DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 074 UD 011 282

AUTHOR Duff, William L., Jr.; And Others
TITLE Teacher Retention and Student Performance in the Inner-Urban Elementary School.
PUB DATE Feb 71
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, N.Y., February 1971

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Performance, *Data Analysis, *Elementary Schools, *Teacher Employment, *Urban Education

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study is to identify the correlates of student performance and teacher retention in an inner city elementary school district, in order to provide administrators with information. The study is divided into two parts. In the first, the authors are concerned with describing the inner urban school system. The data to be analyzed are presented, and classical regression techniques are used to specify the three basic teacher retention and student performance models. In the second section, the data are further analyzed in terms of the unique contribution of a priori specified subsets of predictor variables. In addition, a comparison of a principal component regression approach to the a priori grouping of predictors was used in the unique analysis. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.] (Author/JW)

TEACHER RETENTION AND STUDENT PERFORMANCE IN THE INNER-URBAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL*

by

William L. Duff, Jr.
Samuel R. Houston
Sheldon Bloom [1]

The objective of this study is to identify the correlates of student performance and teacher retention in an inner-city elementary school district. The purpose is to provide urban school administrators with information necessary to cope with the special problems they face in organizing and administering their educational resources.

The study is divided into two parts: a descriptive section and an analytic section. In the descriptive section the writers are concerned with describing the inner urban school system. Here the data to be analyzed are presented and classical regression techniques are used to specify the three basic teacher retention and student performance models. In the second section the data are further analyzed in terms of the unique contribution of a priori specified subsets of predictor variables. This section ends with a comparison of a principal component regression approach to the a priori grouping of predictors used in the unique analysis.

---

[1] Dr. William L. Duff, Jr., Director, Bureau of Business and Public Research University of Northern Colorado; Dr. Samuel R. Houston, Associate Professor of Statistics and Research Methodology, University of Northern Colorado; Dr. Sheldon Bloom, U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

* Paper presented at AERA Meeting, New York, N.Y., February 1971

SECTION I

Data Description

Vectors selected from a 32 x 128 data matrix, descriptive of the students, the faculty, and the school, are used to specify each of the student performance and the teacher retention models. The data are descriptive of elementary schools in Washington, D.C. Public School systems. The data were gathered from census tracts, school records and site visits to the various elementary schools included in the study.[1]

TABLE #1

Variable Description[2]

Var #	Description
1	Percent white (s)
2	Pupil/teacher ratio (pf)
3	Percent married (t)
4	Percent with school-age children (t)
5	Percent under 40 years of age (t)
6	Percent raised in D.C. (t)
7	Percent raised outside D.C., but in the South (t)
8	Percent raised in the South (including D.C.) (t)
9	Percent raised in town of more than 10,000 people (t)
10	Percent raised on a farm (t)
11	Percent reporting parents' income in upper one-half of community (t)
12	Percent male (t)
13	Percent Negro (t)
14	Percent permanent teachers (t)
15	Percent probationary teachers (t)
16	Percent temporary teachers (t)
17	Percent with bachelor's degree (highest degree) (t)
18	Percent with master's degree (t)
19	Number with school-age children in D.C. public schools, compared to the number with school-age children (t)
20	Median family income (s)
21	Median years of education of parents (s)

[1]The data were originally gathered by Professor George Carey, ography Department, Columbia University, for use in "The Passow Report" r the Washington, D.C. Public Schools. After preparation of the report Dr. Carey permitted the authors to use the data.

TABLE # 1 (cont'.)

Var #	Description
22	Attendance as a percent of enrollment (pf)
23	Ratio, capacity to enrollment (the larger the value, the more space available) (pf)
24	Years experience at present school (t)
25	Years experience in D. C. public school system (t)
26	Total years teaching experience (t)
27	Age of school building (pf)
28	Date of latest addition (pf)
29	Number of classrooms (pf)
30	Number of amenities (pf)
31	Number of substandard facilities (pf)
32	6th grade reading scores (s)
33*	Experience prior to D.C. (t)

* generated variable (var 33 = var 26 - var 25)

TABLE # 2

Intercorrelation Matrix for Complete Data Set

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	1.00	-0.23	0.01	-0.31	-0.43	0.16	-0.38	-0.18	0.10	0.02
2	-0.23	1.00	0.11	0.16	0.18	-0.07	0.04	-0.02	-0.07	0.04
3	0.01	0.11	1.00	0.42	0.19	0.35	0.13	0.43	0.30	0.11
4	-0.31	0.16	0.42	1.00	0.16	0.27	0.21	0.43	0.19	0.28
5	-0.43	0.18	0.19	0.16	1.00	-0.13	0.52	0.33	0.12	-0.01
6	0.16	-0.07	0.35	0.27	-0.13	1.00	-0.36	0.59	0.51	-0.10
7	-0.38	0.04	0.13	0.21	0.52	-0.36	1.00	0.54	-0.19	0.26
8	-0.18	-0.02	0.43	0.43	0.33	0.59	0.54	1.00	0.30	0.13
9	0.10	-0.07	0.30	0.19	0.12	0.51	-0.19	0.30	1.00	-0.25
10	0.02	0.04	0.11	0.28	-0.01	-0.10	0.26	0.13	-0.25	1.00
11	0.44	-0.04	0.26	0.10	0.00	0.12	-0.07	0.05	0.29	0.02
12	-0.14	-0.16	-0.00	-0.07	0.14	-0.10	0.14	0.03	-0.05	-0.12
13	-0.89	0.09	-0.04	0.31	0.42	-0.11	0.44	0.28	-0.08	-0.02
14	0.18	-0.23	0.11	0.20	-0.43	0.56	-0.37	0.19	0.36	-0.12
15	-0.06	0.05	0.22	0.03	0.36	-0.17	0.39	0.19	-0.09	0.32
16	-0.18	0.23	-0.14	-0.21	0.41	-0.56	0.34	-0.22	-0.37	0.09
17	-0.18	0.00	0.15	0.03	0.46	-0.29	0.42	0.11	-0.08	0.24
18	0.04	-0.18	-0.01	-0.04	0.01	0.22	-0.10	0.11	0.11	-0.08
19	-0.24	0.13	0.10	0.31	0.21	0.12	0.11	0.21	-0.01	-0.01
20	0.81	-0.12	-0.06	-0.26	-0.48	0.16	-0.44	-0.24	0.15	-0.02
21	0.63	-0.03	0.04	-0.10	-0.33	0.21	-0.34	-0.11	0.21	0.00
22	0.13	0.23	0.21	0.13	-0.03	0.12	-0.09	0.03	0.28	-0.07
23	0.40	-0.73	0.02	-0.10	-0.17	0.11	0.00	0.10	0.08	0.16
24	-0.10	-0.13	0.08	0.23	-0.22	0.25	-0.00	0.23	0.10	0.00
25	0.32	-0.24	0.11	0.15	-0.58	0.43	-0.37	0.07	0.18	0.01
26	0.34	-0.25	0.04	0.05	-0.71	0.30	-0.37	-0.05	0.05	0.03
27	0.04	-0.19	-0.10	-0.10	0.06	0.00	-0.02	-0.01	-0.03	0.11
28	-0.16	0.32	0.15	0.22	-0.04	-0.02	0.04	0.02	0.10	-0.12
29	-0.36	0.43	0.09	0.24	0.13	-0.07	0.20	0.11	-0.01	-0.06
30	-0.23	0.10	0.12	0.26	0.10	0.04	0.13	0.15	0.09	-0.01
31	-0.22	0.26	0.03	0.02	-0.01	-0.06	0.00	-0.06	-0.03	-0.09
32	0.81	-0.10	0.10	-0.20	-0.44	0.22	-0.40	-0.14	0.16	0.03

	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	0.44	-0.14	-0.89	0.18	-0.06	-0.18	-0.18	0.04	-0.24	0.81
2	-0.04	-0.16	0.09	-0.23	0.05	0.23	0.00	-0.18	0.13	-0.12
3	0.26	-0.00	-0.04	0.11	0.22	-0.14	0.15	-0.01	0.10	-0.06
4	0.10	-0.07	0.31	0.20	0.03	-0.21	0.03	-0.04	0.31	-0.26
5	0.00	0.14	0.42	-0.43	0.36	0.41	0.46	0.01	0.21	-0.48
6	0.12	-0.10	-0.11	0.56	-0.17	-0.56	-0.29	0.22	0.12	0.16
7	-0.07	0.14	0.44	-0.37	0.39	0.34	0.42	-0.10	0.11	-0.44
8	0.05	0.03	0.28	0.19	0.19	-0.22	0.11	0.11	0.21	-0.24
9	0.29	-0.05	-0.08	0.36	-0.09	-0.37	-0.08	0.11	-0.01	0.15
10	0.02	-0.12	-0.02	-0.12	0.32	0.09	0.24	-0.08	-0.01	-0.02
11	1.00	-0.09	-0.43	0.05	0.04	-0.06	0.03	0.01	0.08	0.41
12	-0.09	1.00	0.21	-0.15	0.01	0.16	0.10	-0.03	-0.04	-0.21
13	-0.43	0.21	1.00	-0.09	0.09	0.08	0.23	-0.04	0.20	-0.79
14	0.05	-0.15	-0.09	1.00	-0.40	-0.59	-0.49	0.28	0.11	0.26
15	0.04	0.01	0.09	-0.40	1.00	0.30	0.72	-0.01	0.06	-0.13
16	-0.06	0.16	0.08	-0.59	0.30	1.00	0.43	-0.29	-0.12	-0.25
17	0.03	0.10	0.23	-0.49	0.72	0.43	1.00	-0.30	0.01	-0.27
18	0.01	-0.03	-0.04	0.28	-0.01	-0.29	-0.30	1.00	0.14	0.09
19	0.08	-0.04	0.20	0.11	0.06	-0.12	0.01	0.14	1.00	-0.18
20	0.41	-0.21	-0.79	0.26	-0.13	-0.25	-0.27	0.09	-0.18	1.00
21	0.43	-0.21	-0.63	0.23	-0.16	-0.22	-0.32	0.12	-0.12	0.78
22	0.22	-0.16	-0.16	0.10	-0.13	-0.09	-0.14	0.10	-0.08	0.36
23	0.24	0.01	-0.30	0.18	0.08	-0.19	0.09	0.10	-0.18	0.29
24	-0.18	-0.02	0.21	0.36	-0.16	-0.36	-0.09	0.03	0.11	-0.13
25	0.11	-0.09	-0.24	0.67	-0.41	-0.65	-0.46	0.17	0.02	0.34
26	0.06	-0.08	-0.29	0.62	-0.43	-0.59	-0.46	0.14	-0.07	0.36
27	0.01	-0.07	0.00	0.04	0.13	-0.06	0.23	-0.06	-0.03	-0.01
28	-0.02	0.02	0.09	-0.04	-0.07	0.05	-0.17	0.04	0.11	-0.06
29	-0.10	0.04	0.29	-0.12	-0.04	0.13	-0.11	0.05	0.19	-0.29
30	-0.16	0.08	0.19	-0.03	0.04	0.03	-0.06	0.25	0.15	-0.20
31	-0.02	-0.09	0.02	-0.06	-0.07	0.07	-0.17	0.12	0.20	-0.08
32	0.35	-0.21	-0.76	0.25	-0.05	-0.25	-0.26	0.11	-0.19	0.80

	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
1	0.63	0.13	0.40	-0.10	0.32	0.34	0.04	-0.16	-0.36	-0.23
2	-0.03	0.23	-0.73	-0.13	-0.24	-0.25	-0.19	0.32	0.43	0.10
3	0.04	0.21	0.02	0.08	0.11	0.04	-0.10	0.15	0.09	0.12
4	-0.10	0.13	-0.10	0.23	0.15	0.05	-0.10	0.22	0.24	0.26
5	-0.33	-0.03	-0.17	-0.22	-0.58	-0.71	0.06	-0.04	0.13	0.10
6	0.21	0.12	0.11	0.25	0.43	0.30	0.00	-0.02	-0.07	0.04
7	-0.34	-0.09	0.00	-0.00	-0.37	-0.37	-0.02	0.04	0.20	0.13
8	-0.11	0.03	0.10	0.23	0.07	-0.05	-0.01	0.02	0.11	0.15
9	0.21	0.28	0.08	0.10	0.18	0.05	-0.03	0.10	-0.01	0.09
10	0.00	-0.07	0.16	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.11	-0.12	-0.06	-0.01
11	0.43	0.22	0.24	-0.18	0.11	0.06	0.01	-0.02	-0.10	-0.16
12	-0.21	-0.16	0.01	-0.02	-0.09	-0.08	-0.07	0.02	0.04	0.08
13	-0.63	-0.16	-0.30	0.21	-0.24	-0.29	0.00	0.09	0.29	0.19
14	0.23	0.10	0.18	0.36	0.67	0.62	0.04	-0.04	-0.12	-0.03
15	-0.16	-0.13	0.08	-0.16	-0.41	-0.43	0.13	-0.07	-0.04	0.04
16	-0.22	-0.09	-0.19	-0.36	-0.65	-0.59	-0.06	0.05	0.13	0.03
17	-0.32	-0.14	0.09	-0.09	-0.46	-0.46	0.23	-0.17	-0.11	-0.06
18	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.03	0.17	0.14	-0.06	0.04	0.05	0.25
19	-0.12	-0.08	-0.18	0.11	0.02	-0.07	-0.03	0.11	0.19	0.15
20	0.78	0.36	0.29	-0.13	0.34	0.36	-0.01	-0.06	-0.29	-0.20
21	1.00	0.46	0.30	-0.16	0.28	0.27	-0.11	0.04	-0.05	-0.04
22	0.46	1.00	0.03	-0.07	0.18	0.12	-0.24	0.30	0.23	0.09
23	0.30	0.03	1.00	-0.06	0.23	0.22	0.25	-0.40	-0.44	-0.13
24	-0.16	-0.07	-0.06	1.00	0.47	0.44	-0.09	0.16	0.12	0.17
25	0.28	0.18	0.23	0.47	1.00	0.88	-0.08	0.05	-0.05	-0.04
26	0.27	0.12	0.22	0.44	0.88	1.00	-0.04	0.03	-0.08	-0.08
27	-0.11	-0.24	0.25	-0.09	-0.08	-0.04	1.00	-0.76	-0.65	-0.49
28	0.04	0.30	-0.40	0.16	0.05	0.03	-0.76	1.00	0.77	0.53
29	-0.05	0.23	-0.44	0.12	-0.05	-0.08	-0.65	0.77	1.00	0.56
30	-0.04	0.09	-0.13	0.17	-0.04	-0.08	-0.49	0.53	0.56	1.00
31	-0.05	0.05	-0.41	-0.08	-0.06	-0.04	-0.25	0.36	0.34	0.14
32	0.64	0.38	0.32	-0.10	0.38	0.38	-0.11	0.02	-0.17	-0.14

	31	32
1	-0.22	0.81
2	0.26	-0.10
3	0.03	0.10
4	0.02	-0.20
5	-0.01	-0.44
6	-0.06	0.22
7	0.00	-0.40
8	-0.06	-0.14
9	-0.03	0.16
10	-0.09	0.03
11	-0.02	0.35
12	-0.09	-0.21
13	0.02	-0.76
14	-0.06	0.25
15	-0.07	-0.09
16	0.07	-0.25
17	-0.17	-0.26
18	0.12	0.11
19	0.20	-0.19
20	-0.08	0.80
21	-0.05	0.64
22	0.05	0.38
23	-0.41	0.32
24	-0.08	-0.10
25	-0.06	0.38
26	-0.04	0.38
27	-0.25	-0.11
28	0.36	0.02
29	0.34	-0.17
30	0.14	-0.14
31	1.00	-0.15
32	-0.15	1.00

The intercorrelations matrix suggests that teachers found in the inner urban school identified by districts that service a population with a low median income tend to be black, have fewer school-age children, and less well academically prepared than their outer-city counterparts. The schools found in the inner-city tend to have a lower pupil/teacher ratio, have less space per student, have more classrooms, and have had less recent improvements and renovation of school buildings. Not surprisingly, parents of students in the inner-city tend to be less well educated, and their children's attendance rates and reading achievement scores tended to be somewhat lower than those found in outer-urban schools.[1]

Basic Regression Models

In the first two basic models the writers were interested in predicting student performance. In the first model the writers used attendance as a percent of enrollment as the criterion measure (var 22). Here the writers assumed that attendance rate provided a reasonable proxie measure of student attitudes toward schooling. In the third, and final model, the writers were interested in identifying the correlates of school holding power vis a vis its teaching staff. The average number of years of teaching experience at a particular school was used as a criterion measure (var 24).

---

[1] In addition to the inspection of the intercorrelation matrix the writers also ran a series of three regressions using a binary coded median income criterion. The independent variables in each of these runs were teacher, school, and student variables as identified in Table 1. The results correspond to the results reported above.

TABLE # 3

Basic Regression Models

Variable Number	Regression Coefficients Model #1	Model #2	Model #3
1	1.69286*	-1.71993	2.14492
2	0.08976*	0.15018*	-0.14500*
5	-0.06395	1.98264*	
6			4.04246*
9			-0.67034
12	-0.25715	-0.44200	-1.60669
13	-0.12966	0.90354	2.52692
16	-0.24355	0.27384	
18	0.22122	0.25557	
20	0.00015*	0.00035*	0.00005
21	-0.04297	0.17903	-0.18160
23	0.54059*	1.54168*	-1.33990
26	0.01209	0.08689	
27	-0.00394	-0.00771	0.00440
28			0.01718
29	0.00992	0.02502	
30			0.15139
31			-0.12291
33			0.09672
Intercept	2.62303	74.72534	-33.80069
Multiple Correlation	.86973**	.66454**	.51381**
N	128	128	128

* indicates that regression coefficient is significant at the .05 level

** indicates that the regression is significant at the .01 level

All three basic regression models reported in Table #3 are significant at the .01 level. The coefficients indicate that reading achievement is significantly related to four independent variables. The positive coefficients associated with the percentage of white students at a particular school and median family income of parents underline the importance of the home factor in effecting student performance. Likewise, the sign of the coefficient associated with variable #23 (the ratio of capacity to enrollment) suggests that student overcrowding is associated with poor student academic performance. On the other hand, we would expect that the pupil/teacher ratio (var #2) would be negatively related to student performance. The result in Model #1 runs contrary to this expectation. Remembering, however, that our description of the inner city school showed that it tended to have lower pupil/teacher ratios at the particular point in time that data were collected suggests that these results might be expected. We might very well find that the impact of low pupil/teacher ratios might have the expected impact on student performance with the passage of time. This, of course, is something quite different than saying they would be enough to overcome the importance of home factors in effecting student performance.

Our second model, which uses attendance as a percent of enrollment as a criterion measure, also indicates the importance of home factors in determining student performance. The coefficients associated with median income (var #20) and educational level of parents (var #21) are both significant and positively related to attendance rates. The positive sign associated with variable #5 (percent of teachers under forty years of age) suggests that students are more likely to attend classes taught by younger rather than older teachers. (Variable #2 (pupil/teacher ratio), in Model #2 as in Model # 1, shows a significant and positive relationship with student performance. Again, the only reasonable explanation the writers can offer is that the relationship resulted from changes that occurred in the district shortly before the data was gathered.

The teacher retention equation indicates that teachers born in the area served by the district were most likely to stay with the district over periods of time. The model also shows that schools with high pupil/teacher ratios have a more difficult time holding teachers than schools where the reverse condition holds. Again, the reader is reminded of the behavior of this variable in the preceding performance equations. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that low pupil/teacher ratios seem to effect the holding power of a school vis a vis its teachers, but do not effect student performance in the same way. Indeed, in the student performance models, the relationship is precisely the reverse.

SECTION II

Analysis of Data

The investigators employed two approaches in their analysis of the data. The first approach utilized the techniques of Ward[1] to determine the unique contribution of proper subsets of the predictor variables to three criteria. The unique contribution is defined to be as the difference between two squares of multiple correlation coefficients (R^2s), one obtained for a regression model in which all predictors are used, called the full model (FM), and the other obtained for a regression equation in which the proper subset of variables under consideration has been deleted; this model is called the restricted model, (RM). The difference between the two R^2s may be tested for statistical significance with the variance ratio test. The hypothesis tested states, in effect, that these variables contribute nothing to the determination of the expected criterion values that is not already available in the restricted prediction system.

The first model to be considered used as its criterion measure the sixth grade reading scores. Sixteen independent variables (1,2,5,12,13,16,17,18,20,21,23,24,26,27,28,29) were used for the full regression model. In addition, these predictor variables were sub-grouped *a priori* into three disjoint subsets and the unique contribution of each of the subsets was tested for significance. Each of the three subsets was broken down further and the unique contribution of each component was tested at each stage. (Table #4 contains the various groupings and results of unique contribution tests.) The first subset (variables 1, 20, and 21), which might be

[1] Ward, J. H., "Multiple Linear Regression Models," Computer Applications in the Behavioral Sciences, Harold Borko (Editor), (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962), pp. 204-237.

called a home factor, had a significant unique contribution (see Table #4). Breaking the subset down further, variable 1 (percent white) and variable 20 (median family income) seemed to be making significant contributions to the explanation of the criterion of reading achievement. The unique contribution of the second subset (variables 2, 23, 27, 28, and 29) was significant beyond the .05 level. This particular subset might be considered a physical facilities factor. The ratio of capacity to enrollment (variable 23) emerged with the highest significant unique contribution as the analysis was extended. Finally, the third subset of predictor variables (variables 5,12,13,16,17,18,24,26), which might be considered as a teacher characteristics factor, failed to make a significant unique contribution to the explanation of the dependent variable.

Changing the criterion variable from reading achievement to attendance as a percent of enrollment (variable 22) and retaining the same sixteen predictors, the investigators found that the first subset again made a significant unique contribution (see Table #5). The principal contribution came from variable 20 (median family income). The physical facilities factor, the second subset, made a significant contribution with variable 28 (date of latest addition), variable 2 (pupil/teacher ratio), and variable 23 (ratio of capacity to enrollment) appearing as important contributors. The teacher characteristics factor subset failed again to make a significant unique contribution. However, it's interesting to note that variable 5, which is contained in this subset, did make a significant contribution on its own merit even though the total subset fell short.

TABLE # 4

Proportions of Variance Attributable to Groups of Variables Believed to be Associated with Sixth Grade Reading Scores

PREDICTOR-Variable Group	Total Contribution Proportion (R^2)	PREDICTOR-Variable Group	Unique Contribution Proportion
Model 1 (1,2,5,12,13,16, 17,18,20,21,23,24,26, 27,28,29) - Full Model(FM)	.7587		
Model 2(FM - 1,20,21)	.6576	Variables 1,20,21	.1011[a]
Model 3 (FM - 1)	.7237	Variable 1	.0350[a]
Model 4 (FM - 20)	.7320	Variable 20	.0267[a]
Model 5 (FM - 21)	.7563	Variable 21	.0024
Model 6 (FM - 2,23,27,28,29)	.7260	Variables 2,23, 27,28,29	.0327[b]
Model 7 (FM- 27,28)	.7532	Variables 27,28	.0055
Model 8 (FM - 27)	.7550	Variable 27	.0037
Model 9 (FM - 28)	.7586	Variable 28	.0000
Model 10 (FM - 2)	.7511	Variable 2	.0076
Model 11 (FM - 23)	.7491	Variable 23	.0096[b]
Model 12 (FM - 29)	.7570	Variable 29	.0017
Model 13 (FM - 5,12,13,16, 17,18,24,26)	.7455	Variables 5,12, 13,16,17,18,24,26	.0132
Model 14 (FM - 16,24,26)	.7540	Variables 16,24,26	.0047
Model 15 (FM - 16)	.7574	Variable 16	.0013
Model 16 (FM - 24)	.7566	Variable 24	.0021
Model 17 (FM - 26)	.7570	Variable 26	.0017
Model 18 (FM - 17,13)	.7577	Variable 17,18	.0010
Model 19 (FM - 17)	.7586	Variable 17	.0001
Model 20 (FM - 18)	.7579	Variable 18	.0008
Model 21 (FM - 5,12,13	.7570	Variables 5,12,13	.0017
Model 22 (FM - 5)	.7587	Variable 5	.0000
Model 23 (FM - 12)	.7572	Variable 12	.0015
Model 24 (FM - 13)	.7587	Variable 13	.0000

[a] These proportions reported as unique contributions are significant at the .01 level for N = 128. In computing F values, it was assumed that one parameter was associated with each variable in the prediction system. The degrees of freedom for the number of predictors were determined by the number of variables given an opportunity to contribute to the prediction.

[b] Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE # 5

Proportions of Variance Attributable to Groups of Variables Believed to be Associated with Attendance as a Percent of Enrollment

PREDICTOR-Variable Group	Total Contribution Proportion (R^2)	PREDICTOR-Variable Group	Unique Contribution Proportion
Model 1 (1,2,5,12,13,16, 17,18,20,21,23,24,26, 27,28,29) - Full Model (FM)	.4624		
Model 2 (FM - 1,2021)	.2984	Variables 1,20,21	.1640[a]
Model 3 (FM - 1)	.4508	Variable 1	.0116
Model 4 (FM - 20)	.4049	Variable 20	.0575[a]
Model 5 (FM - 21)	.4473	Variable 21	.0152
Model 6 (FM - 2,23,27,28, 29)	.3361	Variables 2,23,27, 28,29	.1263[a]
Model 7 (FM - 27,28)	.4330	Variables 27,28	.0294
Model 8 (FM - 27)	.4622	Variable 27	.0003
Model 9 (FM - 28)	.4417	Variable 28	.0207[b]
Model 10 (FM - 2)	.4090	Variable 2	.0534[a]
Model 11 (FM - 23)	.4206	Variable 23	.0418[a]
Model 12 (FM - 29)	.4624	Variable 29	.0001
Model 13 (FM - 5,12,13,16, 17,18,24,26)	.4199	Variables 5,12,13, 16,17,18,24,26	.0425
Model 14 (FM - 16,24,26)	.4439	Variables 16,24,26	.0185
Model 15 (FM - 16)	.4617	Variable 16	.0007
Model 16 (FM - 24	.4617	Variable 24	.0007
Model 17 (FM - 26)	.4449	Variable 26	.0175
Model 18 (FM - 17, 18)	.4616	Variable 17,18	.0008
Model 19 (FM - 17)	.4624	Variable 17	.0000
Model 20 (FM - 18)	.4617	Variable 18	.0007
Model 21 (FM - 5, 12, 13)	.4268	Variables 5,12,13	.0356
Model 22 (FM - 5)	.4360	Variable 5	.0264[b]
Model 23 (FM - 12)	.4610	Variable 12	.0015
Model 24 (FM - 13)	.4557	Variable 13	.0067

[a] These proportions reported as unique contributions are significant at the .01 level for N = 128. In computing F values, it was assumed that one parameter was associated with each variable in the prediction system. The degrees of freedom for the number of predictors were tetermined by the number of variables given an opportunity to contribute to the prediction.

[b] Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE # 6

Proportions of Variance Attributable to Groups of Variables Believed to be Associated with Years Experience at Present School

PREDICTOR-Variable Group	Total Contribution Proportion (R^2)	PREDICTOR-Variable Group	Unique Contribution Proportion
Model 1 (1,2,5,6,12,13,17,18,20,22,23,27,28,32) - FM (Full Model)	.3064		
Model 2 (FM - 1,20,22,32)	.2819	Variables 1,20,22,32	.0245
Model 3 (FM - 1,20)	.2829	Variables 1,20	.0235
Model 4 (FM - 20)	.3011	Variable 20	.0053
Model 5 (FM - 1)	.2838	Variable 1	.0226
Model 6 (FM - 22,32)	.3025	Variables 22,32	.0040
Model 7 (FM - 22)	.3057	Variable 22	.0007
Model 8 (FM - 32)	.3025	Variable 32	.0039
Model 9 (FM - 23,27,28)	.2551	Variables 23,27,28	.0513[b]
Model 10 (FM - 27,28)	.2868	Variables 27,28	.0196
Model 11 (FM - 27)	.3062	Variable 27	.0002
Model 12 (FM - 28)	.2949	Variable 28	.0115
Model 13 (FM - 23)	.2902	Variable 23	.0162
Model 14 (FM - 2,5,6,12,13,17,18)	.1055	Variables 2,5,6,12,13,17,18	.2009[a]
Model 15 (FM - 5,6,12,13)	.1114	Variables 5,6,12,13	.1950[a]
Model 16 (FM - 5)	.2334	Variable 5	.0730[a]
Model 17 (FM - 6)	.2428	Variable 6	.0636[a]
Model 18 (FM - 12)	.2992	Variable 12	.0007
Model 19 (FM - 13)	.2663	Variable 13	.0072
Model 20 (FM - 17,18)	.2994	Variable 17,18	.0401[b]
Model 21 (FM - 17)	.2998	Variable 17	.0066
Model 22 (FM - 18)	.3064	Variable 18	.0000
Model 23 (FM - 2)	.2820	Variable 2	.0244[b]

[a] These proportions reported as unique contributions are significant at the .01 level for N = 128. In computing F values, it was assumed that one parameter was associated with each variable in the prediction system. The degrees of freedom for the number of predictors were determined by the number of variables given an opportunity to contribute to the prediction.

[b] Significant at the .05 level.

The third criterion variable investigated was variable 24 (see Table #6), years experience at present school. The fourteen predictors specified for this full model included variables 1,2,5, 6,12,13,17,18,20,22,23,27,28, and 32. The first subset consisted of variables 1,20,22 and 32. This particular subset of home factor variables did not make a significant unique contribution. The second subset consisting of physical facilities variables (23,27, and 28) made a significant unique contribution at the .05 level. None of the specific variables of this subset had a significant unique impact on the criterion, however. This might be explained by the high inter-correlations of these variables. Finally, the teacher factor subset (variables 5, 6, 12, 13, 17, and 18) was found to be making a significant (.01 level) unique contribution to the explanation of the criterion variable. A study of Table #6 reveals that variable 5 (percent under 40 years of age), variable 6 (percent raised in D.C.), variables 17 and 18 together (percent with bachelor's degree and percent with master's degree) and variable 2 (pupil/teacher ratio) were significant contributors to this subset.

In addition to the regression analysis with emphasis on unique contributions, the researchers sought to determine the unique contribution of factors to the explanation of the three criteria. Each set of predictor variables in the three regression models was factor analyzed using principal components and three new full regression models were generated in which each dependent variable was expressed as a function of the obtained factors.[1] In Table #7, the factors

[1] For a detailed discussion of the process of determining the regression models, see, W.F.Massy, "Principal Components Regression in Exploratory Statistical Research," Journal of the American Statistical Association,, March 1965, pp. 234-256.

used for the first two regression runs are found. While there are 16 factors, only five were judged to be relevant.

Kaiser suggests that the number of factors judged significant be limited to those factors whose eigenvalues are greater than unity.[1] These five factors together account for 76 percent of the total variance of the sixteen independent variables; each of the remaining eleven factors contributes little to the over-all variance.

Using variable 32 as the criterion, a new regression model was investigated in which the five factors were utilized as independent variables. The unique contribution of factor 1 which loads heavily on variables 1, 13 and 20 (see Table #7) made a unique contribution which is estimated to be .5623. This was significant beyond the .01 level. The unique contribution of factor 2, estimated to be .0343, was also significant at the .01 level. This factor had high loadings on variable 27, 28 and 29. The estimated unique contribution of factor 3 (high loadings on variables 16 and 24) was .0942 which was significant beyond the .01 level. Factors 4 and 5 failed to make a significant unique contribution as the estimates in both cases is below .01. It is interesting to note that factor 1 is related to the home factor in the previous regression runs, while factor 2 seems related to the physical facilities and factor 3 emphasizes the teacher characteristics.

---

[1] See W. W. Cooley and P. R. Lohnes, Multivariate Procedures for the Behavioral Sciences, Wiley, N. Y., 1962, p. 162.

TABLE # 7

Principal Component Analysis of Sixteen Predictors Used in Table 4 and Table 5

Variable	F_1	F_2	F_3	F_4	F_5
1	0.84	-0.01	-0.35	-0.06	0.14
2	-0.41	0.42	-0.45	0.53	-0.10
5	-0.66	-0.32	-0.25	-0.20	-0.29
12	-0.23	-0.12	0.14	-0.55	0.32
13	-0.79	-0.06	0.47	-0.00	-0.08
16	-0.49	-0.22	-0.58	-0.14	0.23
17	-0.41	-0.53	-0.21	-0.07	0.32
18	0.18	0.16	0.24	-0.36	-0.76
20	0.84	0.13	-0.36	0.01	0.01
21	0.70	0.24	-0.40	-0.10	-0.10
23	0.55	-0.47	0.16	-0.46	0.06
24	0.02	0.28	0.67	0.15	0.30
26	0.62	0.34	0.52	0.12	0.19
27	0.15	-0.76	0.15	0.40	-0.15
28	-0.27	0.83	-0.12	-0.24	0.13
29	-0.47	0.74	-0.08	-0.18	0.02
Eigenvalue	4.63	2.96	2.14	1.28	1.13
Cumulative Proportion of Total Variance	.29	.49	.61	.69	.76

TABLE # 8

Principal Component Analysis of
Fourteen Predictor Variables Used in Table 6

Variable	F_1	F_2	F_3	F_4	F_5
1	0.90	-0.09	0.19	0.12	-0.04
2	-0.28	0.63	0.49	-0.33	-0.02
5	-0.60	-0.10	0.14	0.01	0.58
6	0.29	0.08	-0.44	-0.45	0.14
12	-0.26	-0.14	-0.26	0.60	-0.11
13	-0.87	-0.02	-0.25	-0.06	0.07
17	-0.38	-0.39	0.49	0.27	0.38
18	0.17	0.08	-0.66	-0.22	0.34
20	0.90	0.09	0.17	0.03	0.05
21	0.31	0.49	0.10	0.00	0.60
23	0.47	-0.62	-0.24	0.26	0.27
27	0.00	-0.75	0.21	-0.46	0.00
28	-0.11	0.83	-0.13	0.34	0.02
32	0.89	0.15	0.12	0.07	0.12
Eigenvalue	4.26	2.51	1.47	1.21	1.08
Cumulative Proportion of Total Variance	.30	.48	.59	.68	.75

In the second regression run, variable 22 served as the dependent variable. When the five factors used with criterion variable 32 were used as predictors of variable 22 (attendance as a percent of enrollment), the same three factors emerged as significant. Factors 2 and 3 were significant at the .01 level while factor 1 was significant at the .05 level. Factor 2 appeared to be the dominant contributor with its unique contribution estimated to be .1178.

The criterion variable 24, a different set of 14 independent variables served as predictors. When these 14 variables were factor analyzed, five factors were identified to be relevant using Kaiser's rule for significant contribution. These five factors appear in Table 8 and together they account for 75 percent of the total variance of the fourteen independent variables; the other25 percent is distributed over the remaining nine factors. Of the five factors, only factor 3 made a significant unique contribution to the explanation of the criterion variable 24. Its contribution was estimated to be .0748 which was significant beyond the .01 level. The high loadings appear to be on variables 2, 17, and 18. These variables provide information about the teacher.

While it was hoped that the unique contribution approach and the factor-regression models would supply information which might be complimentary, a close scrutiny of the results of both approaches suggests they are somewhat comparable. This can probably be explained by the fact that the a priori specification of the three subsets to be analyzed turned out in reality to be related to the factors obtained in the principal components analysis.