for leaving. Many studies on teacher turnover report similar findings that low salary and poor working conditions are two prevalent reasons given for teacher turnover (Grissmer, Haggstron and Darling-Hammond, 1988; Jensen, 1987; Duttweiler, 1987; Seyfarth and Bost, 1986).

The causes of teacher turnover are varied and complex; however, the literature indicates that many
causes are directly related to the social and political system and teachers' teaching ability in the classroom.

**Classroom Teaching Performance**

Classroom teaching performance refers to all activities, procedures, and methods utilized by classroom teachers in the teaching process (Georgia Department of Education, 1988; Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument). According to Georgia Department of Education, salient components of effective instruction are planning, organizing, coordinating, and providing resources; providing a positive learning environment; maintaining appropriate classroom behavior; and evaluating students' progress.

Graphically, the concept may be illustrated as follows:

```
Classroom Teaching Process → Planning
                             Organizing and Providing Resources
                             Positive Learning Environment
                             Appropriate Classroom Behavior
                             Student Evaluation
```
Hence, Classroom Teaching Performance is defined as the scores assigned to teachers by principals to designate their performance levels using the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI) and the Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument (TPAI).

Although the principal, the leader of the school, has overall responsibility for providing a school environment that enhances the teaching/learning process, the teacher is directly responsible for student achievement in the classroom (Steadman, 1985). Hence, the classroom teacher must provide the atmosphere and instructional resources that enhance and improve the learning process.

The Planning component of the teaching process, based on the TPAI, requires instruction objectives to be stated in terms of learner outcomes. These objectives must be specified, developed in terms of performance outcomes, adequate in scope and depth of content, and appropriate to their instructional levels. Additionally, Broko and Niles (1987, cited in Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments--Research/Rationale, 1988) stated that the most important student characteristic considered by teachers in their planning is ability level. They indicated that it is important
to match the various ability levels of students in the classroom.

Organizing the learning environment for the effective use of time, space, and instructional material and equipment facilitates instructional activities. The ability of teachers to provide effective instruction in the classroom, to a great extent, depends on the teacher's ability to effectively manage the classroom environment (Steadman, 1985).

Successful performance on the TPAI requires teachers to be effective managers in the classroom. According to Brophy (1983, cited in Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments--Research/Rationale, 1988): "Good classroom organization and management not only involves responding to problems but in preventing them. . . . this prevention is accomplished primarily by good planning, curriculum pacing, and instruction that keeps students profitably engaged in appropriate activities" (p. 29).

Establishing and maintaining a positive learning environment in the classroom is a key element in providing effective instruction for students. The two principal components of providing a positive learning environment in the classroom are communicating
enthusiasm for teaching and for the subject and demonstrating interest in the learner.

The TPAI measures enthusiasm in terms of verbal and nonverbal communications by teachers. The goal of high teacher enthusiasm in the classroom is to create enthusiasm for learning by students. During learning activities, students often look to the teacher for cues as to how to respond. If the teacher presents the topic or assignment with enthusiasm suggesting that it is interesting, important, or worthwhile, the students are likely to adopt this same attitude (Brophy, 1987, cited in Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments--Research/Rationale, 1988). Additionally, he states that teacher enthusiasm has been positively related to student achievement. All behavior in the classroom by teachers and students should enhance the learning process. Inappropriate classroom behavior must be corrected as soon as possible.

Clegg (1984) discovered in his study, "Discipline In The Classroom," that poor school discipline endangers students and staff, contributes to teacher burnout, hinders student education, costs taxpayers, and encourages criminality both in and out of school.
According to Carter's (1987) discussion of the Gallup Polls on Public Education, a lack of student discipline was the number-one problem facing public schools between 1969 and 1985. The main causes cited were inadequate parenting, ineffective teacher training, poor school organization, and inadequate administrative leadership. He recommended a model that includes: (a) shared sense of purpose for discipline training; (b) focus on individual students' needs; (c) purposeful, organized activities for learning self-discipline; and (d) personal responsibility for the program's success.

A statistical report by the Center for Education Statistics (1987) on Public School Teachers Perspective on School Discipline indicated that 44 percent of the teachers in public schools reported that there was more disruptive classroom behavior in their schools in 1986-87 than five years before. Almost one-third (29 percent) indicated that they had seriously considered leaving teaching because of student misbehavior; and on the average, teachers estimated that about seven percent of the students they taught had habitual behavior problems.

Reflecting upon today's society, we can see that
the teaching process has become more complex. Laws emphasizing student rights, general change in the family structure (more one-parent families), changed values, and a more heterogeneous student population require a teacher with the ability to manage the classroom in addition to being a disciplinarian. Long (1987) concluded that if today's teachers are to be effective classroom managers, "they must develop and be encouraged to use a variety of models representing management styles appropriate to the various situations that arise in the classroom" (p. 217). Moreover, he stated, "management is not a simple problem, and it cannot be solved with simple answers" (p. 217).

Fifer (1986) identified two factors that are essential in helping today's teachers become effective classroom managers--room arrangement and teacher mobility. In his observation of preservice teachers, he noticed that behavior problems seem to occur in areas of the classroom farthest from the teacher. Also, the number of discipline problems were relative to teacher location in the classroom. This agrees with Wong's (1973, cited in Fifer, 1986) statement that "discipline problems are directly proportional to the distance between the teacher and student, and discipline
problems are directly proportional to the amount of time a teacher spends behind his/her desk" (p. 403).

Brophy (1983) concludes that a comprehensive approach to managing student behavior in the classroom must include consideration for individual differences; interesting, relevant instructional activities; clear and concise rules; techniques for resolving conflicts; and consistent, firm, and fair application of management techniques in the classroom.

Finally, the TPAI requires the selection of procedures and materials for assessing learner performance on the selected objectives. Students' performance should be assessed by utilization of a variety of techniques such as objective and essay tests, papers, projects, etc. Each student should be given ample opportunity to demonstrate mastery of the learning objective (Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments--Research/Rationale, 1988).

In summary, the literature review indicates that effective teaching performance in today's classrooms requires a good knowledge of "how to" as well as tenacity and commitment to effectiveness in the teaching process. The TPAI measures teaching effectiveness in terms of instructional planning,
organization, effectiveness and learning resources, providing a positive learning environment, maintaining appropriate classroom behavior, and evaluating student progress. Additionally, the literature supports the assertion that classroom teaching performance impacts teachers' decisions to remain in or leave a school system or even change careers. The Effective Schools research suggests that effective classroom teaching skills are essential to effective teaching and high student achievement and teacher satisfaction. School systems may help teachers improve their teaching skills by providing inservice training based on assessed needs through staff development activities.

**Demographic Variables of Schools and Teacher Turnover**

The demographic factors of schools clearly influence teachers' decisions to remain with or leave their schools. Demographic factors pertinent to schools such as schools' socio-economic status, racial make-up of the student population, and the administration appear to some extent to influence teachers in deciding to remain with or leave their school systems.
The income level of families in a school determines the socio-economic status (SES) of the school and, to a great extent, the level and quality of educational services provided for the students in the school (Carnoy & Levin, 1985). Carnoy and Levin (1985) assert that all responsible officials, businessmen, legislators, local school boards, superintendents, principals, and teachers tend to provide educational services based on the socio-economic status of schools. They provide the following historical perspective:

Revolutionary America did not have a public school system open to all classes of people, or indeed an education system of any kind. An American's opportunity to obtain formal schooling depended on where he lived and how much money he had. Even elementary education, if it was available at all, was rarely free.

By 1876, some 60 percent of school-age children (five to seventeen years old) were enrolled in public elementary and secondary schools. . . . By 1920 schooling was compulsory, in nearly all the states. . . . Many families wanted to see their children move up the social ladder, and even in revolutionary times education (along
with wealth) was looked on as a prerequisite for political leadership and social rank. ... Schooling retained its perceived role for some groups as the path to social mobility and as a civilizing force. By the late nineteenth century the urban poor were not only a significant segment of the population, but also the country's industrial labor base. The earlier lack of uniformity in the provision and form of education gave way to schooling that was increasingly influenced by the organization of industrial production and increasingly the concern of professional educators and state bureaucracies. These professionals turned their attention primarily to controlling the education of the urban poor, attempting to use schooling as a means of civilizing them into a new industrial society. ... Instead of the common school experience for all children that Mann had visualized, public education tended to prepare the children for workers and immigrants for one set of work in the hierarchy and children of professionals for ... higher positions. ... Their approach to schooling of the urban power was reinforced by the method of
financing education. . . . By relying on local property owners and guaranteeing only minimum financial support to any given district, the states established a systematic financial bias against the poor. Wealthier school districts spent five or more times as much per pupil as poorer districts. Racially segregated schools (with far less funds available to the black schools) were legitimated by an 1896 U.S. Supreme Court decision (*Plessy v. Ferguson*). (pp. 7-10)

Remnants of these practices, according to Kozol (1985) and William (1988) influence education decisions and practices to some extent today. Kozol (1985) is highly critical of education that is provided in inner city schools. He charges that inner city students are grossly mistreated, uneducated, physically and emotionally abused by white teachers and white school boards. Furthermore, he argues that all who are aware but do nothing must share in the blame. In addition, he asserts that black students' creativity, independence, and originality are blatantly suppressed by white teachers because the students are required to follow books which contain very little relative to
students' culture and to the historical contribution of their ancestors.

Stringfield and Teddlie (1988) indicated that differences in schools have a slightly greater effect on student achievement than differences in teachers.

In a summary of the Louisiana School Effectiveness Study, Stringfield and Teddlie (1988) reported that factors involving teacher and principal expectations for students' long-term achievement are still highly correlated with socio-economic status. However, they noted other factors of importance. Additionally, Stringfield and Teddlie indicated that in high achieving low and high SES schools, the principals as leaders clearly focused on and/or facilitated the instructional purpose of their schools. In a low socio-economic context, Stringfield and Teddlie found that the staff develops and elaborates a set of rationalizations for their behavior and for the overall school performance, such as "no one could teach these kids" and "with parents like these, what do you expect?" These excuses serve to justify consistently poor teaching performance. The principal reinforces these norms by writing "good" evaluation reports on all the teachers.
Demographic Variables of Teachers and Teacher Turnover

In this section, teacher turnover will be examined in terms of its relationship to demographic variables of race, age, teaching experience, education level, subject and grade level taught, distance traveled to work, and location of residence.

Dworkin (1980) investigated the changing demography of public school teachers in one of the nation's largest urban school districts in the southwest. Data were based on 3,549 public school teachers. The purpose of the investigation was to explore differences in the occupational origins of age cohorts of three racial groups of urban public school teachers. The investigation examined the variation of race and occupational origin as factors affecting teachers' attitudes toward their continuing a teaching career. It also incorporated an additional variable that compared the actual assignment of a teacher to a school of a given racial composition against that teacher's expressed preference for placement or nonplacement in such a school. Thus, it was possible to examine these factors as influences on decisions to leave teaching and subsequently to link faculty desegregation guidelines to the problem of teacher turnover.
Some of the significant findings were as follows:

1. Younger black and white teachers, significantly more often, come from higher level professional and "white collar" families than do their older cohorts, while younger Mexican-American teachers more often come from lower "blue collar" and farm backgrounds than their older counterparts.

2. In general, teachers who plan to quit are white, under the age of 36, come from higher level occupational origins, and are assigned to schools with student racial distributions that these teachers define as undesirable.

3. There is a slightly higher exit incidence of teachers from "blue collar" origins in the 36- to 45-year-old-age cohort than in any other white cohort.

4. Nearly 40 percent of the youngest black teachers have occupational origins in the highest status occupational categories, while less than 20 percent of their older counterparts come from these categories.

5. The younger Chicano cohorts are concentrated in "blue collar" families of origin, while the older teachers are concentrated in "white collar" families of origin.
6. New teachers of the middle class origins, regardless of their race, are significantly more likely to quit teaching if they perceive their assignments as undesirable than are teachers from working class backgrounds.

Federal mandates for faculty desegregation that consider only the teacher's race and ignore occupational origins, force school districts to replace teachers who resign from urban districts with individuals who are equally likely to quit teaching.

A preliminary report by Georgia's Professional Standards Commission (1988) on Georgia Public School Personnel from 1985-1988 revealed that in order to understand fully the patterns of teacher attrition, it is vital to place the wide variety of attrition decisions in the context of the careers and life cycles of people. A major prediction from teacher attrition theory is that teacher attrition patterns will follow a U-shaped curve over the life cycle. For instance, age-specific attrition probabilities will be high for younger teachers who are early in their career, very low for middle-aged teachers during the mid-career phase, and high again once retirement eligibility is achieved. Of the 5,468 professionals who left their
positions in the Georgia public schools after the 1985-86 school year, 1,121 were men and 4,184 were women. The mean age of the men who left was 40; the mean age of the women was 35. The overall mean experience in the state for this group who left was 12 years; the mean age was 40. Attrition rates vary considerably among personnel with varying years of professional experience. In the teaching profession, attrition is always highest among younger teachers and among those with the least experience; the Georgia data also show that attrition rates for the first year of tracking (1985-86 to 1986-87) were highest for those personnel with 0-7 years State experience--nearly one-half of those who left (49 percent) did so during these first seven years. The next experience group, those in the 8-14 year cohort, represent 20 percent of those who left that year. Together, these two experienced cohorts represent the first 14 years of state experience and account for 69 percent of the total attrition, which seems to level off for the 15-20 year experience cohort--(8 percent) and then an increase to 12 percent for those with 21-30 years experience. Ten percent of those with 31-40 years experience left during this period, dwindling to less
than one percent (40 individuals) for those with over 41 years of State experience. Of the 5,468 Georgia school personnel who left in 1985-86, 1,000 had two years or less state experience. Of those, 833 had only one year of state experience; 167 had two years. Of the 833 who left after one year, 302 were elementary teachers, 359 were secondary teachers, 139 were special education teachers, and the remaining 33 were evenly distributed among the other professional codes. Of the 167 who left after two years, 44 were elementary teachers, 74 were secondary teachers, and 34 were special education teachers. For the second year of tracking, Georgia attrition data (disaggregated by years of state experience) reveal a pattern similar to the previous year, although the percentages in most of the experience cohorts vary. Of the 4,476 personnel who left at the end of the 1986-87 school year, 2,031, or 45 percent, did so with 0-7 years of State experience; 4 percent less than the same group the previous year. The next experience group, those in the 8-14 year experience cohort, accounts for 21 percent of those who left in 1986-87, one percent more than their counterparts the previous year. Together, these two experience cohorts (0-14 years of experience) account
for 66 percent of the total attrition from 1986-87 to 1987-88. This percentage is three percent less than the same group the previous year. It can be noted that for both years tracked, 11 percent of the attrition can be attributed to retirements (the 31 and over experience cohort).

Administrative Evaluation of Teachers

Evaluation is an integral part of the teaching function. Assessing the effectiveness of teachers' performance is crucial to achieving one of the major goals of the school—high academic performance by students. DeRoche (1987) posited that school administrators are educational leaders and that the quality of education in the school is only as good as the school, principal, faculty, and staff. Furthermore, he stated that the challenge for today's principal is to provide instructional leadership while accomplishing the goals of the school and meeting the accountability requirements of the state, local school board, and community.

The teacher evaluation program utilized by Georgia places the responsibility for teacher evaluation solely with the building principal, who has completed a state
training program for teacher and staff evaluation. Georgia's Quality Basic Education law requires all supervisory personnel including local school boards, superintendents, central office administrators, principals, and other local school administrators to successfully complete the state-designed evaluation training program (Georgia's Quality Basic Education Act, 1985).

While some aspects of the evaluation process may be delegated to other local or district level leadership personnel, the principal must review, sign, and submit all annual evaluations to the designated district level officials (Georgia Teacher Evaluation Manual, 1987).

Since Georgia's principals are given the major responsibility and authority in the evaluation process, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership, i.e., skills, knowledge, and fairness in the evaluation process, become crucial to the effectiveness, success and influence that they exert on teachers' decisions to remain with or leave their schools.

Gino (1985) conducted a study to measure the attitudes of teachers toward the effectiveness and fairness of the process of performance-based teacher
evaluation in relationship to the degree of inservice administrators received in using a performance-based evaluation system. Sixty-four teachers were randomly selected and interviewed to measure their attitudes toward the effectiveness of teacher evaluations and their principals' evaluation skills.

The findings indicated that principals with a high degree of inservice training more effectively identified teacher strengths and weaknesses than principals who had received a low degree of inservice training. High inservice-trained principals promoted better identification of responsibilities of teachers and principals than low inservice-trained principals. Principals with high inservice did a better job of developing positive working relationships between teachers and administrators in the improvement of instruction than principals who had received a low degree of inservice training. Principals who had high inservice training did a better job of improving teachers' attitude toward the effectiveness of teacher evaluation than principals who had received a low degree of inservice training. Teachers whose principals received a high degree of inservice training felt that their principals' current evaluation skills
had improved more than did teachers whose principals received a low degree of inservice training. The attitudes of teachers and principals regarding the selected criteria related to effective teaching behavior were noticeably better than among teachers whose principals had received a low degree of inservice training. As stated previously, principals who received a high degree of inservice did a better job of implementing the teacher evaluation system than did principals who had received a low degree of inservice training.

Curran (1986) investigated teacher attitudes toward a teacher evaluation program to determine the degree to which teachers changed their attitudes toward teaching after substituting a teacher involvement evaluation program for a pre-existing summative evaluation model.

The study focused on three research questions:

1. Does teacher involvement change teacher attitudes toward teaching more than the existing summative evaluation program?

2. Does teacher involvement in the evaluation program encourage greater improvement in teaching instruction than the existing summative evaluation program?
3. Does the involvement process promote change with respect to what teachers "do" with their students?

Twenty-four teachers completed two questionnaires. The first questionnaire, A Survey of Teacher Attitudes Toward Teacher Evaluation, was distributed before and after the pilot test program. The second questionnaire, the Exit Questionnaire, was distributed at the conclusion of the pilot test program. Both questionnaires were designed to evoke categorical responses from teachers about their attitudes toward the teacher evaluation program.

The findings of the study indicated that teachers perceived the involvement program as changing teacher attitudes toward teaching more than the pre-existing summative evaluation program. The involvement process also encouraged change in teacher attitudes toward teaching relative to the number of years of teaching experience, formal education background, sex of teacher, and teaching assignment. The involvement process encouraged teachers to focus more on student performance and actually changed teacher attitudes toward improving instruction more than the summative evaluation program.

Kauchak, Peterson, and Driscoll (1985) conducted a
study on teacher attitudes toward teacher evaluation practices by principals. The sample population consisted of a total of 228 teachers from Utah and Florida. Two data sources were used.

The primary source was 60 teacher interviews conducted in the state of Utah. These included 17 males and 43 females; 37 elementary and 23 secondary; and 38 urban and 22 rural. The sample ranged in experience from first-year teachers to teachers with 33 years of experience; the mean number of years of experience was 13.2, the median was 9. All interviews were voluntary and unremunerated.

The second data source consisted of a 23-item questionnaire administered to 168 teachers, 93 from Utah and 75 from Florida; 46 males and 122 females. The mean and median number of years of teaching experience were 4.7 and 5.2 years, respectively. Initial analysis showed no difference between Utah and Florida groups, so the data were subsequently pooled. The study focused on several methods of evaluating teachers: principals' visits, student evaluations, achievement test scores, and peer evaluation.

In the evaluation method utilizing principals' visits, three questions were asked to determine
teachers' reactions to principals' visits: (1) How are you officially or formally evaluated? (b) Does this visit or practice work for you; does it improve your teaching? (c) Are you being evaluated fairly and usefully by the present system? Response to question (c) indicated that teachers viewed principals' visits as perfunctory, too brief and unstructured.

The findings revealed that, in general, the teachers did not see principals' visits as being instrumental in improving their teaching and, therefore, challenged the competency of the principals as evaluators. The elementary teachers commented on the fact that the principal had not had direct training experience at the elementary level.

At the secondary level, the problem of evaluation competence centered on subject matter knowledge. Secondary teachers expressed concern at being evaluated by those who were not expert in their subject area.

The study concluded that the teachers accepted the principals' visits as a necessary evil or nuisance and did not view the visits as a useful tool for instructional improvement.

Weaver (1988) analyzed the purposes of teacher evaluation as perceived by the evaluators and
evaluatees. Data were collected from 19 school districts in Indiana to provide a description of how elementary and secondary teachers (evaluatees) and administrators (evaluators) perceive the purposes of teacher evaluation relating to either formative and/or summative practices, to determine what they perceive as ideal practices, and to analyze their perceptions of the overall adequacy of the satisfaction with current evaluation practices. After examining the literature, a questionnaire was designed and tested. It was mailed to 92 building principals for distribution to 1,257 teachers. The T-test was the statistical measure used. Teacher contracts, policy statements, observation and evaluation instruments, and written comments from the questionnaire were analyzed.

The findings revealed that evaluators generally perceived that they performed the evaluation process in an adequate and satisfactory manner. Evaluatees were critical of evaluation instruments and inconsistent procedures and questioned evaluators' qualification and expertise, the amount of time they spent on teacher evaluation, and the lack of feedback. The study concluded that while some of the school districts indicated that the purpose of teacher evaluation was to
improve instruction, it generally appeared that evaluation systems were underdeveloped and did not address the individual or organizational needs.

According to Krajeuski (1986), most teachers become very concerned, frustrated and intimidated by being evaluated by principals. Furthermore, teachers have doubts about principals' competency in the evaluation process. He stated:

With all of the problems teachers have to contend—low wages, discipline problems, apathetic parents—the last thing they need is intimidating, adversarial evaluations. What they need is a principal who is conscientious, affirmative and knowledgeable. (p. 33)

Additionally, Medley and Cooker (1987) argued that principals' judgments of teacher effectiveness are not very valid. They reported that:

The small number of studies on the validity of principals' judgments (or ratings based on them) that have been reported in the literature have yielded consistently negative findings. Each such study has concluded that there is no appreciable agreement between principals' judgment of teachers' effectiveness and the amount students learn. (p. 138)
They berated state legislators, school boards, and citizen groups for continuing to require statewide programs to evaluate teachers— in apparent ignorance of research findings.

Reynolds (1985) conducted a study that examined the teachers' and administrators' acceptance level of an evaluation process and instrument, its impact on the career ladder and on the acceptance level, if any, of the number of building inservices conducted on the evaluation process and instrument.

The data revealed that there was a significant difference in how teachers and administrators accepted the evaluation process and instrument. The administrators were overall more supportive of the evaluation process and instrument than were teachers. However, they did not feel that there was sufficient time to do all the paperwork involved in observation and documentation. The number of building inservice sessions did have some impact on the acceptance level as did the placement on the career ladder.

Teachers did not feel that a fair, equitable, and consistent evaluation could be achieved by the building principal.

In conclusion, educational research studies seem to
agree that evaluating or measuring teacher performance is an accepted and expected component of the teaching profession. Setting performance goals and devising ways to measure the achievement levels are both crucial to efficiency and effectiveness in the teaching profession.

Teachers and principals held different opinions on how to measure performance levels. Principals asserted that they were knowledgeable and capable of effectively assessing teaching performance. Teachers disagreed. They questioned how principals, with little or no direct teaching experience and/or expert subject matter knowledge, could fairly and effectively evaluate performance that requires a high level of competency in content areas.

This variance in attitude has very strong implications for the teacher evaluation program in Georgia since the principal's evaluation may singly determine whether a teacher continues to teach.

Steps are being taken to minimize the differences between teachers and principals on the evaluation process. Teacher involvement programs and principals' inservice training are being utilized widely with a significant degree of success.
Summary

The major focus of this study was to analyze the relationship between teacher turnover and the variables of classroom teaching performance, school and teacher demographics, and teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process. A review of the literature indicated that teacher turnover is one of the primary causes of the teacher shortage problem. The problem of teacher turnover is greatly amplified although there is documentation that centers on factors such as recruitment, fewer college students selecting teaching as a career, a competitive teacher job market, and many states' bureaucratic requirements. Most of the researchers agree that many of the above causes of teacher shortages will continue to exist in spite of the best strategies used. They also agree that since teacher turnover is a major cause of teacher shortages, controlling teacher turnover must be the goal of school systems across the nation.

Many factors contribute to teacher turnover. Classroom teaching performance impacts teacher turnover in a variety of ways. Georgia's Department of Education assessment instruments indicate that planning, organizing, coordinating, providing resources,
interacting with students, and evaluating their progress are salient components of managing the classroom learning environment. The literature indicated that teachers' ineffectiveness with these components strongly influence their decisions to change school systems or to leave the teaching profession. In addition, the literature supported the strong relationship that exists between school and teacher demographics and the teacher turnover problem. Studies of school demographics revealed that the quality of education provided was closely related to the socio-economic level of schools and students. These studies indicated that student performance in low socio-economic schools was lower than students' performance from other socio-economic levels. There was a variety of opinions on why differences existed. Similarly, teacher demographic variables of race, age, experience training, subject and grade level taught, travel distance, and location of residency seriously influence teachers' decisions to remain with or leave a school system. Teacher demographic studies revealed that teachers who plan to leave teaching are white, are under the age of 36, come from a higher level of occupational origins, and are assigned to schools with a student racial distribution that they define as undesirable.
Also, principals evaluation of teachers as part of some states' mandated educational improvement programs are beginning to play a larger role in the teacher turnover problem. In Georgia, principals' evaluation decisions are almost irreversible; therefore, the principal must be a competent instructional leader.

Finally, the review of the literature indicated that continued study and research are needed to further refine the knowledge and understanding of the relationship between teacher turnover and the variables of classroom teaching performance, schools and teacher demographics, and administrative evaluation of teaching performance.
The purpose of this study was to analyze the relationship among the variables of classroom teaching performance, selected demographic variables of school and teacher, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, and teacher turnover in elementary grades in the DeKalb County School System. Elementary teachers who indicated that they intended to resign from the school system at the end of the 1988-89 school term were selected. Also, a group of randomly selected remaining teachers, stratified by age and race, was included in the analysis.

The theoretical assumptions upon which the study was based are: (a) teachers who failed the Classroom Teaching Performance (CTP) test and were assigned to lower socio-economic status (SES) schools under principals with inadequate teacher evaluation skills would leave the system at a higher rate; (b) teachers who failed the CTP test and were assigned to upper SES schools under principals with inadequate teacher evaluation skills would leave the system at a
rate; (c) teachers who passed the CTP test and were assigned to lower SES schools under principals with adequate teacher evaluation skills would leave the system at a lower rate; (d) teachers who passed the CTP test and were assigned to upper SES schools under principals with inadequate teacher evaluation skills would leave the system at a lower rate; (e) white teachers, (under 25 years of age, placed in elementary grades K-7 of majority black students, lower SES schools, with 0-3 years of experience, a bachelor's degree and up to one hour commute time) would leave the school system at a higher rate; and (f) black teachers (under 25 years of age, placement in elementary grades K-7 of majority white students, upper SES schools, 0-3 years of experience, a bachelor's degree and up to one hour commute time) would leave the system at a lower rate.

The research theory was expected to show that teacher turnover in elementary grades could be explained by examining the relationship among such independent variables as:

1. Classroom Teaching Performance Scores
2. Teacher Perceptions of Principal Instructional Leadership in the Evaluation Process
3. Selected School Demographic Variables
   a. Socio-Economic Status
   b. Race of Principal
   c. Race of Students

4. Selected Demographic Variables of Teachers
   a. Race
   b. Age
   c. Teaching Experience
   d. Educational Level
   e. Grade Level Taught
   f. Distance Traveled to Work
   g. Residential Location

   These relationships are diagrammed in Figure 2.
Figure 2: The Relationships Among the Variables

Independent Variables

- Classroom Teaching Performance
- Teacher Perceptions of the Principal Instructional Leadership in the Evaluation Process
- School Demographics:
  a. Socio-economic status of schools
  b. Status of schools
  c. Race of principal
  d. Racial make-up of students
- Teacher Demographics:
  a. Race
  b. Age
  c. Experience
  d. Education level
  e. Grade level taught
  f. Travel distance
  g. Location of residence

Dependent Variable

- Teacher Turnover
Definition of Variables

1. **Teacher Turnover** refers to the decision of teachers to leave or remain with the DeKalb School System, measured in terms of those who actually left or remained during the 1988-89 school year.

2. **Classroom Teaching Performance Score (CTPSCOR)** refers to the score on the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI) for experienced teachers and the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI) for new Georgia teachers (See Appendix A). The score on the GTOI which is based on the judgment of the principal varied from needs improvement (NI) to satisfactory (S). The score on the TPAI, which is based on the collaborative rating of an assessment team, varies from pass (P) - P = 83% on a single assessment to 75% on two consecutive assessments. The TPAI is designed to cover in detail the total teaching process. The teachers are provided all materials and resources needed to prepare for the scheduled observations. This process is designed to show how teachers perform basic teaching skills under optimal circumstances. The GTOI is designed to assess the skills of experienced teachers in order to:
a. Identify and reinforce effective teaching practices
b. Identify areas where development can improve instructional effectiveness
c. Identify teachers who do not meet the minimum standards so that appropriate action can be taken.

For this study, a passing CTPSCOR is defined operationally as a rating of "Satisfactory" on the GTOI or a rating of "83%" on a single assessment or "75%" on two consecutive assessments on the TPAI. A failing TCMPSCOR is defined operationally as a rating of "Needs Improvement" on the GTOI, or a rating below 83% for a single assessment or below "75%" for two consecutive assessments, or waived assessment opportunity, or resigned before assessment on the TPAI.

Additionally, classroom teaching performance involves the sum of the processes and procedures (i.e., planning, organizing, providing resources, interacting with students, evaluating students' progress) teachers practice in the classroom. It also involves the extent to which the teacher manages the learning environment in terms of the following indicators.

a. **Utilization of time** by maximizing
instructional time so that academic learning time is increased and time needed for routine tasks is decreased.

b. **Utilization of the physical setting** by arranging physical space and seating patterns to complement the teacher's instructional objectives and methods and seek to maximize both the physical space and available resources.

c. **Establish optimal learning environment** through the maintenance of appropriate student behavior by communicating high expectations for appropriate student behavior, setting specific class rules, providing careful and continuous monitoring of student behavior using intervention strategies effectively. Also, the teachers should communicate personal enthusiasms, provide stimulating and interesting learning activities, demonstrate warmth and friendliness, and help each student develop a strong positive self-concept.

3. **Socio-Economic Status of Schools** refers to the level of income of the families in the schools based on
the number of students who receive free and reduced-price lunches. Schools will be classified as having lower socio-economic status (SES) or upper socio-economic status (SES).

a. Lower SES Schools refers to any school with more than 20 percent of its students receiving free or reduced-price lunches.

b. Upper SES Schools refers to any school with less than 20 percent of its students receiving free or reduced-price lunches.

4. **Teacher Perceptions of the Principal Instructional Leadership in the Evaluation Process** (TPPILEP) refers to the teacher perceptions of the principal evaluation skills using the TPAI and GTOI, knowledge of effective instruction, practice of fair and objective evaluation in achieving the goals of the school, and the principal's interpersonal style and planning skills. For this study, teacher perceptions of the principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process is defined operationally as the score on the TPPILEP (See Appendix A). These perceptions are further defined as follows:

a. Principals' evaluation skills using the TPAI indicate that they give clear and concise
directions, evaluate skills in specific areas, clearly explain required teaching competencies, provide model examples to ensure TPAI competency understanding, provide a variety of activities to assist in TPAI task accomplishment, explain instructional objectives, understand how to assess student progress using the TPAI, assess teacher performance based on TPAI guidelines, provide a learning environment as prescribed by the TPAI, and monitor teaching performance as prescribed by the TPAI. Using the GTOI, principals' evaluation skills are illustrated by their clear and concise directions, specific content area evaluation, clear explanation of GTOI rationale and all other components, models or examples of all components, varied activities that assist in GTOI, and monitoring of teaching performance as prescribed by the GTOI (8-17).

b. A principal's knowledge of effective instruction refers to the school's climate, instructional objectives, school resources,
instructional approaches, effective planning, schedules for instructional activities, students' assessment, guidelines for monitoring student progress, and classroom observations (18-27).

c. A principal's practice of fair evaluation is denoted by his consistency, lack of bias, reasonability, objectivity, timeliness, sensitivity, ability to set expectations for teaching performance, empathy, knowledge of strong and weak persons, high expectation of performance, friendliness, and personal satisfaction from working with the staff (28-39).

d. A principal's interpersonal style is indicated by his use of praise, acceptance of opinions of others, willingness to accept solutions proposed by others, willingness to explain how and why in problem-solving, empathy in problem-solving, seeking of acceptable solution from alternatives and demonstration of the easy way to comply to rules. The principal's planning skills are illustrated by an overall strategy related
to monitoring good achievement, prioritizing causes of problems, selecting the best objectives, developing alternatives to counteract causes of problems, selecting resources, developing alternative evaluation techniques, utilizing evaluations for revising decisions, and showing inner-linkages of decisions and sub-plans (40-54).

5. Demographic Variables of Teachers. The term refers to personal information about the teacher such as:

a. Age, which refers to the chronological age of the teacher.

b. Experience, which refers to the number of years working as a professional educator.

c. Race, which refers to the ethnic background of the teacher (Black, Caucasian, etc.).

d. Educational level, which refers to the highest degree earned by the teacher.

e. Grade level taught, which refers to grades K-7.

f. Travel distance, which refers to the distance and time required to travel from teacher's residence to and from school.
g. Location of residence refers to where the teacher maintains his/her household.

6. **Demographic Variables of Schools.** The term refers to school characteristics such as:

   a. **Socio-economic Status** refers to the level of income of the families in the schools based on the number of students who receive free and reduced-priced lunches. Schools were classified as having upper socio-economic status (SES) or lower socio-economic status (SES).

   **Upper SES School** refers to any school with less than 20 percent of its students receiving free or reduced-price lunches.

   **Lower SES School** refers to any school with more than 20 percent of its students receiving free or reduced-price lunches.

   b. **Race of Principal** refers to the ethnic background of the school's principal (Black, Caucasian, etc.).

   c. **Racial Composition of Students** refers to ethnic background of the school's students (Black, Caucasian, etc.).

   It was expected that this study would show that
although many factors contributed to teacher turnover, the relationship among the variables of classroom teaching performance, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, school demographics, and selected demographic variables of teachers strongly impact teachers' decisions to leave the school system.

Murphy (1985) identified the following as factors that strongly influenced teacher attrition: low salary, low status of the teaching profession, nonsupportive working environment, unmotivated students, and nonsupportive administrators.

A teacher attrition study conducted for the State of Georgia by Darden (1981) listed over 20 factors that influenced teacher turnover: low salary, student discipline, relocation, lack of parental support, family responsibilities, travel distance, burnout, and others.

Interviews conducted by the elementary personnel administrator in the DeKalb County School System (1988) indicated that teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, difficult working conditions, burnout, poor parental support, inability to discipline students, travel
distance from teachers' homes, bored/lack of challenge, low salary/inadequate benefits, health problems, family responsibility, and retirement influenced teachers to leave the school system.

Teacher attrition studies that were examined shared the common element that no single factor caused teacher turnover. Instead, several of the above factors, grouped together, influenced teacher turnover.

The conceptual framework for this study focused on the relationship among the independent variables and the dependent variable. The purpose of the study was to determine whether teacher turnover could be predicted by classroom teaching performance, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, school demographics, and selected demographic variables of teachers.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were developed and tested in order to analyze the relationships among the independent variables of classroom teaching performance scores, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, selected school and teacher demographics, and the dependent variable of
teacher turnover in elementary grades in the DeKalb County School System.

The hypotheses were stated in the null form for testing purposes:

**Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant relationship between classroom teaching performance scores as measured by the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument and the Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument and teacher turnover.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is no significant relationship between teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process and teacher turnover.

**Hypothesis 3:** There is no significant relationship between socio-economic status of schools and teacher turnover.

**Hypothesis 4:** There is no significant relationship between principal race and teacher turnover.

**Hypothesis 5:** There is no significant relationship between student race and teacher turnover.

**Hypothesis 6:** There is no significant relationship between teacher race and teacher turnover.

**Hypothesis 7:** There is no significant relationship between teacher age and teacher turnover.
**Hypothesis 8:** There is no significant relationship between teacher experience and teacher turnover.

**Hypothesis 9:** There is no significant relationship between education training and teacher turnover.

**Hypothesis 10:** There is no significant relationship between grade level taught and teacher turnover.

**Hypothesis 11:** There is no significant relationship between travel distance and teacher turnover.

**Hypothesis 12:** There is no significant relationship between location of teacher residence and teacher turnover.

**Hypothesis 13:** Teacher turnover cannot be predicted by: classroom teaching performance scores, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, and selected school and teacher demographic variables.

**Summary**

This chapter presented the theoretical framework for the study, which consisted of the identification of the independent and dependent variables. The major premise of this chapter was to identify, define, and link the variables as they interacted among each other. The independent variables were identified as
classroom teaching performance scores, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the education process, and selected school and teacher demographics. Teacher turnover was identified as the dependent variable.

The independent variables were selected as a result of the literature search, conferences, and exit interviews with departing DeKalb County teachers from the 1988-89 school year. This chapter focused on analyzing the relationships among the independent variables and the dependent variable. To facilitate the analysis process, thirteen research hypotheses were developed.
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of the study was to analyze the relationship among the variables of classroom teaching performance, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, school and teacher demographics, and teacher turnover in elementary grades.

This chapter provides a description of the research design, population, sample selection, instrumentation, data collection methodology, and data analysis procedures.

Research Design

The descriptive correlational design was utilized in this study. This design was chosen because the purpose of the study was to analyze relationships among factors that impacted elementary teachers' decisions to leave the DeKalb County School System. According to Ary, James, and Razavieh (1985), correlational studies are frequently used in descriptive research that is concerned with determining the extent of the relationships existing between variables. Such studies
enable one to ascertain the extent to which variation in one variable is associated with variations in another. The magnitude of the relationship is determined through the use of the coefficient of correlation.

The coefficient of correlation, a decimal number, represents the degree of the observed relationship among the variables; the size of the decimal number determines the strength and significance of the relationships.

The strength of the relationships can be inferred from the numerical value of the correlation coefficient. Values near zero imply a weak relationship, whereas values closer to either +1 or -1 indicate a stronger relationship.

The statistical significance indicates whether the coefficient obtained is different from zero at a given level of confidence. A statistically significant correlation represents evidence of an actual relationship rather than a relationship due simply to chance.

Population

The population consisted of teachers from elementary
schools in the DeKalb County School System. The population was selected from elementary schools with teachers who provided written notice that they would leave the school district at the end of the 1988-89 school year. Employees are required to provide such a notice by April of each year.

Sample

The population for this study consisted of 256 teachers, 128 departing teachers and 128 remaining teachers in 20 elementary schools (10 lower SES and 10 upper SES) with the highest turnover ratios. All teachers had given written notice that they would not return after the 1988-89 school year. For the 128 remaining teachers, a stratified random selection was used to ensure representation of teachers by age and race. A comparison of the perceptions of teachers who left the system to teachers who remained in the system provided additional data for analysis. All of the teachers were evaluated during the 1988-89 school year. In this evaluation, the principal used either the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI) for teachers seeking initial professional certification in Georgia or the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument
(GTOI) for professionally certified experienced teachers.

Instruments

The instruments utilized in this study were the Georgia Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI), the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI) and a questionnaire that was developed by the researcher on Teacher Perception of Principal Instructional Leadership in the Evaluation Process (TPPILEP). The questionnaire also included teacher demographic data. In addition, data on school demographics were obtained from school records in the personnel department. The State of Georgia requires annual evaluations of all teachers by each school district (TPAI for teachers seeking initial certification and GTOI for certified teachers). The results of these evaluations are sent to the Georgia Department of Education for research purposes and program evaluation. Statewide and systemwide norms collected from the TPAI and GTOI were obtained from the State Department of Education and East Metro Regional Assessment Office (EMRAC). Each of these three instruments, which are contained in Appendix A of this study, is profiled below.
The TPAI is a set of assessment instruments designed to measure the effectiveness level of general teaching skills. These general teaching skills were developed by teachers and other administrators and are considered to be essential for effective teaching performance (Capie, Anderson, Johnson, and Ellett, 1979). The Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument comprises five different instruments: Teaching Plans and Materials, Classroom Procedures, Interpersonal Skills, Professional Standards and the Student Perceptions. The instruments were developed for the Georgia Department of Education, Evaluation Division, primarily to assess beginning teachers for initial certification purposes.

Although no validity levels have been provided, content validity studies through Georgia's Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments Technical Manual (1989) indicate strong support of the validity of the TPAI. The reliability of the TPAI, through the interrater agreement analysis since 1985, has remained relatively high and continues to increase as raters gain more experience with the instrument and process (Georgia's Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments Technical Manual, 1989).
The Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI) is used by the State of Georgia to evaluate all certified experienced teachers. It may be used to evaluate noncertified teachers. The GTOI covers teaching tasks and practices.

The evaluation process for the GTOI consists of seven steps: orientation, pre-evaluation conference, observations, scoring and written comments, post-observation conference, annual evaluation summary report and conference, and professional development plan. Since the GTOI was in its field test during the 1988-1989 school year, no validity or reliability levels have been established.

**Classroom Teaching Performance Score**

The classroom teaching performance score from the TPAI or the GTOI is denoted by:

a. 1 complete fail
b. 2 waived assessment or resigned before assessment
c. 3 passed but needed a professional development plan (PDP)
d. 4 complete pass
One purpose of the study was to analyze the relationship between teacher turnover and the teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process using the TPAI or the GTOI. These instruments give principals in Georgia schools great latitude and power in assessing teaching performance since principals' assessments of teachers are generally irreversible. If teachers perceive the principals as incompetent evaluators, then this may cause additional stress and anxiety on the teachers. According to Bolton (1973), the evaluation process creates tension in both the evaluator and the evaluatee which may influence the teacher's decision to leave his/her school or system.

The Effective Schools research pointed out the important role effective administrative leadership plays in effective teaching and student achievement. An effective leader sets the overall tone and direction of the school. Hoy and Miskel (1982) indicated that the perceptions followers hold of the leader can be crucial to their willingness to continue to follow.
Ginos (1985) concluded from his study on *The Relationship of Inservice Training to Effective Teacher Evaluation* that teachers whose principals received a "high degree" of inservice training in teacher evaluation had a much better attitude toward their principals in the evaluation process than teachers whose principals received a low degree of evaluation training.

Constance Sandidge (1989), an Assistant Principal for Instruction at Southwest DeKalb High School in the DeKalb County School System, reported that teachers were more receptive and accepting of the evaluation results from administrators with high credibility in curriculum and instruction.

There is general agreement that evaluation is an essential component of most endeavors; however, the degree of effectiveness is directly related to the skills and credibility of the evaluator.

Therefore, the first task was to select an appropriate instrument. After a thorough investigation of the literature, the researcher constructed an instrument that reflected the instructional leadership skills which are utilized by DeKalb County School principals in the evaluation of teachers based on the TPAI or the GTOI indicators (Appendix A).
The questionnaire consisted of 54 statements regarding teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process. The 54 statements reflect concerns in the areas of:

a. Principal evaluation skills using the TPAI and GTOI. (8-17)

b. Principal knowledge of effective instruction. (18-27)

c. Principal practice of fair and objective evaluations. (28-39)

d. Principal interpersonal style and planning skills. (40-54)

Questions 1-7 related to teacher demographic information. The scoring for questions 8-39 was: A 1 Strong Agree, B 2 Agree, C 3 Undecided, D 4 Disagree and E 5 Strongly Disagree. The scoring for questions 40-55 was: A 1 Never, B 2 Rarely, C 3 Sometimes, D 4 Often, and E 5 Undecided.

Validity of the TPPILEP

The demographic data on the instrument was validated by comparing it to each teacher's personnel file. The statements on the instrument which measure (a) principal evaluation skills using the TPAI and GTOI
(8-17); (b) principal knowledge of effective instruction (18-27); (c) principal practice of fair and objective evaluation (28-39); and (d) principal interpersonal style and planning skills (40-54) reasonably matched the definitions in the opinion of at least five experts. After the instrument had been administered to the sample population, an item to scale correlational analysis was conducted to determine construct validity. Fruchter and Guilford (1978) considered items with a correlation coefficient of at least .3 as reaching statistically construct validity. The range of the correlation coefficient on the TPPILEP instrument was .67158 to .92198. No items were dropped from any of the scales (see Appendix C).

Procedure

The procedure of this study consisted of the following steps:

1. Obtained permission from the DeKalb County School System to conduct the study which included:
   - secured a list from personnel department of all elementary teachers who indicated that they would leave the school system at the end of the 1988-89 school year.
- examined teachers' files and computer printouts to validate teachers' demographic data.

- examined school records to obtain information on school demographics (See Appendix B).

2. Notified building administrators of permission by the DeKalb School System to conduct the study and requested their permission to send TPPILEP questionnaires to their teachers.

3. Sent cover letter and questionnaire to terminating teachers and a random selection of remaining teachers requesting their participation in the study.

4. Collected completed questionnaires.

5. Analyzed all data and wrote the final report.

Data Collection

The data included in this study was acquired from two sources. The summary of the official state assessment scores on the TPAI and GTOI was available from the State Department of Education and the East Metro Regional Assessment Center.

Secondly, a questionnaire was administered that provided demographic data and data on the teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process.
After all departing and remaining teachers had been identified (DeKalb County School System Department of Personnel, 1988) including whether they were assessed on the TPAI or the GTOI, the principals of the schools in the study were contacted and given a full explanation of the study and notified of the intent to request teachers to complete the TPPILEP questionnaires--TPAI for noncertified teachers and GTOI for certified experienced teachers.

After the teachers had been selected, coded questionnaires and return envelopes were sent to each. They were requested to return completed questionnaires in sealed, confidential envelopes. The teachers' identities were not to be revealed at any time in the study.

Table 1 shows the distribution and return of questionnaires by leaving teachers. The data shows a return rate of 82.81 percent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaires Sent</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaires Returned</th>
<th>Percent Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 128 106 82.81%
Table 2 shows the distribution and return of questionnaires by remaining teachers. The data shows a return rate of 92.23 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaires Sent</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaires Returned</th>
<th>Percent Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 128 118 92.23%
Table 3 shows the combined questionnaire return rate for leaving and remaining teachers. The data shows a combined return rate of 87.50 percent.

**Table 3**

Summary of Distribution and Return of Questionnaires by Leaving and Remaining Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Schools</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Questionnaires Sent</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Questionnaires Returned</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Questionnaires Returned</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis**

The data from the questionnaires and the state's official assessment instruments were compiled so as to analyze the relationship among the variables through statistical measurement. The statistical measurement used on the data collected was a descriptive correlational analysis process.

In this study, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were used to determine the
degree of relationship between/among the variables listed in hypotheses 1-4.

Factor analysis and regression analysis were used to test the fifth hypothesis. Factor analysis was utilized to determine those variables in a group of variables which were highly related to each other by placing them in the same factor. Regression analysis enabled the researcher to make accurate predictions of the outcome on one variable after the outcome on another related variable had been determined; hence, establishing the relationship between each independent variable to the dependent variables and the independent variable as a single group.

The interpretation of the data analysis is based on the coding of the scale as indicated in Appendix D. Teacher turnover was measured from an examination of personnel records in the DeKalb County School System. This examination was conducted to identify teachers who left and teachers who remained with the school system. For the purpose of computer analysis, those who left were coded 0 and those who remained were coded 1.

Similarly, the mean and standard deviation were computed for the variables of classroom teaching performance scores, school and teacher demographics based on the coding of the scale in Appendix D.
Table 4 presents the mean and standard deviation for all teachers in the study by race, age, experience, education, grade level taught, travel distance, location of residence, school socio-economic status, principal race, student race, teacher classroom teaching performance scores, and teacher turnover.

The table shows a mean score of .7545 for teacher race. Based on the coding of the scale (Appendix D), black teachers are coded 0 and white teachers are coded 1. The mean score of .7545 indicates that there were slightly more white teachers than black teachers in the study since .7545 is nearer 1 which represents white teachers than 0 which represents black teachers.

The mean score of 1.3750 for teacher age indicates that more of the teachers ranged in age from 27-33 years old. The coding of the scale for teacher age is 0 for a range of 21-26 years, 1 for a range of 27-33 years, 2 for a range of 34-40 years, etc. The mean score of 1.3750 is nearer 1, which indicates that most of the teachers ranged from 27-33 years old.
Table 4
Mean and Standard Deviation for Teacher and School Demographics, Classroom Teaching Performance Scores, and Teacher Turnover (LEAVREM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRACE</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>.7545</td>
<td>.5419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAGE</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
<td>1.1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXP</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1.2098</td>
<td>1.2620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEDUC</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>.5491</td>
<td>.6404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGRADELT</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1.2308</td>
<td>1.5064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDISTANCE</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1.0804</td>
<td>1.0429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRESIDE</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>.8834</td>
<td>.9886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHSES</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>.6563</td>
<td>.4760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACE</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>.3304</td>
<td>.4714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STURACE</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>.2545</td>
<td>.5461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTPSCOR</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>2.2991</td>
<td>.9772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Turnover (LEAVREM)</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>.5134</td>
<td>.5009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: TEXP = Teacher Experience, TAGE = Teacher Age, TEDUC = Teacher Education Training, SCHSES = School Socio-Economic Status, PRACE = Principal Race, STURACE = Student Race, TRESIDE = Teacher Residence, TDISTANCE = Travel Distance, LEAVREM = Teacher Turnover - Leave/Remain, TRACE = Teacher Race, CTPSCOR = Teacher Classroom Teaching Performance Score, TGRADELT = Teacher Grade Level Taught.
Similarly, the mean score of 1.2098 for teacher experience indicates that most of the teachers had from 0 to 8 years of experience. The mean score of .5491 means that most of the teachers held bachelor degrees, while the mean score of 1.2308 for grade level taught indicates that most of the teachers taught in grades kindergarten through fourth. The mean score of 1.0804 for travel distance indicates that most of the teachers travel up to 20 miles to get to their school assignments.

The mean score of .8834 for the location of teacher residence shows that most of the teachers resided in North DeKalb County and other northern metropolitan Atlanta areas. The mean score of .6563 for the socio-economic status of schools indicates that most of the schools were lower socio-economic status schools.

The mean score of .3304 for principal race shows that most of the principals were black, while the mean score of .2545 indicates that the majority of the students were black.

The mean score of 2.2991 for teacher classroom teaching performance scores means that most of the teachers had passing classroom teaching performance scores.
The mean score of .5134 for teacher turnover (teachers who left or remained) indicates that slightly more of the teachers in the study were from the remaining group.

Hence, based on the coding of the scale, the mean scores in Table 4 show that the majority of the teachers in the study were white, teaching majority black students from lower socio-economic status schools, with predominantly black principals in kindergarten through fourth grades, with 0-8 years of experience. Additionally, the table shows that these teachers travel up to 20 miles from the North DeKalb area and most of them had satisfactory classroom teaching performance scores.

The variables as measured show reasonable distribution in Tables 5-16. Also, these variables' statistical distribution by standard deviation, as shown in Table 4, show a reasonable spread in distribution.

Table 5 presents the data on the frequency distribution for teacher race. The data show that 71.9 percent of the teachers were white, 27.2 percent black and .9 percent other races.
Table 5
Frequency Distribution for Teacher Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 224 100.0

Table 6 presents the frequency distribution for teacher age. The data show that 47 percent of the teachers were between 21 and 33 years of age.

Table 6
Frequency Distribution for Teacher Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-26</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-33</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 224 100.0
Table 7 presents the frequency distribution for teacher experience. The data show that almost half of the teacher experience ranged from 0-8 years.

**Table 7**

*Frequency Distribution for Teacher Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Range (Years)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 presents the frequency distribution for teacher education level. The data show that over half of the teachers had bachelor's degrees.
Table 8

Frequency Distribution for Teacher Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 presents the frequency distribution for teacher grade level taught. Fifty percent of the teachers taught K-3 grades.

Table 9

Frequency Distribution for Teacher Grade Level Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 presents the frequency distribution for teacher travel distance. Over 70 percent of the teachers travel from 0-20 miles to school.

Table 10

Frequency Distribution for Teacher Travel Distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 presents the frequency distribution for teacher location of residence. The data show that over 56 percent of the teachers lived in North DeKalb County and other counties farther north.
Table 11

Frequency Distribution for Teacher Location of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident Location</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Dekalb, South Dekalb, East Atlanta, South Metro</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dekalb, North Atlanta, North Fulton, Rockdale County</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwinnett County</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb County</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 presents the frequency distribution for the schools' socio-economic status. The data show that the socio-economic status of almost 66 percent of the schools was low.
Table 12
Frequency Distribution for School Socio-Economic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School SES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 presents the frequency distribution for principal race. The data show that 67 percent of the principals were black and 33 percent were white.

Table 13
Frequency Distribution for Principal Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 presents the frequency distribution for student race. The data show that 77.2 percent of the students were black.

Table 14

Frequency Distribution for Student Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 presents the frequency distribution for classroom teaching performance scores. The data show that 65.2 percent of the teachers had passing scores while almost 34 percent of the teachers either failed, waived the assessment period, or resigned before being assessed.
Table 15
Frequency Distribution for Classroom Teaching Performance Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete Fail</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waived or Resigned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before Assessment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed but Needed Professional Development Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Pass</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals                              224 100.0

Table 16 presents the frequency distribution for the teachers included in the study who left the system or remained with the system. The table shows that 51.3 percent of the teachers in the study were teachers who remained with the school system.

Table 16
Frequency Distribution for Teachers Who Left or Remained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals                              224 100.0
Summary

The descriptive correlational design was used in this study. This design was selected because the purpose of the study was to analyze relationships among factors that impact elementary teachers' decisions to remain with or leave their school/system. According to Ary, James, and Razavieh (1985), correlational studies are often used in descriptive research that is concerned with determining the extent of the relationships existing between two variables.

The population consisted of teachers from 20 DeKalb County elementary schools, 10 lower SES and 10 upper SES, with the highest turnover ratios. One hundred twenty-eight (128) teachers who resigned from the school system at the end of the school year (1988-89) from the 20 elementary schools participated in the research. An equal number (128) of remaining teachers in the 20 schools were selected. The sample population consisted of 256 teachers. Of the 256 questionnaires distributed, 224 teachers returned usable questionnaires for an 87.5 percent return rate.

Data were compiled from the teachers' test results on the Georgia TPAI, GTOI, and the TPPILEP, a 54-item questionnaire, developed by the researcher. These
instruments provided data for the statistical analysis of teacher and school demographics and data related to teacher classroom teaching performance, their perceptions of the principal evaluation skills, knowledge, practice of fairness, and administrative leadership style.
CHAPTER V
ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to determine whether significant relationships existed between teacher turnover and the following variables: (a) teacher classroom teaching performance scores (CTPSCOR), (b) teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process (TPPILEP) and demographic variables of schools and teachers. The independent variables were: (a) classroom teaching performance scores (CTPSCOR) as measured by Georgia's Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI) and Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI); (b) teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, i.e., principal evaluation skills (PSKILLS), knowledge of evaluation process (PKNOW), practice of fair evaluation (PPRACEV), and leadership styles (PSTYLE); (c) school demographics, i.e., school socio-economic status (SCHSES), principal race (PRACE), student race (STURACE); and (d) teacher demographics, i.e., teacher race (TRACE), age (TAGE), experience (TEXP), education level (TEDU), grade level
taught (TGRADELT), travel distance (TDISTANCE), and location of residence (TRESIDE).

This chapter provides a description of the statistical analyses utilized to test the hypotheses which were generated from the research questions in Chapter I. It is divided into two sections. Section one provides a discussion of the statistical analyses utilized in this study and section two presents the data in order of hypotheses' results.

The statistical operation used in analyzing the data was the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Nie, Hill, Jenkins, Steinbrunner & Bent, 1975). This computer program is available at Morehouse College Computer Center.

**Overall Statistical Analysis**

First, the Pearson product-moment correlation was utilized to determine the degree of correlation between the dependent variable and the independent variables. Tables 17 and 20 show the Pearson product-moment correlations between the dependent variable and the independent variables. For each relationship the sample N, mean \( \bar{x} \), Pearson r, and Probability P are given. The data from Tables 17 and 20 show that significant
relationships exist at the .05 level of significance (one-tailed test) between teacher turnover and the independent variables of teacher age, race, experience, education level, travel distance, and classroom management performance score.

Secondly, factor analysis shows the conceptual correlation between the dependent variable and the independent variables. This analysis means that any group of independent variables placed in the same factor as the dependent variable tend to be significantly related in the same communality and are independent of other factors. Other variables placed in the same factor also tend to cohere in the same commune and are independent of other factors. Table 18 shows the Rotated Factor Matrix of All Variables. The data show that TRACE and CTPSCOR have a significant correlation with teacher turnover.

Finally, multiple regression analysis summarizes and quantifies relationships among the variables. It establishes the relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables as a single group.

The results shown in Table 19 confirm a significant relationship beyond the .05 level of significance between Classroom Teaching Performance Scores, Teacher Race, and Teacher Turnover. The other independent
variables did not make a significant contribution to teacher turnover.

Results in Relation to Research Hypotheses

In an effort to address each null hypothesis and to allow the researcher to deal with the data in a meaningful manner, each null hypothesis, with appropriate statistics, is presented.

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant relationship between classroom teaching performance scores as measured by Georgia's Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument and Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument and teacher turnover.

Table 17 presents the results of the Pearson product-moment correlation analysis to test this hypothesis.

Table 17

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation for Teacher Classroom Teaching Performance Scores (CTPSCOR) and Teacher Turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(\bar{X})</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTPSCOR</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>2.2991</td>
<td>.1887</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance = .05 level or below
The table shows that there is a significant relationship between classroom teaching performance scores and teachers' decisions to remain with or leave the school system. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient is .1887 for CTPSCOR (N = 224) and is significant beyond the .01 level of significance (P = .002). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that teachers who leave the school system tend to have failing classroom teaching performance scores and those who remain tend to have passing classroom teaching performance scores. This conclusion is reached because in the coding of the data (Appendix D), a passing classroom management performance score was coded 1 and a failing classroom teaching performance score was coded 0 and the teacher turnover scores were coded 0 for those who left and 1 for those who remained. Hence, the correlation coefficient, .1887, indicates a positive correlation between teacher classroom teaching performance score and teacher turnover. Therefore, teachers with failing classroom teaching performance scores tended to leave the school system and teachers with passing classroom teaching performance scores tended to remain with the school system.
Hypothesis 2: There is no significant relationship between teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, i.e., PSKILLS, PKNOW, PPRACEV and PSTYLE and teacher turnover.

Table 18 presents the results of the Pearson product-moment correlation analysis to test this hypothesis.

Table 18

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation for Teacher Perceptions of Principal Instructional Leadership in the Evaluation Process, i.e., PSKILL, PKNOW, PPRACEV, PSTYLE, and Teacher Turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSKILL</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>-0.0477</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKNOW</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>0.0740</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPRACEV</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>0.0092</td>
<td>0.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTYLE</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>0.0185</td>
<td>0.391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance = .05 level or below

The table shows that there is no significant relationship between teacher perceptions of principal skills in the evaluation process and teacher turnover.
The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient is -.0477 for PSKILL (N = 222), which is not significant at the .05 level of significance (P = .240). Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

With respect to teacher perceptions of principal knowledge in the evaluation process, the table shows that there is no significant relationship between principal knowledge and teacher turnover. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient for PKNOW is -.0740 (N = 224), which is not significant at the .05 level of significance (P = .135). Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

The table shows that teacher perceptions of principal practice of equity in the evaluation process is not significantly related to teacher turnover. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient for PPRACEV is -.0092 (N = 224), which is not significant at the .05 level of significance (P = .445). Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

The table shows that there is no significant relationship between teacher perceptions of principal administrative style and teacher turnover. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient for PSTYLE is .0185 (N = 224), which is not significant at the .05
level of significance \((P = .391)\). Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Hence, hypothesis 2 is accepted which means that there is no significant relationship between teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process and teacher turnover.

Next, the data with respect to school demographic variables and teacher turnover are analyzed.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant relationship between socio-economic status of schools and teacher turnover.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant relationship between principal race and teacher turnover.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant relationship between student race and teacher turnover.

Table 19 presents the results of the Pearson product-moment correlation analysis to test these hypotheses.
Table 19

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation for School Demographic Variables of SCHSES, PRACE, STURACE, and Teacher Turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHSES</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>.6563</td>
<td>-.0088</td>
<td>.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACE</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>.3304</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STURACE</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>.2545</td>
<td>-.0207</td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance = .05 level or below

The table shows that there is no significant relationship between socio-economic status of schools and teacher turnover. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient for socio-economic status of schools is -.0088 (N = 224), which is not significant at the .05 level of significance (P = .448). Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

With respect to principal race, the table shows that there is no significant relationship between principal race and teacher turnover. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient for PRACE is .0002 (N = 224), which is not significant at the .05 level of significance (P = .499). Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

The table shows that student race is not significantly
related to teacher turnover. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient for STURACE is \(-0.0207\) \((N = 224)\), which is not significant at the .05 level of significance \((P = .379)\). Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Hence, hypothesis 3 is accepted, which means that there is no significant relationship among school demographic variables of school socio-economic status, race of principal, racial composition of students, and teacher turnover.

The data with respect to teacher demographic variables are presented below.

Hypothesis 6: There is no significant relationship between teacher race and teacher turnover.

Hypothesis 7: There is no significant relationship between teacher age and teacher turnover.

Hypothesis 8: There is no significant relationship between teacher experience and teacher turnover.

Hypothesis 9: There is no significant relationship between teacher education training and teacher turnover.
Hypothesis 10: There is no significant relationship between grade level taught and teacher turnover.

Hypothesis 11: There is no significant relationship between travel distance and teacher turnover.

Hypothesis 12: There is no significant relationship between location of residence and teacher turnover.

Table 20 presents the results of the Pearson product-moment correlation analysis to test the above hypotheses.

Table 20
Pearson Product-Moment Correlation for Teacher Demographic Variables and Teacher Turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \overline{x} )</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRACE</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>.7545</td>
<td>-.2108</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAGE</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
<td>.1347</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXP</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1.2098</td>
<td>.1480</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEDU</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>.5491</td>
<td>.1377</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGRADELT</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1.2308</td>
<td>.0598</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDISTANCE</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1.0804</td>
<td>-.1137</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRESIDE</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>.8834</td>
<td>-.1338</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance = .05 level or below
The table shows that there is a significant relationship between teacher race and teacher turnover. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient for TRACE is \(-.2108\) \((N = 224)\), which is significant beyond the .01 level of significance \((P = .001)\). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected which means that there is a significant relationship between teacher race and teacher turnover. In fact, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, \(-.2108\) means that white teachers are more likely to leave the school system. This conclusion is reached because in the coding of the data (Appendix D), white teachers were given the code of 1 while black teachers were given the code of 0. The teacher turnover score, with a low score of 0, was given to those who left, and the higher score of 1 was given to those who remained. Hence, the negative correlation coefficient, \(-.2108\), shows an inverse relationship between the independent variable, teacher race, and the dependent variable, teacher turnover. Therefore, white teachers tended to leave the school system and black teachers tended to remain with the school system.

The table reveals that teacher age is significantly related to teacher turnover. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient for TAGE is \(.1347\) \((N = 224)\) and
is significant at the .05 level of significance \( (P = .022) \). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is a significant relationship between teacher age and teacher turnover. Additionally, it means that younger teachers are more likely to leave the school system. This conclusion is based on the coding of the data, which show that younger teachers are coded 0 and older teachers are coded 1, 2, 3, or 4, and the low teacher turnover score of 0 was given to those who left and the higher score of 1 was given to those who remained. Hence, the correlation coefficient, .1347, indicates a positive correlation between teacher age and teacher turnover. Therefore, the younger teachers tended to leave the school system and the older teachers tended to remain with the school system.

With respect to teacher experience, the table shows that there is a significant relationship between teacher experience and teacher turnover. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient for TEXP is .1480 \( (N = 224) \), which is significant at the .01 level of significance \( (P = .013) \). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is a significant relationship between teacher experience and teacher turnover. Furthermore, this means that teachers with low
experience tend to leave the school system while teachers with high experience tend to remain with the school system. In terms of experience, teachers with low experience were coded 0 and teachers with high experience were coded 1, 2, 3, or 4, while teachers who left were coded 0 and teachers who remained were coded 1 (Appendix D). The correlation coefficient, .1480, indicates a positive correlation between teacher experience and teacher turnover. Therefore, teachers with lower experience tended to leave the school system and teachers with higher experience tended to remain with the school system.

The table indicates that teacher education level is significantly related to teacher turnover. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient for TEDUC is .1377 (N = 224) and is significant at the .05 level of significance (P = .020). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is a significant relationship between the educational training teachers accrue and teacher turnover. Also, this means that teachers with less educational training tended to leave the school system while teachers with more educational training tended to remain with the school system. This conclusion is based on the coding of the data (Appendix
D). Teachers with entry level degrees (bachelor) were coded 0 and teachers with higher degrees were coded 1, 2, or 3. Hence, the correlation coefficient, .1377, indicates a positive correlation between teacher education and teacher turnover. Therefore, teachers with lower educational training tended to leave the school system and teachers with higher educational training tended to remain with the school system.

With respect to teacher grade level taught, the table shows that there is not a significant relationship between teacher grade level taught and teacher turnover. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient for TGRADELT is .0598 (N = 221), which is not significant at the .05 level of significance (P = .188). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

The table reveals that there is a significant relationship between teacher travel distance and teacher turnover. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient for TDISTANCE is -.1137 (N = 224) and is significant at the .05 level of significance (P = .045). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that there is a significant relationship between teacher travel distance and teacher turnover. Moreover, this means that the greater the distance teachers
traveled to get to their schools each day the more likely they were to leave the school system. This conclusion was reached because in the coding of the data, low travel distances were coded 0 and higher travel distances were given the higher code of 1, 2, 3, or 4, while the low teacher turnover score of 0 was given to those who left and the higher score of 1 was given to those who remained. Hence, the negative correlation coefficient, -0.1137, indicates an inverse relationship between teacher travel distance and teacher turnover. Therefore, teachers who traveled greater distances to their school assignments tended to leave the school system, while teachers who traveled shorter distances to their school assignments tended to remain with it.

The table shows that location of teacher residence is significantly related to teacher turnover. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient is -0.1338 (N = 223) and is significant at the .05 level of significance (P = .023). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that location of teacher residence is significantly related to teacher turnover. Additionally, this means that teachers who lived in northern DeKalb County communities and other north
metropolitan Atlanta communities left the school system, while teachers who lived in Central and South DeKalb County communities and other south metropolitan Atlanta communities remained with the school system. This conclusion was reached because in the coding of the data (Appendix D), teachers who lived in Central and South DeKalb were coded 0 and teachers who lived in North DeKalb and other north metro Atlanta areas were coded 1, 2, and 3 (codes 2 and 3 represent Cobb and Gwinnett Counties, respectively). Hence, the negative correlation coefficient, -.1338, indicates an inverse relationship between location of teacher residence and teacher turnover. Therefore, the findings indicate that teachers with high residence scores tended to leave the school system and teachers with low residence scores tended to remain with it.

In summary, the findings from the correlation analysis indicate that younger white teachers with lower experience and education training, who travelled from North DeKalb and other north metropolitan areas, left the school system during the 1988-89 school year significantly more than the other groups. Hence, the null hypotheses for these variables and teacher turnover were rejected. The hypothesis for teacher grade level taught was accepted.
Hypothesis 13: Teacher turnover cannot be predicted by classroom teaching performance scores, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, and selected school and teacher demographic factors.

Tables 21 and 22 present the results of the data obtained from Factor Analysis and Regression Analysis to test this hypothesis.

Table 21 shows that turnover (LEAVREM), teacher race and classroom teaching performance scores are placed in Factor 5, where the factor score loadings are the highest for these variables. This means that with respect to hypothesis 13, only classroom teaching performance scores and teacher race are placed with teacher turnover (LEAVREM). Thus, with respect to Factor 5, classroom teaching performance scores and teacher race are predictors of teacher turnover, but PSKILLS, PKNOW, PPRACEV, PSTYLE, TEXP, TEDUC, SCHSES, PRACE, STURACE, TRESIDE, TDISTANCE AND TGRADELT are not predictors of teacher turnover. Therefore, this null hypothesis is accepted.
### Table 21

Rotated Factor Matrix of All Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSKILLS</td>
<td>.87730</td>
<td>-.12530</td>
<td>-.03263</td>
<td>.02704</td>
<td>.00440</td>
<td>.10803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKNOW</td>
<td>.92484</td>
<td>-.08726</td>
<td>-.02820</td>
<td>-.02118</td>
<td>-.00081</td>
<td>.01138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPRACEV</td>
<td>.90615</td>
<td>-.12243</td>
<td>-.08823</td>
<td>.00954</td>
<td>.05376</td>
<td>.01581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTYLE</td>
<td>.59884</td>
<td>-.08733</td>
<td>.09805</td>
<td>-.05521</td>
<td>.11668</td>
<td>.06205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXP</td>
<td>-.11749</td>
<td>.88297</td>
<td>.04360</td>
<td>-.00435</td>
<td>.08956</td>
<td>-.04097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAGE</td>
<td>-.09032</td>
<td>.84959</td>
<td>-.04141</td>
<td>-.15452</td>
<td>.04165</td>
<td>-.00371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEDU</td>
<td>-.00728</td>
<td>.75337</td>
<td>.08803</td>
<td>.00235</td>
<td>.04868</td>
<td>.06042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHSES</td>
<td>.12191</td>
<td>-.03225</td>
<td>-.83930</td>
<td>.01960</td>
<td>-.06964</td>
<td>.01378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACE</td>
<td>-.04218</td>
<td>-.04306</td>
<td>.79091</td>
<td>-.10045</td>
<td>.11486</td>
<td>-.12069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STURACE</td>
<td>-.08365</td>
<td>.17016</td>
<td>.66362</td>
<td>-.06411</td>
<td>-.32198</td>
<td>.16012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRESIDE</td>
<td>.01056</td>
<td>-.08713</td>
<td>-.01133</td>
<td>.83523</td>
<td>-.09472</td>
<td>-.03184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDISTANCE</td>
<td>.01657</td>
<td>-.05781</td>
<td>-.20581</td>
<td>.75600</td>
<td>-.00227</td>
<td>.12301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAVREM</td>
<td>-.00563</td>
<td>.13568</td>
<td>.03347</td>
<td>-.09815</td>
<td>.72741</td>
<td>.07800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACE</td>
<td>.15151</td>
<td>.09486</td>
<td>.16602</td>
<td>.46457</td>
<td>-.55037</td>
<td>-.20577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTPSCOR</td>
<td>-.01079</td>
<td>.40943</td>
<td>.09545</td>
<td>.32465</td>
<td>.31415</td>
<td>-.26424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGRADELT</td>
<td>.04787</td>
<td>.01915</td>
<td>-.01314</td>
<td>.05049</td>
<td>.08507</td>
<td>.93414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The underlined coefficients represent variables with statistical commonalities in relationship to one another and the dependent variable, teacher turnover.

**Legend:**
- **PSKILLS**: Principal Evaluation Skills
- **PKNOW**: Principal Knowledge of Evaluation Process
- **PPRACEV**: Principal Practice of Fair Evaluation
- **PSTYLE**: Principal Leadership Style
- **TEXP**: Teacher Experience
- **TAGE**: Teacher Age
- **TEDU**: Teacher Education Training
- **SCHSES**: School Socio-Economic Status
- **PRACE**: Principal Race
- **STURACE**: Student Race
- **TRESIDE**: Teacher Residence
- **TDISTANCE**: Travel Distance
- **LEAVREM**: Teacher Turnover - Leave/Remain
- **TRACE**: Teacher Race
- **CTPSCOR**: Teacher Classroom Teaching Performance Score
- **TGRADELT**: Teacher Grade Level Taught
The factor analysis also shows that the other factors are placed in the factors as follows:

FACTOR 1: As shown by Table 18, PSKILLS, PKNOW, PPRACEV and PSTYLE have a high loading under Factor 1. This means that these variables are in the same commune and can be grouped together. However, it should be observed that PSTYLE is negative which implies that when the principal is closed in his leadership style, teachers may perceive him/her to be skillful, knowledgeable, and fair in the evaluation process.

FACTOR 2: Teaching Experience, Teacher Age, and Educational Training have a high loading under Factor II. This shows that these variables are in the same commune and can be grouped together. Since the coefficients for Teacher Experience, Teacher Age, and Educational Training are all positive for these variables, they directly influence teachers' decisions to remain with or leave the school system.
FACTOR 3: School Socio-economic Status, Principal Race, and Student Race have a high loading under Factor 3. This shows that these variables are in the same commune and can be grouped together. In observing that school socio-economic status has a negative coefficient and principal race and student race have positive coefficients, it may be assumed that the race of the students and principals in low SES schools is similar.

FACTOR 4: Teacher commuting distance and place of residence have a high loading under Factor 4. This shows that these variables are in the same commune and can be grouped together. They have positive coefficients and, therefore, have a complimentary relationship.

FACTOR 6: Teacher grade level taught was the only factor with a high loading under Factor VI. It has no commonality with any of the other variables.
Hence, in analyzing the factor analysis data, the placement of teacher turnover (LEAVREM), TRACE, and CTPSCOR in the same factor seems to indicate a logical systematic coherence of these variables. This means that although teacher age, experience, education, travel distance, and residence are also significantly related to teacher turnover, the bonding between teacher race, classroom teaching performance scores and teacher turnover is independent of the other variables and has a stronger impact as a group on teacher turnover.

Hypothesis 13 is best examined in the regression analysis (Table 22). Table 22 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis.

In the regression analysis, teacher turnover (LEAVREM) is the dependent variable and all other variables are the independent variables. It was intended to determine the order in which teacher turnover is predicted by classroom teaching performance scores, principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, i.e., principal evaluation skills, principal knowledge of the evaluation process, principal practice of fair evaluation, and principal leadership style; school demographic variables of school socio-economic status, principal race, and student
Table 22

Multiple Regression Analysis with Teacher Turnover as the Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRACE</td>
<td>-.221031*</td>
<td>-3.387</td>
<td>.0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTPSCOR</td>
<td>.197275*</td>
<td>3.023</td>
<td>.0028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables in the Equation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trace</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAGE</td>
<td>.085947</td>
<td>1.269</td>
<td>.2059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>.090150</td>
<td>1.291</td>
<td>.1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEDUC</td>
<td>.089249</td>
<td>1.336</td>
<td>.1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGRADELT</td>
<td>.051692</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>.4325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STURAC</td>
<td>.042917</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>.5192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDISTANCE</td>
<td>-.088747</td>
<td>-1.343</td>
<td>.1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSKILLS</td>
<td>-.005134</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>.9380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKNOW</td>
<td>-.037226</td>
<td>-0.566</td>
<td>.5718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPRACEV</td>
<td>.022999</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>.7264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTYLE</td>
<td>-.035628</td>
<td>-0.537</td>
<td>.5917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHSES</td>
<td>.014295</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>.8277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRESIDE</td>
<td>-.098374</td>
<td>-1.421</td>
<td>.1568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACE</td>
<td>.005747</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>.9301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple R = .29164
R Square = .08506
Adjusted R Square = .07655
F = 9.99360
Significant F = .0001

* The underlined coefficients represents the independent variables and their BETA coefficients which indicate a significant relationship with the dependent variable, Teacher Turnover.
racial composition and teacher demographic variables of race, age, experience, educational training, and grade level taught.

The table shows that teacher race and teacher classroom teaching performance scores are significantly related (Sig. F = .0001) to teacher turnover. The BETA coefficients are -.221031 and .197275, respectively. This means that only TRACE and CTPSCOR (in that order) of all the variables tend to predict teacher turnover. The variables of TRACE, TEXP, TEDUC, TGRADELT, STURACE, TDISTANCE, PSKILLS, PKNOW, PPRACEV, PSTYLE, SCHSES, TRESIDE and PRACE are not in the equation and are insignificantly related. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. However, TRACE and CTPSCOR accounted for approximately eight percent (adjusted R square = .07659) of the cause of teacher turnover in this study. This means that there are many variables yet to be considered in order to explain teacher turnover.

Analysis

In the Pearson product-moment correlation, teacher race, classroom teaching performance scores, age, experience, education, travel distance, and residence are significantly related to teacher turnover. The results
of the factor analysis, clearly placed teacher turnover, teacher race, and classroom teaching performance scores in Factor 5. The results of the regression analysis confirm this relationship while indicating that only eight percent of the variance in teacher turnover is predicted. The other independent variables that were significantly related to teacher turnover in the Pearson product-moment correlational analysis were geared out in the factor analysis and regression analysis. Teacher age, experience, and education are placed in Factor 2, and teacher residence and travel distance are placed in Factor 4. This means that both black and white teachers, in accordance with the system's method of recruitment and reward for further training, tend to gain more experience and education with age. Similarly, both black and white teachers, if they reside outside the system, tend to travel longer distances to schools. Therefore, when these variables are interacting simultaneously with teacher race and classroom teaching performance scores on teacher turnover, their separate effects are small and insignificant as compared to the more dominant effects of race and classroom teaching performance scores. Seen from another perspective, both black and white teachers with low and high classroom
teaching performance who are young and old, experienced and inexperienced, qualified and less qualified, living in North/South DeKalb and travel long/short distances to work are related (Pearson product-moment correlation) to teacher turnover. Preeminently, however, the data from this study indicate that white teachers whose performance is inadequate in the classroom often are the ones who tend to leave the DeKalb School System.

Summary

The purpose of the study was to determine whether teacher turnover could be predicted by classroom teaching performance scores, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, school demographic variables and teacher demographic variables. This chapter presented the statistical analysis of the data with respect to the relationship between teacher turnover and classroom teaching performance scores, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, and school and teacher demographic variables.

Of the 13 hypotheses that were examined, hypotheses 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12 were rejected, while hypotheses 2, 3, 4, 5 and 13 were accepted. Hypothesis 1, which
stated that there was no significant relationship between teacher turnover and classroom teaching performance scores, was rejected because a significant relationship at the .05 level of significance was found to exist. The Pearson product-moment correlation matrices (Tables 17 and 20) show that teacher turnover, TRACE, TAGE, TEXP, TEDUC, TDISTANCE, TRESIDE AND CTPSCOR are related. However, factor analysis (Table 21) shows that TRACE and CTPSCOR are placed in the same factor with teacher turnover (LEAVREM) and also are the only predictors of teacher turnover in the regression analysis (Table 22). This implies that teachers who tend to leave are white and score low on the classroom teaching performance test.

It was noted, however, that teachers' race and classroom teaching performance scores accounted for approximately eight percent of the cause of teacher turnover in this study. This meant that other variables must be considered in explaining teacher turnover.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Public education in the United States is still the preeminent means of educating the masses. Today, however, many schools in this country do not have enough quality teachers to teach students, mainly because of teacher shortages in many teaching fields. Moreover, this shortage continues to become more severe. Increasing teacher turnover has been identified as a major cause of the growing teacher shortage problem. More teachers continue to leave teaching than colleges and universities replace.

This study examined teacher turnover in the DeKalb County School System, Georgia's largest school system. The study revealed that the DeKalb School System, like many other school systems, recognizes that minimizing or eliminating teacher turnover is a viable method of addressing the critical teacher shortage problem.

The purpose of the study was to determine whether teacher turnover could be predicted by variables of classroom teaching performance scores, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the
evaluation process, and selected school and teacher demographic factors.

The review of the related literature indicates that teacher turnover is one of the primary causes of teacher shortages. Other factors that contribute to the teacher shortage problems are: inadequate teacher recruitment strategies, fewer students selecting teaching as a career, a competitive teacher job market, low salary, poor working conditions, and increased bureaucratic requirements by many states. Most researchers agree that the teacher shortage problem will continue to grow in spite of the best strategies used to minimize or eliminate it. Moreover, these researchers agree that controlling teacher turnover is one of the most efficient and effective ways of addressing the teacher shortage problem.

The theoretical assumption of the study is that teacher turnover may be explained by examining the relationship among such independent variables as classroom teaching performance scores, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, and selected school and teacher demographic factors. This assumption generated the following research hypotheses:
1. There is no significant relationship between classroom teaching performance scores as measured by Georgia's Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument and Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument and teacher turnover.

2. There is no significant relationship between teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process and teacher turnover.

3. There is no significant relationship between socio-economic status of schools and teacher turnover.

4. There is no significant relationship between principal race and teacher turnover.

5. There is no significant relationship between student race and teacher turnover.

6. There is no significant relationship between teacher race and teacher turnover.

7. There is no significant relationship between teacher age and teacher turnover.

8. There is no significant relationship between teacher experience and teacher turnover.

9. There is no significant relationship between teacher education training and teacher turnover.
10. There is no significant relationship between grade level taught and teacher turnover.
11. There is no significant relationship between travel distance and teacher turnover.
12. There is no significant relationship between location of residence and teacher turnover.
13. Teacher turnover cannot be predicted by classroom teaching performance scores, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, and selected school and teacher demographic variables.

The descriptive correlational design was employed in this study. Three instruments were used to collect the data. Two of the instruments, Georgia's Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI) and Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI) are state-required annual evaluation instruments. They provided data on teacher classroom management performance scores.

The third instrument, Teacher Perceptions of Principal Instructional Leadership in the Evaluation Process (TPPILEP), was developed by the researcher. It provided data on teacher perceptions of principal skills, knowledge, practices and leadership style in the
evaluation process. This questionnaire also provided school and teacher demographic data. The instrument was validated statistically by an item to scale correlation analysis.

The population consisted of 256 teachers--128 departing teachers and 128 remaining teachers--in 20 elementary schools with the highest turnover ratios in the DeKalb County School System. Ten of the schools were classified as lower socio-economic status schools and the other 10 were classified as upper socio-economic status schools (based on the number of students receiving free and reduced-price lunches).

Correlational Analysis (Pearson r), Factor Analysis, and Regression Analysis were used to analyze data collected from the state assessment instruments and the questionnaire to determine the degree of relationship, if any, between the variables. The main findings in relation to each hypothesis are presented.

**Hypothesis 1:** There was a significant relationship found to exist between classroom teaching performance scores as measured by Georgia's Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument and the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument and teacher turnover. Therefore, this null hypothesis was rejected.
The Pearson product-moment correlation analysis shows that classroom teaching performance scores are significant beyond the .01 level of significance. This analysis indicates that when classroom teaching performance level with students is high, teachers tend to remain with the system and when their performance level is low, they tend to leave the system. This finding closely parallels concerns about teaching that many DeKalb County departing teachers expressed during their exit interviews. One of the teachers' major concerns related to their inability to teach effectively in the classroom. Hence, many of these teachers left the system before performance assessment, deferred performance assessment, or received an unsatisfactory score on performance assessment, which in turn influenced them to leave the system.

Hypothesis 2: There was no significant relationship found to exist between teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership (skills, knowledge, practices and leadership style) in the evaluation process and teacher turnover. This hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 3: There was no significant relationship between socio-economic status of schools and teacher turnover. This null hypothesis was accepted.
Hypothesis 4: There was no significant relationship between principal race and teacher turnover. This null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 5: There was no significant relationship between student race and teacher turnover. This null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 6: There was no significant relationship between teacher race and teacher turnover. This null hypothesis was rejected. Teacher race was found to be significantly related to teacher turnover in the correlation, factor, and regression analyses.

Hypothesis 7: There was no significant relationship found between teacher age and teacher turnover. This null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 8: There was no significant relationship found between teaching experience and teacher turnover. This null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 9: There was no significant relationship found between teacher education training level and teacher turnover. This null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 10: There was no significant relationship found between grade level taught and teacher turnover. This null hypothesis was accepted.
Hypothesis 11: There was no significant relationship found between travel distance and teacher turnover. This null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 12: There was no significant relationship found between location of teacher residence and teacher turnover. This null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 13: Teacher turnover cannot be predicted by classroom teaching performance scores, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, or selected school and teacher demographic variables. Hypothesis 13 was accepted. However, classroom teaching performance scores and the teacher demographic variable--teacher race--were found to be predictors of teacher turnover.

Conclusions

Through the medium of public education, our youth are prepared for meaningful, productive, and happy lives. It is the medium used to pass information from generation to generation. Public education is provided through an educational system in which teachers, operating in school units, provide learners with structured activities required by the government. Teachers interact with students on a daily basis in the
students' educational development. Hence, the teacher is a very crucial part of students' formal education. In schools today, this vital element—the classroom teacher—is in short supply. Research literature revealed that while the supply of teachers continues to decline, the need for additional teachers continues to increase. The literature revealed that teachers leave school systems for a variety of reasons.

The analyses of teacher turnover as done by this study lead to the following conclusions:

1. There was a significant relationship between classroom teaching performance scores as measured by Georgia's Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument and the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument and teacher turnover. This null hypothesis was rejected based on the data from the Pearson correlation analysis, factor analysis, and regression analysis.

2. There was no significant relationship between teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process and teacher turnover.

3. There was no significant relationship found among school demographic variables of socio-
economic status of schools, race of principal, racial composition of students, and teacher turnover.

4. There was a significant relationship among teacher demographic variables of race, age, experience, education level, travel distance, location of residence, and teacher turnover. Grade level taught was not significantly related to teacher turnover.

5. Teacher turnover cannot be predicted by classroom teaching performance scores, teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership in the evaluation process, and selected school and teacher demographic variables. This hypothesis was accepted because only classroom teaching performance scores and teacher race were found to be predictors of teacher turnover.

Implications

The teacher shortage problem is projected to become more severe in the 1990s. This study focused on teacher turnover which is one of the major causes of teacher shortages. It is also one of the most feasible areas in which to work to reduce teacher shortages.
This study analyzed 13 variables hypothesized as causes of teacher turnover. The findings of the study revealed that teacher classroom management performance scores and teacher race had a significant influence on teachers' decisions to leave the DeKalb School System.

The following implications were generated from the findings and conclusions of this study:

1. Programs and strategies should be developed that would help teachers successfully complete the assessment process.

2. Immediate attention should be focused on DeKalb's white teaching staff to determine specifically why these teachers are more inclined to leave the system.

3. Strategies should be developed and implemented to encourage white teachers to remain with the system.

4. Further research should be conducted to identify other variables that cause teacher turnover.

**Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:
1. Since the scores on teachers' annual performance evaluations were found to be significantly related to teacher turnover, the DeKalb County School System should increase and highly publicize its staff development offerings of courses, workshops, and seminars that are designed to help teachers prepare for their on-the-job performance evaluation. Additionally, the school system should furnish tutorial service by "teaching field experts" to provide specialized help in preparing teachers for their performance assessment. Each local elementary school principal should organize a "performance assessment team" to provide individual support and study resources for teachers who must be assessed.

2. Since the race of the teacher was found to be the strongest predictor of teacher turnover in this study, i.e., white teachers left at a higher rate than black teachers, the DeKalb School System should provide workshops and seminars that would help white teachers increase their understanding of their race characteristics in relation to their students' socio-cultural needs (Delpit, 1988).
3. The DeKalb County School System should conduct additional studies, utilizing on-site observations of white elementary teachers, to identify any additional specific causes of the higher rate of turnover among white teachers.

4. Since the variables that were significantly related to teacher turnover accounted for approximately eight percent of the cause of teacher turnover in this study, the school system should conduct additional studies utilizing teachers from all schools in the system to identify other factors that may predict teacher turnover.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI)

GTOI Evaluation Process Model

Georgia's Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument

Teacher Perceptions of Principal Instructional Leadership in the Evaluation Process (TPAI)

Teacher Perceptions of Principal Instructional Leadership in the Evaluation Process (GTOI)
Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument

GTOI DIMENSION STATEMENTS: STANDARD FORM

TEACHING TASK I: PROVIDES INSTRUCTION

Dimension A: Instructional Level—The amount and organization of the lesson content are appropriate for the students based on their abilities and the complexity and difficulty of the material.

Dimension B: Content Development—Content is developed through appropriate teacher-focused or student-focused activities.

Dimension C: Building for Transfer—Lesson includes initial focus, content emphasis or linking, and summaries which build for transfer of learning.

TEACHING TASK II: ASSESSES AND ENCOURAGES STUDENT PROGRESS

Dimension A: Promoting Engagement—Instructional engagement is promoted through stimulating presentations, active participation, or techniques which promote overt or covert involvement.

Dimension B: Monitoring Progress—Progress, understanding, and bases of misunderstanding are assessed by interpreting relevant student responses, contributions, performances, or products.

Dimension C: Responding to Student Performance—Students are provided reinforcement for adequate performances when appropriate and specific feedback or correctives for inadequate performances.

Dimension D: Supporting Students—Support for students is conveyed by using techniques such as providing encouragement, lowering concern levels, dignifying academic responses, and using language free of sarcasm, ridicule, and humiliating references.

TEACHING TASK III: MANAGES THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Dimension A: Use of Time—Use of instructional time is optimized by techniques such as providing clear directions and using efficient methods for transitions, materials distribution, and other routine matters and by techniques such as focusing on objectives and providing sufficient instructional activities.

Dimension B: Physical Setting—The physical setting allows the students to observe the focus of instruction, to work without disruption, to obtain materials, and to move about easily; and it allows the teacher to monitor the students and to move among them.

Dimension C: Appropriate Behavior—Appropriate behavior is maintained by monitoring the behavior of the entire class, providing feedback, and intervening when necessary.
GTOI EVALUATION PROCESS MODEL

Orientation

Pre-Evaluation Conference

Observations

Scoring and Written Comments

Post-Observation Conference

Annual Evaluation Summary Report and Conference

Professional Development Plan
# Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument

## TEACHER PERFORMANCE OBSERVATION RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Competencies and Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1.1 Selects or directs learning resources for lessons</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2.2 Describes or selects teaching materials for lessons</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3.3 Plans instruction and procedures for assessing learning progress on the objectives</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4.4 Plans instruction at a variety of levels</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5.5 Identifies and refers learners who require the assistance of specialists</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## USES TECHNIQUES, METHODS, AND MEDIA RELATED TO THE OBJECTIVES

1.6 Uses teaching methods appropriate for objectives, learners, and environment | 1234 5 |
1.7 Uses instructional materials and other instructional aids | 1234 5 |

## COMMUNICATES WITH LEARNERS

2.10 Covers directions and explanations related to lesson content | 1234 5 |
2.11 Provides feedback to learners throughout the lesson | 1234 5 |
2.12 Uses acceptable written and oral expression with learners | 1234 5 |

## DEMONSTRATES A VARIETY OF TEACHING METHODS

3.13 Implements learning activities in a logical sequence | 1234 5 |
3.14 Uses a variety of teaching methods | 1234 5 |
3.15 Works with individuals, small groups, and large groups effectively | 1234 5 |

## REINFORCES AND ENCOURAGES LEARNER INVOLVEMENT IN INSTRUCTION

4.16 Uses procedures which get learners involved in lessons | 1234 5 |
4.17 Maintains learner involvement in lessons | 1234 5 |
4.18 Reinforces and encourages the efforts of learners to maintain involvement | 1234 5 |

## DEMONSTRATES AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE SUBJECT

5.19 Helps learners recognize the purpose/meaning or topics of activities | 1234 5 |
5.20 Demonstrates knowledge in the subject area | 1234 5 |

## ORGANIZES TIME, SPACE, MATERIALS, AND EQUIPMENT FOR INSTRUCTION

6.21 Arranges non-instructional aids | 1234 5 |
6.22 Uses instructional aids efficiently | 1234 5 |
6.23 Provides a learning environment that is attractive and orderly | 1234 5 |

## DEMONSTRATES ENTHUSIASM FOR TEACHING, LEARNING, AND THE SUBJECT

7.24 Communicates personal enthusiasm | 1234 5 |
7.25 Stimulates learner interest | 1234 5 |
7.26 Conveys the impression of knowing what to do and how to do it | 1234 5 |

## HELPS LEARNERS DEVELOP POSITIVE SELF-CONCEPTS

8.27 Demonstrates warmth and friendliness | 1234 5 |
8.28 Demonstrates sensitivity to the needs and feelings of learners | 1234 5 |
8.29 Demonstrates patience, empathy, and understanding | 1234 5 |

## MANAGES CLASSROOM INTERACTIONS

9.30 Promotes feedback to learners about their behavior | 1234 5 |
9.31 Promotes constructive interpersonal relationships | 1234 5 |
9.32 Maintains appropriate classroom behavior | 1234 5 |
9.33 Manages disruptive behavior among learners | 1234 5 |

---

Observer Comments

Teacher Comments

---

I have read and am aware of the contents of this form which is based on observations by my principal, instructional supervisor, and/or during the school year.

Date: __________________________
Signature of Observer: __________________________

Date: __________________________
Signature of Observer: __________________________
June 7, 1989

Colleague:

This questionnaire is a request for information on classroom management and other variables related to teacher turnover. Please respond to each item listed on the attached questionnaire. Return completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to


Thank you for your assistance.

Do not place your name on the answer sheet
Teacher Perceptions of Principal Instructional Leadership in the Evaluation Process (TPAI)

Part I: Demographic Information

The following information is for statistical analysis. It will provide important background data for analyzing the information in Part II of this questionnaire. The information for the entire study is strictly confidential.

Please respond to items 1 - 7.
Use a #2 pencil to encode your answer on the enclosed answer sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Age</th>
<th>2. Race</th>
<th>3. Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 21-26</td>
<td>1. Black</td>
<td>1. 0-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 27-33</td>
<td>2. Caucasian</td>
<td>2. 4-8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 34-40</td>
<td>3. Oriental</td>
<td>3. 9-12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 41-47</td>
<td>4. Hispanic</td>
<td>4. 13-20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. over 48</td>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td>5. Over 20 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Educational Attainment</th>
<th>5. Grade Level Taught</th>
<th>6. Majority race students in your class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Masters</td>
<td>2. 4</td>
<td>2. Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Specialist</td>
<td>3. 5</td>
<td>3. Oriental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Doctorate</td>
<td>4. 6</td>
<td>4. Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td>5. 7</td>
<td>5. Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Travel Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 0-10 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 11-20 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 21-30 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 31-40 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Over 40 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II: Questionnaire

Please respond to items 8-18. Use a No. 2 pencil to encode your answers on the enclosed answer sheet.

CODE: 1 = SA - Strongly Agree
2 = A - Agree
3 = U - Undecided
4 = D - Disagree
5 = SD - Strongly Disagree

Examples: My principal contributed to my professional growth and development. SA A U D SD

In the example above, the rater strongly agrees with the statement by encoding 1 for the letter set SA.

My principal:

8. provides clear and concise directions as prescribed by the TPAI ______________________________ SA A U D SD

9. evaluates me on specific areas of the TPAI. ___________ SA A U D SD

10. clearly explains the competencies required by the TPAI ______________________________ SA A U D SD

11. provides model examples to ensure clear understanding of the TPAI competencies ___________ SA A U D SD

12. provides a variety of activities that assist me in TPAI tasks accomplishment ___________ SA A U D SD

13. provides explanations of TPAI instructional objectives ________________________________ SA A U D SD

14. understands how student progress is assessed using the TPAI ____________________________ SA A U D SD

15. assesses teacher performance based on the guidelines of the TPAI ________________________ SA A U D SD

16. provides a learning environment as prescribed by the TPAI ______________________________ SA A U D SD

17. monitors teaching performance as prescribed by the TPAI ______________________________ SA A U D SD

18. provides a positive climate that enhances instructional activities _________________________ SA A U D SD
19. provides clear and concise schoolwide instructional objectives ........................................ SA A U D SD
20. provides resources and supplies to enhance the instructional program ................................ SA A U D SD
21. provides support for innovative approaches to instruction .................................................. SA A U D SD
22. provides instructional activities that indicate exceptional planning skills ............................. SA A U D SD
23. uses effective oral and written communication skills ........................................................... SA A U D SD
24. provides equipment, materials, instructional space and well-coordinated schedules for instructional activities ........................................................ SA A U D SD
25. provides assessment guidelines for effective evaluation of learner's performance ............... SA A U D SD
26. places student progress as the highest of priorities in instructional planning ........................ SA A U D SD
27. places classroom observation as a high priority in instructional planning ............................. SA A U D SD
28. is consistent in staff evaluation ............................................................................................. SA A U D SD
29. is unbiased in staff evaluation ............................................................................................... SA A U D SD
30. is reasonable in staff evaluation ......................................................................................... SA A U D SD
31. is objective in staff evaluations .......................................................................................... SA A U D SD
32. is timely in staff evaluation ................................................................................................. SA A U D SD
33. is sensitive in staff evaluation ............................................................................................. SA A U D SD
34. provides guidance for assessed weaknesses in staff evaluation ........................................... SA A U D SD
35. is aware of strong and weak performers on the staff ......................................................... SA A U D SD
36. has high expectations of staff performance. SA  A  U  D  SD
37. is empathetic with staff. SA  A  U  D  SD
38. is friendly toward staff. SA  A  U  D  SD
39. enjoys his work with the staff. SA  A  U  D  SD

Part III:

Please respond to items 40-54. Use a #2 pencil to encode your answers on the enclosed answer sheet.

CODE:  1 = Never  
       2 = Rarely 
       3 = Sometimes 
       4 = Often  
       5 = Very Often

A. With respect to interpersonal style, my principal:

40. uses praise to arouse teachers' need to work............. 1  2  3  4  5
41. accepts the opinion of others............................... 1  2  3  4  5
42. goes along with your solution to a problem when there is a difference of opinion........... 1  2  3  4  5
43. explains why / how you should do something rather than blaming you when you happened to do it wrong............................................. 1  2  3  4  5
44. sees your side in a problem with him/her................ 1  2  3  4  5
45. finds a solution that is acceptable to you where there is a difference of opinion......................... 1  2  3  4  5
46. shows you the easy way to comply with rules that higher authority enforces............... 1  2  3  4  5
8. With respect to decision making and planning, my principal asks teachers to:

47. develop an overall strategy for knowing when we are failing to meet our goals and what to do to correct the problem

48. prioritize the causes of the problem

49. prioritize and choose the best objective from among alternatives

50. design alternatives to counteract the causes of problems

51. estimate the cost of time and resources of alternative methods

52. generate alternative techniques for evaluating decisions

53. use the results of evaluation for revising decisions

54. show the inner-linkages of decisions and sub-plans
June 7, 1989

Colleague:

This questionnaire is a request for information on classroom management and other variables related to teacher turnover. Please respond to each item listed on the attached questionnaire. Return completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to

____________________________

____________________________

____________________________

Thank you for your assistance.

Do not place your name on the answer sheet.
TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPAL INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS (GTOI)

Part I: Demographic Information

The following information is for statistical analysis. It will provide important background data for analyzing the information in Part II of this questionnaire. The information for the entire study is strictly confidential.

Please respond to items 1 - 7.
Use a #2 pencil to encode your answer on the enclosed answer sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Age</th>
<th>2. Race</th>
<th>3. Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 21-26</td>
<td>1. Black</td>
<td>1. 0-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 27-33</td>
<td>2. Caucasian</td>
<td>2. 4-8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 34-40</td>
<td>3. Oriental</td>
<td>3. 9-12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 41-47</td>
<td>4. Hispanic</td>
<td>4. 13-20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. over 48</td>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td>5. Over 20 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Educational Attainment</th>
<th>5. Grade Level Taught</th>
<th>6. Majority race students in your class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Masters</td>
<td>2. 4</td>
<td>2. Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Specialist</td>
<td>3. 5</td>
<td>3. Oriental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Doctorate</td>
<td>4. 6</td>
<td>4. Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td>5. 7</td>
<td>5. Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Travel Distance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 0-10 miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 11-20 miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 21-30 miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 31-40 miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Over 40 miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II. Questionnaire

Please respond to items 8-39. Use a #2 pencil to encode your answers on the enclosed answer sheet.

**CODE:**
1 = SA - Strongly Agree  
2 = A - Agree  
3 = U - Undecided  
4 = D - Disagree  
5 = SD - Strongly Disagree

**Example:** My principal contributed to my professional growth and development.  

SA □ □ □ □ □
A □ □ □ □ □
U □ □ □ □ □
D □ □ □ □ □
SD □ □ □ □ □

In the example above, the rater strongly agrees with the statement by encoding '1' for the letter set 'SA'.

My principal:

8. provides clear and concise directions as prescribed by the GTOL.  

SA □ □ □ □ □
A □ □ □ □ □
U □ □ □ □ □
D □ □ □ □ □
SD □ □ □ □ □

9. evaluates me on specific areas of the GTOL.  

SA □ □ □ □ □
A □ □ □ □ □
U □ □ □ □ □
D □ □ □ □ □
SD □ □ □ □ □

10. clearly explains the rationale and all components of the GTOL.  

SA □ □ □ □ □
A □ □ □ □ □
U □ □ □ □ □
D □ □ □ □ □
SD □ □ □ □ □

11. provides model examples to enhance understanding of the Tasks, Dimensions and Professional Practices of the GTOL.  

SA □ □ □ □ □
A □ □ □ □ □
U □ □ □ □ □
D □ □ □ □ □
SD □ □ □ □ □

12. provides a variety of activities that assist me in GTOL tasks accomplishment.  

SA □ □ □ □ □
A □ □ □ □ □
U □ □ □ □ □
D □ □ □ □ □
SD □ □ □ □ □

13. provides explanations of GTOL instructional objectives.  

SA □ □ □ □ □
A □ □ □ □ □
U □ □ □ □ □
D □ □ □ □ □
SD □ □ □ □ □

14. understands how student progress is assessed using the GTOL.  

SA □ □ □ □ □
A □ □ □ □ □
U □ □ □ □ □
D □ □ □ □ □
SD □ □ □ □ □

15. assesses teacher performance based on the guidelines of the GTOL.  

SA □ □ □ □ □
A □ □ □ □ □
U □ □ □ □ □
D □ □ □ □ □
SD □ □ □ □ □

16. provides a learning environment as prescribed by the GTOL.  

SA □ □ □ □ □
A □ □ □ □ □
U □ □ □ □ □
D □ □ □ □ □
SD □ □ □ □ □

17. monitors teaching performance as prescribed by the GTOL.  

SA □ □ □ □ □
A □ □ □ □ □
U □ □ □ □ □
D □ □ □ □ □
SD □ □ □ □ □

18. provides a positive climate that enhances instructional activities.  

SA □ □ □ □ □
A □ □ □ □ □
U □ □ □ □ □
D □ □ □ □ □
SD □ □ □ □ □
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. provides clear and concise schoolwide instructional objectives SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. provides resources and supplies to enhance the instructional program SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. provides support for innovative approaches to instruction SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. provides instructional activities that indicate exceptional planning skills SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. uses effective oral and written communication skills SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. provides equipment, materials, instructional space and well-coordinated schedules for instructional activities SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. provides assessment guidelines for effective evaluation of learners' performance SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. places student progress as the highest of priorities in instructional planning SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. places classroom observation as a high priority in instructional planning SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. is consistent in staff evaluation SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. is unbiased in staff evaluation SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. is reasonable in staff evaluation SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31. is objective in staff evaluations SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32. is timely in staff evaluation SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33. is sensitive in staff evaluation SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34. provides guidance for assessed weaknesses in staff evaluation SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35. is aware of strong and weak performers on the staff SA A U D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36. has high expectations of staff performance.................. SA A U D SD
37. is empathetic with staff........................................ SA A U D SD
38. is friendly toward staff........................................ SA A U D SD
39. enjoys his work with the staff................................. SA A U D SD

**Part III:**

Please respond to items 40-54. Use a #2 pencil to encode your answers on the enclosed answer sheet.

**CODE:**

1 = Never
2 = Rarely
3 = Sometimes
4 = Often
5 = Very Often

A. With respect to interpersonal style, my principal:

40. uses praise to arouse teachers’ need to work.............. 1 2 3 4 5
41. accepts the opinion of others................................ 1 2 3 4 5
42. goes along with your solution to a problem
when there is a difference of opinion....................... 1 2 3 4 5
43. explains why / how you should do something
rather than blaming you when you happened
to do it wrong.................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
44. sees your side in a problem with him / her.............. 1 2 3 4 5
45. finds a solution that is acceptable to you where
there is a difference of opinion............................. 1 2 3 4 5
46. shows you the easy way to comply with
rules that higher authority enforces....................... 1 2 3 4 5
8. With respect to decision making and planning, my principal asks teachers to:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>develop an overall strategy for knowing when we are failing to meet our goals and what to do to correct the problem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>prioritize the causes of the problem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>prioritize and choose the best objective from among alternatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>design alternative to counteract the causes of problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>estimate the cost of time and resources of alternative methods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>generate alternative techniques for evaluating decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>use the results of evaluation for revising decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>show the inner-linkages of decisions and sub-plans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Letter Requesting Permission to Conduct the Study

Letter Granting Permission to Conduct the Study
Robert L. Tucker  
675 Niskey Lake Circle  
Atlanta, Georgia 30331

April 25, 1989

Dr. Edward L. Bouie  
Program Development and Staff Assessment  
DeKalb County School System  
3770 North Decatur Road  
Decatur, Georgia 30032

Dear Dr. Bouie:

In partial fulfillment of the requirement for the Doctor of Education Degree (Ed.D.) at Atlanta University, I am conducting a research study on the relationship among classroom management performance, socio-economic status of schools, administrative leadership, selected teacher demographic variables and teacher turnover in elementary grades.

This letter is a request for your permission to collect data on all elementary teachers (approximately 300) who have indicated that they will terminate employment with the DeKalb School System at the end of the 1988-89 school year. All terminating teachers will be asked to complete a questionnaire on demographic information and their perception of principals' fairness in administering the evaluation program. Also, data from the TPAI and GTOI will be used in the analysis of the relationship among the indicated variables.

As a Personnel Administrator with the DeKalb County School System, I am acutely aware of the confidentiality requirement of employee records and files and I will strictly adhere to this requirement.
Memorandum

To: Mr. Robert L. Tucker

From: Edward L. Bouie, Sr.

Reference: Research Project

This letter serves as permission for you to conduct your research project in the DeKalb School District.

As you know, our major focus in the school system is to raise the level of student achievement, therefore, you are expected to adhere to the following criteria:

1. There must be an anonymity of the school system personnel that may be used in the research.

2. You cannot interfere nor take away any instructional time of students and teachers.

3. A completed copy of the results should be filed with my office.

You will be under the direction of Dr. Null Tucker, Department of Research and Evaluation. When you are ready to begin your research, please contact him at 292-6613.

If I may be of further help, please let me know.

ELB:ocb

Copy to Dr. Null Tucker
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TPPILEP Construct Validity

Item to Scale Correlation
TPPILEP Construct Validity

Item to Scale Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Provides clear direction</td>
<td>.83369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Evaluates on specific areas</td>
<td>.88130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Clearly explains rationale</td>
<td>.87610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Provides model examples</td>
<td>.79044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Provides variety of activities</td>
<td>.68189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Provides explanation of objectives</td>
<td>.87740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Understands student progress</td>
<td>.78674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Assesses teacher performance</td>
<td>.87940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Provides learning environment</td>
<td>.82530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Monitors teachers' performance</td>
<td>.84153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal Knowledge

of Effective Instruction (Items 18-27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Provides positive school climate</td>
<td>.78101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Provides schoolwide instructional objectives</td>
<td>.81908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Provides resources and supplies for instruction</td>
<td>.81408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Provides support for innovative approaches</td>
<td>.84588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Provides instructional activities that indicate exceptional planning skills</td>
<td>.71152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Uses effective communication</td>
<td>.76981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Provides instructional resources</td>
<td>.81375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Provides assessment guidelines</td>
<td>.84703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Places high priority on students' progress</td>
<td>.75337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Places high priority on classroom observations</td>
<td>.67719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal Practices of Fair Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. Is consistent in staff evaluation</td>
<td>.84124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Is unbiased in staff evaluation</td>
<td>.85618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Is reasonable in staff evaluation</td>
<td>.85739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Is objective in staff evaluation</td>
<td>.80089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Is timely in staff evaluation</td>
<td>.76297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Is sensitive in staff evaluation</td>
<td>.82654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Provides guidance for assessed weaknesses in staff evaluation</td>
<td>.76204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Is aware of performance levels of each staff member</td>
<td>.75153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Has high expectations of staff performance</td>
<td>.67150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Is empathetic with staff</td>
<td>.76168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Is friendly toward staff</td>
<td>.74393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Enjoys working with staff</td>
<td>.73970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. Uses praise</td>
<td>.81398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Accepts opinions of others</td>
<td>.86297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Accepts solutions suggested by others</td>
<td>.72871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Explains how/why rather than blaming others for errors</td>
<td>.85835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Sees views presented by others</td>
<td>.89784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Finds a solution that is acceptable to all involved</td>
<td>.89731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Shows easy way to comply with rules</td>
<td>.88621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Develops strategy to guide problem situation</td>
<td>.86298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Prioritize the causes of problems</td>
<td>.91267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Prioritize and choose best objective from alternative solutions</td>
<td>.91274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Designs alternative to counteract causes of problems</td>
<td>.91792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Estimates cost of time and resources of alternative methods</td>
<td>.82755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Generates alternative techniques for evaluating decisions</td>
<td>.92198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Uses results of evaluation for revising decisions</td>
<td>.89954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Show the inner-linkages of decisions and sub-plans</td>
<td>.86447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Scale Coding for TPPILEP
## Scale Coding for TPPILEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Race (TRACE)</strong></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Age (TAGE)</strong></td>
<td>21-26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27-33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34-40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-47</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Experience (TEXP)</strong></td>
<td>0-3 years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-8 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-12 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13-20 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>over 20 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Education Attainment (TEDUP)</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Grade Level Taught (TGRDLT)</strong></td>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Race (STURACE)</strong></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Travel Distance (TDISTANC)</strong></td>
<td>0-10 miles</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20 miles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30 miles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40 miles</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>over 40 miles</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Classroom Management Performance Score (TCMPSCOR)</strong></td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Socio-Economic Status (SCHSES)</strong></td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Place of Residence (TRESIDE)</strong></td>
<td>Central and So. DeKalb</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. DeKalb and N. Atlanta</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cobb County</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gwinnett County</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal Race (PRACE)</strong></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Turnover (LEAVREM)</strong></td>
<td>Leave</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>