

SOME CAUSES OF TEACHER TURNOVER IN
A SINGLE-ENTERPRISE COMMUNITY



A Thesis
presented to
THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
MASTER OF EDUCATION

by
DUNCAN HECTOR STEWART

MARCH, 1969

ABSTRACT

The major purpose of this study was to determine factors correlated with teacher turnover in a single enterprise community in Manitoba. Data were collected by questionnaire from 98 teachers who had left their teaching position at Thompson in the school years from 1958 to 1968.

Seventy-five factors, identified mainly from related research, were used in the questionnaire. The factors were not classified in the questionnaire but they focussed on the following items: personal and family; economic; community; schools; pupils; and school board. In addition to these items, other questions were designed to solicit biographical and professional data about the respondents. Finally, five open-ended questions were included to provide respondents with the opportunity of expressing their reasons for leaving the district, for going to the district, initially, as to how long they intended to stay, and general comment related to changes that would induce the respondents to return.

The total responses to each of the seventy-five items were placed on a weighted four-point ordinal scale. Questionnaire items were ranked on the basis of the total score for each item. Information from other questions was reported in raw data form or as percentages.

The results of the analysis of data for the total sample revealed that personal and family factors were ranked highest as compared with other factors. However, economic factors were identified by respondents as major contributors to teacher turnover. Some community factors received considerable attention and school factors developed only a sporadic response. Pupil and school board factors acquired a very limited response.

The general conclusions from this study were that: (1) the

participants in this study were young people and young people are mobile; (2) some teachers are "turnover prone;" (3) a number of factors, rather than a single factor, influenced the teacher's decision to move, but teachers were able to select, on the basis of rank order, the factors responsible for their turnover rather than select a group or cluster as the cause of movement; (4) personal and professional characteristics, other than age, were related to factors affecting turnover; (5) transportation and communication were two important and influential areas in teacher turnover as reflected in the lack of cultural activities and university facilities; (6) personal and family factors with some economic causes were key contributors to movement; (7) the school system, except for some failure by the supervisory staff to provide assistance and leadership, was not criticized by teachers, although some dissatisfaction was expressed with the earlier years of its operation; (8) considerable comment was expressed by respondents in favor of the community and school system.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	1
Importance of the Study	2
Delimitations	4
Limitations	5
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	8
Research in Labor Mobility	8
Factors Related to Labor Mobility	9
Definition of Labor Mobility	11
Factors Related to Teacher Turnover	12
Summary	18
III. COLLECTION, ORGANIZATION AND TREATMENT OF DATA	20
The Questionnaire	20
Distribution of the Questionnaires	22
Treatment of Data	24
IV. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS	26
Sex	26
Age	26
Years of Teaching Service	28
Grades Taught	32
Occupation	32
Size of Community	35

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. AN ANALYSIS OF THE TOTAL RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL	
FACTORS AND GROUPS OF FACTORS	37
Individual Factors	37
Factors in Combination	46
Personal and Family Factors	50
Economic Factors	52
Community Factors	53
School Factors	55
Pupil Factors	58
School Board Factors	58
VI. OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS	61
Suggested Changes	61
Suggested Changes to Induce Return	63
Original Influence Factors to go to Thompson	64
Length of Intention to Stay	65
Isolation	66
VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .	69
Summary of the Study	69
Conclusions and Implications	71
Recommendations	79
BIBLIOGRAPHY	83
APPENDIX A. Questionnaire, Instruction Sheet and Result Sheet	87
APPENDIX B. Personal and Professional Data Questionnaire and	
Open-Ended Questions	95
APPENDIX C. Introductory Letter and Follow-up Letter	99

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Tabulation of Survey Returns	25
II. Distribution of Respondents by Sex	27
III. Distribution of Respondents by Age When Leaving Thompson .	27
IV. Distribution of Respondents by Years of Service at Thompson	28
V. Distribution of Respondents by Years Taught Since Leaving Thompson	30
VI. Distribution of Respondents by Total Years of Teaching Experience Until Present	31
VII. Distribution of Respondents by Grades Taught at Thompson .	33
VIII. Distribution of Respondents by Grades Taught Since Leaving Thompson	33
IX. Distribution of Respondents by Occupation in Year After Leaving Thompson	34
X. Distribution of Respondents by Size of Community in Which Teaching was Done After Leaving Thompson	36
XI. Distribution of Individual Factors by Size of Score . . .	38
XII. Number of Factors Selected in Combination	47
XIII. Personal and Family Factors as Causes of Teacher Turnover	50
XIV. Economic Factors as Causes of Teacher Turnover	52
XV. Community Factors as Causes of Teacher Turnover	54
XVI. School Factors as Causes of Teacher Turnover	57
XVII. Pupil Factors as Causes of Teacher Turnover	59

TABLE	PAGE
XVIII. School Board Factors as Causes of Teacher Turnover . . .	59
XIX. Changes Suggested by Respondents That Would Help to Retain a Larger Portion of the Thompson Staff	62
XX. How Long Did You Intend to Remain in Thompson?	65
XXI. How Important Was the Whole Matter of Isolation, With the Long Distance From a Large Urban Centre With its Amenities of Life as a University, and Cultural Advantages, in Your Decision to Leave Thompson? . . .	67

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Teacher turnover in Canada has been receiving considerable attention in recent years. A number of studies, particularly in Alberta, have been made recently dealing with the problem of teacher turnover. School boards and administrators, Department of Education authorities and teacher organization personnel are all concerned with staff turnover and the difficulty in getting replacements for teachers who leave their position. This problem seems to be particularly acute in rural and remote areas. In order to meet the problem temporary and restricted, training programs for teachers have been proposed and pursued, in order to provide replacements for teachers who leave their position. The point to be made here is that the problem exists. The question is to determine why teachers leave. What factors are associated with the turnover-prone teacher or district? Are these factors related to all frontier communities that lead to teacher turnover? After identifying these correlates of turnover, what ameliorative steps may be possible to alleviate circumstances in order to prevent the high turnover of teachers in remote areas?

I. THE PROBLEM

The general purpose of this study was to investigate some correlates of teacher turnover in a single-enterprise community. The community selected for investigation was the town of Thompson. The study

extended over a ten-year period from 1958 to 1968. All teachers who had left the Thompson school system during these ten years were invited to participate as respondents to a questionnaire.

The problem was to identify certain factors which could be associated with the turnover of teachers who have taught at Thompson. Certain factors or clusters of factors were identified by respondents as having a greater influence on their turnover than other factors. Some personal characteristics associated with teachers who move emerged during the course of the investigation.

II. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The Manitoba Teachers' Society and The Manitoba Association of School Trustees have spent considerable time and effort since 1965 in preparing an annual survey of teacher retention and losses. Both organizations have shown much concern about teacher turnover in the Province of Manitoba. The Manitoba Teachers' Society survey for 1968 still shows a 23 per cent turnover of teachers for the province, or 23 of each 100 teachers left their position in Manitoba. The 1968 figure was the lowest rate recorded for the four years the survey has been conducted. For 1967 and 1966 turnover figures were 26.3 per cent and 27.1 per cent respectively.

Teacher turnover has been recognized by Bruce (1964) as a troublesome and confusing problem to boards of education. According to him it is one of the most difficult for school authorities. Phillips (1967) referred to teacher turnover as a problem which needed attention.

He stated that despite the significance of the effects of teacher turnover, information about teachers who change positions or leave the profession, is inadequate. The available data do not answer such questions as: how many teachers leave? Where do they go? Why do they go? What are they like? etc. We need these answers in order to assess more fully the impact of teacher turnover on the profession. This will help us devise more intelligent recruitment methods. This will also tell us more about holding the people we already have.

Teacher and trustee organizations for Manitoba in 1968 showed the same rate of teacher turnover for Thompson in their annual survey of teacher retention and losses. Each organization indicated that from a staff of 103 teachers, 40 people left at the end of June for a percentage loss of 38.8 per cent, or a retention of 63 teachers which gave the school district 61.2 per cent holding power. A consistently large number of teachers, on a similar ratio to 1968, has been leaving the Thompson school system each year. This high percentage of resignations would seem to create problems in developing a permanent and competent staff. It is suggested that it might be advisable for the Thompson school administration to consider factors that are contributing to teacher turnover in their district. For such a reason this particular study may have some importance. The movement of competent, qualified and experienced teachers from a school system is disruptive to the successful operation of the schools when the numbers in movement are excessive. Certain areas and divisions in Manitoba are having much difficulty in retaining a stable teaching staff. Rural divisions as

Agassiz and Lakeshore show a 46.5 per cent and 48.8 per cent teacher turnover respectively for 1967, according to The Manitoba Teachers' Society figures. The remote areas of the province indicate a 42.1 per cent turnover for 1967 and 39.3 per cent for 1968. The Thompson school system includes approximately two-thirds of the total remote area. On the other hand, the urban area of Metropolitan Winnipeg has held fairly steady at about a 15 per cent loss in teachers for the past two years. On the basis of these figures teacher turnover is obviously of much greater significance to various rural divisions and the remote area of the province than it is to Greater Winnipeg. This does not say it has no significance for the urban area, but it does seem to be a problem of major importance to remote areas as Thompson. If this study can identify some of the correlates of this considerable rate of teacher turnover in a single-enterprise isolated area as Thompson, then it has served a purpose. A study of those causes or reasons related to this excessive turnover could possibly identify areas in which constructive recommendations might be made.

III. DELIMITATIONS

This study attempts to identify the extent to which certain factors correlate with turnover among all teachers who had been under contract to the Thompson school system. The period under study extends from 1958 to 1968. Substitute teachers or those teaching under a part-time arrangement were not included. No teachers were excluded from the

study through lack of certification.

No differentiation is made among the teachers as to who was included on the basis of prior location in coming to Thompson or as to where they went when they left Thompson. Personal and professional data were used for other purposes, but not to place any delimitation on participation in the study.

IV. LIMITATIONS

Some difficulty developed in getting an accurate list of those people who had been under a teaching contract at Thompson. Certain limitations develop in any study when it endeavors to go back over a period of ten years. Limitation was created through failure to get proper identification, but the most serious restriction was in getting correct mailing addresses. Obviously some teachers who had taught at Thompson were not contacted through failure to get their proper address.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A review of research in labor mobility may have some importance for this study. The term mobility which has been generally used in the labor and manpower market, rather than turnover as used in this research, has been subject to various interpretations by authorities. They seemed to be somewhat reluctant to permit themselves to be tied down to a specific definition in terminology. Parnes (1954) said:

Labor mobility may be conceived in three quite different ways:

- (1) As the capacity or ability of workers to move from one job to another, or into and out of employment, or into and out of the labor force;
- (2) As their willingness or propensity to make such moves, given the opportunity; or
- (3) As their actual movement.

He further elaborates on related factors affecting the variables involved in labor mobility by referring to the goals of a worker and his evaluation of his present situation being subject to influences external to himself. He points out these influences include the value system of the culture and the wishes of his family. It seems impossible to consider worker mobility except in relation to a complex of social and institutional factors.

Gladys L. Palmer (1954) in her report on the survey of patterns and factors in labor mobility restricted her consideration of the term of the mobility of workers to include changes of job, of employer, of

industry, of locality or region and also changes of status.

However, Dr. Bertil Gardel (1963), who was advisor to the Alfa Laval Company in Sweden on the occasion of the company move to a new location to Tumba, showed much concern in mobility of individuals through human reactions. He said:

The response of an individual to a decision to change is directly related to his own picture of the relevant aspects the change may have for him and the assessment he makes of these. This reaction depends on how reliably he thinks he can determine what the change will bring from the point of view of his own advantage. His certainty is conditioned partly by the data available regarding the change, by the opportunities he has of influencing the change, and by his own confidence in the management of the firm.

Besides human reaction to mobility there are several other interesting aspects of the study. There seems to be a contrast or paradox in that labor creates an inflow into a depressed area when many workers are moving from the same area to a more advantage area. It is said that professional workers are more mobile by tradition than manual workers. Distinction can be drawn between voluntary and involuntary mobility. Geographical mobility varies in definition from other types of mobility as occupational and industrial. In all countries there seems to be powerful currents taking workers from agriculture into urban industry, from villages to towns, and towns to cities.

Geographical mobility has been defined as the capacity of a person to move from one part of the country to another. The requirement here is to find an answer to the question why one worker is mobile and another is not. This determination of individual mobility seems

to depend on a variety of factors, as age, family connection and responsibility, social relations, cultural and educational background, material ties (house, land), expectations and possibilities at his new place of work. There seems to be many complex social, cultural and psychological factors involved in geographical mobility.

Dey and Reitan (1967) discuss mobility in a recent article and they present a classification that is of some interest. They suggest that movement or mobility can be classified in the following ways. Vertical mobility which is the movement up and down the socio-economic ladder reflecting the opportunity in North America for each generation to better its position within society. This view represents the movement of a person's status in society. This movement tends to be separated in two parts between manual work and the non-manual occupations. Horizontal mobility is the shifting from one type of work to another or job changes which do not necessarily involve economic or social changes in status nor geographic mobility. It is this area of horizontal movement that a tendency has existed to assume that such movement represents geographic mobility with related psychological factors as propensity to move. Researchers to date have assumed and inferred that horizontal job mobility and geographic mobility were synonymous. The authors here suggest data on worker mobility are quite imprecise as related to horizontal or geographic mobility. They further suggest that geographic mobility is a needed dimension as separated from horizontal mobility. The armed services and other high mobility

occupations, such as teaching and construction work need attention under geographic mobility. It is in this area then of geographic mobility that this study proposes to concentrate to try to find causes only for teacher turnover.

It seems to be easier to define and classify types of labor mobility conceptually than to give operational meaning to the various terms and to decide how specific job changes are to be classified. On the basis of such limitations the following types of mobility of workers have been generally recognized by Parnes (1954):

1. Interfirm movement, from one firm to another or a change of employer.
2. Occupational movement, from one industry to another.
3. Industrial movement, from one industry to another.
4. Geographic movement, from one local area to another.
5. Movement from an unemployed to an employed status.
6. Movement from an employed to an unemployed status.
7. Movement into and out of the labor force.

These types of mobility do not represent exclusive categories of labor market transactions. A single job change may involve a combination of several of the kinds of mobility mentioned. A worker through changing a job could be involved in an interfirm, occupational, industrial, and geographic shift. On the other hand, intraplant transfers may create occupational shifts alone. An industrial shift can occur when a worker moves between two plants of a company that is engaged in different industries. Geographic movement may occur without a change in employer,

occupation or industry. In other words, considerable difficulty is encountered while trying to define and classify various types of labor movement.

It can be said though with some degree of accuracy that the problems to define geographic labor mobility are perhaps not so significant as those related to interfirm, occupational and industrial movement. It is suggested that geographic movement should refer to a situation in which a worker changes his residence so as to make himself available for jobs for which he previously would not have been available because of their distance from his home. This concept of geographic mobility is not all embracing in the total labor area, but it has some importance and it gives some direction to a study of teacher mobility which seemingly involves geographic movement.

There have been some interesting studies recently in Alberta on teacher turnover and retention. Probably the most important of these studies was by Chamchuk (1966). He points out in his study the average school board recruits about 25 per cent of its staff annually. This amount is made up from 6 per cent due to increased enrolment, 6 per cent caused by transfers within the province and 14 per cent directly related to drop-outs from teaching. He also lists the following rates of teacher resignations:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Per Cent of Staff</u>
Large cities	11.2
Counties	21.3
Divisions	23.1
Other	21.8

In Chamchuk's study the destinations of teachers resigning in 1965 in Alberta were listed as follows:

	<u>Per Cent</u>
Teaching elsewhere in the province	41.0
Teaching outside the province	10.6
Marriage	2.0
Returning to housekeeping	17.9
Entering non-teaching occupation	3.2
Returning for further study	14.6
Superannuation or illness	4.5
Teaching in non-public schools	1.3
Other destinations	3.8
Not indicated	1.1

In Manitoba, The Manitoba Teachers' Society (1965) gives the following distribution of the total number of teachers who resigned including 26.8 per cent of all teachers:

	<u>Per Cent</u>
Teaching outside Manitoba	20.3
Further training	21.0
Home duties	30.2
Another occupation	7.5
Retiring	7.3
Other	13.7

Chamchuk (1966) points out that about 8 per cent of mobile teachers indicated satisfaction with their previous positions. He concluded in his study that for counties and divisions (non-urban) unsatisfactory living accommodation and community resources were a main cause of turnover. Lack of opportunity for advancement and conflict with staff, administration, and school boards were other main causes of dissatisfaction. Salaries were not as significant a factor as those just listed. A significant complaint was that full-time

teaching and the related activities associated with being professional teachers were too demanding of time of married women maintaining a home and raising a family.

Another Alberta study by Eric G. Hohn (1964) in a Master's dissertation entitled "A Study of the Causes of Teacher Transfer in a School System," studied a number of variables relevant to intra-system mobility. The factors identified by Hohn were six in number:

- (1) School-community factors;
- (2) Administrative and supervisory factors;
- (3) Pupil factors;
- (4) Working conditions;
- (5) Training and professional factors;
- (6) Family factors.

One other point of interest reported from Alberta in the Department of Education's Report on Teacher Recruitment (October 15, 1965) is as follows:

Divisions and counties lost three and one half times as many teachers to cities as the number gained from that source.

Teacher turnover should not be considered in isolation from other areas of mobility. It is only fair to consider movement of teachers in comparison to total mobility of people in Canada. On the basis of figures made available through the Economics and Research Branch of the Department of Labor by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in conjunction with the 1961 census certain information on mobility was made available. A survey of a 20 per cent household sample was used. The

results were based on net changes in place of residence over a five-year period from 1956-61. Information obtained showed that 46 per cent of Canadian people had moved in the five-year period though 3 per cent of the total were actually movers from abroad which reduced total mobility to between 42 and 43 per cent. This percentage of movement is high in comparison to the United States where current population reports issued by the U.S. Department of Commerce estimate 75 per cent to 80 per cent of the people are non-movers or not subject to mobility. However, in that country mobility is more regionally extensive where 16 per cent of movers through a five-year period cross state boundaries. In Canada, movement amongst provinces is slightly more than 8 per cent of total movers (Polianski, 1965).

Van Zwoll (1964) made the following comment on teacher turnover in a comparison of mobility involving teaching and industry:

At its most favorable, teacher turnover on the national level seems to be at a rate of a little over 10 per cent. At the local levels the turnover rate will vary considerably above and below the national figure. A turnover rate of 20 to 25 per cent is not at all rare in even some of the better paid urban areas of the nation. This compares to a rate of labor turnover in manufacturing of 3.6 per cent for 1958 and 3.3 per cent for 1961. In fact, the turnover of labor in manufacturing between 1930 and 1961 was in the range of 2.9 to 8.3 per cent. During twenty-three of those years the rate of turnover in manufacturing was within a 3.0 to 4.4 per cent bracket.

Mobility appears to be high and regionally intensive in Canada. Of the nearly 43 per cent of the people who move in Canada, 25 per cent of them move within the same municipality and 16.8 per cent move within provincial boundaries. There is some variation from province to province

but these figures apply generally to the country and they are acceptable for comparison purposes. Manitoba figures are reasonably close to the national norm.

It can be pointed out here that in comparison to the United States, mobility in Canada is high at the regional and local level, but not at the provincial or state level where movement is greater in the U.S.A. However, teacher movement within the province is greater as based on figures determined by turnover from division to division. What is significant for this study is that by any comparison teacher turnover in isolated settlements on Manitoba's or Canada's resource frontier is considerably higher on a percentage basis than is the movement of people in Canada or the United States. The figures for teacher turnover and their comparison with other results of mobility would seem to point to specific causes as contributing factors to a high turnover teacher rate in certain areas.

In endeavoring to determine causes of teacher turnover, it is inevitable that certain inherent problems will emerge to cause complications. For example, Charters (1956) in discussing causes of teacher turnover, refers to the behavior and types of teachers. In his explorations of causes on this study, it is found that turnover is determined in part by the types of teachers who compose the school's staff. Teachers with differing orientation to their jobs are "turnover prone" in characteristically different degrees. Furthermore, school systems differ in the kinds of teachers which they attract to the staff. It

is further noted that age and residence are related to turnover and that as teachers grow older and tenure of residence increases in a domicile, mobility is reduced. The point of significance here is that these are not causes clearly and sharply outlined. Distinctions are going to be difficult to draw in determining causes. However, Charters in his study on teacher turnover in 1954-55 does arrive at some conclusions as a result of an investigation of the determinants of teacher turnover in the U.S.A. The conclusions were as follows:

1. Low salaries are the prime cause of teacher turnover.
2. Young men and women come into the country for their first teaching job and as soon as they have obtained their initial years of teaching experience, their training and professional ambition encourages them to move out.
3. Local married women and a few men teach only to supplement their family income during the long winter months. These are not really interested in making teaching a career--rather their local ties, their family ties and friends are stronger than any other attraction and consequently, these become the "veteran" teachers.
4. Teachers move because of greater opportunity for advancement.
5. Working wives supporting their husbands in university.
6. Young married or unmarried women who prefer to live in a large metropolitan city and commute thirty to forty miles a day.

A study on teacher turnover in Illinois (Anderson and Conville, 1956) listed the following reasons for teachers leaving their teaching positions. They summarized, in order, the reasons as follows: inadequate salary, marriage, too many duties other than teaching, large and over-crowded classrooms, lack of equipment and teaching devices,

problems in discipline and pupils in general, poor inter-personal relations, home duties, poor supervision, illness, inability to get along with administrators, too much school board interference, spouses movement, and minor reasons.

There is a suggestion that teacher stability seems to be related to economic security and it is suggested that administrators must provide teachers with reasonable class loads and adequate instructional materials. It is also suggested that administrators or employers should provide prospective teachers with an accurate and complete job description.

A study of teacher and school board relationships (McCarty and Nuccio, 1963) pointed to a number of problem areas between teachers, board members and administrators. They identified several areas where the perception of administrators and board members regarding the attitudes and satisfactions of teachers were highly unrealistic. These conclusions indicate the problem of poor inter-personal relationships and they suggest some procedure which might help to improve the existing problems.

Finally, it might be of interest here to mention a study on teacher satisfaction by Chase (1951). This study, though it goes back eighteen years, does seem to have some significance as related to teacher turnover and permanence on staff. It involved some 17,000 teachers in 200 systems in 43 states. Some of the reasons given for satisfaction in teacher employment were:

1. Freedom to plan one's work;
2. Good salaries;
3. Good equipment and supplies;
4. Stimulating professional leadership;
5. Recognition of good work and achievements;
6. Participation in decision making.

It was suggested that satisfaction would develop with the following improvements:

1. Improvement of working conditions, especially teaching load, school plant and equipment;
2. Improvement in salaries;
3. Improved professional status and greater community recognition for teachers.

Chase concludes his study with the following generalizations as taken from teacher responses:

1. Teachers feel their satisfaction is greatly affected by "freedom to plan their own work," and by a sense of professional status and responsibility.
2. Satisfaction in teaching is affected by teachers' feelings with respect to salary and by opportunities to participate in decisions regarding salary schedules.
3. Teachers' feelings with regard to the quality of professional leadership and supervision are closely related to their satisfaction.
4. The feeling on the part of teachers that they have the opportunity to participate regularly and actively in educational planning and policy-making is closely related to their satisfaction.
5. Satisfaction in the system is closely related to a considerable extent upon a feeling by teachers that the teaching

load, school plant, equipment and supplies and other working conditions are conducive to effective work.

After analyzing these various studies at both a provincial and national level, it should be possible to classify the various factors mentioned into a few categories. One dimension that seemed to receive much attention was the characteristic of individuals that created the determination to move. This determinant, in itself, has been called propensity to move or become mobile and it seemed to have significance in teacher and labor movement. Personal factors, as pointed out here, have much importance in the movement of workers. Youth seemed to be a contributing factor to movement. The information gained from these studies was used in developing the questionnaire used in this study and it provided a means of comparison with the findings of the research from this thesis.

Labor mobility tended to break down into various classifications as interfirm movement, occupational movement, industrial movement, and geographic movement. Teacher movement in contrast has been associated largely with geographic change and interfirm movement or a change of employer. However to change employers necessitates a geographical change for a teacher but not always so for labor. Mobility seemed to be connected to the socio-economic ladder for labor and its consequent desire to improve a person's status in society. There could be a connection with teachers movement in this respect but it does not seem to be too obvious. The personal element, however, did seem to be strong as a cause of mobility for labor and teachers alike.

A second group of factors that might be termed important as indicated in related literature are school factors. These would include areas as school administration, school facilities, class size, teacher-administrative relationships, etc. A third area of consequence might be called community factors related to housing facilities, recreational opportunities, community attitudes, as religious bias, climate and geographical location. A fourth area suggested for consideration included pupil factors as indicating their capabilities, expectations and behavior. Some attention was given to economic factors but more so, in American reviews where a fair amount of emphasis was placed on salaries. Problem areas were pointed out as the need for teachers to have more freedom in planning their work and decision making but once again the emphasis in this respect came from studies pursued in the United States. Related literature on mobility tended to point to a multiplicity of factors influencing a person to move.

CHAPTER III

COLLECTION, ORGANIZATION, AND TREATMENT OF DATA

I. THE QUESTIONNAIRE

A questionnaire was constructed which included various items found in research related to teacher turnover. Other items were devised after consultation with former and present teachers at Thompson. Revisions of the original questions were made after an evaluative analysis by several judges. The questionnaire shown in Appendix A and B is the instrument used in the collection of data for this study on Teacher Turnover at Thompson.

The questionnaire is divided into three sections. One part asks the respondent to provide certain personal and professional data. The information sought in this section includes such data as items on sex, age when respondent left Thompson, years of teaching experience, grades taught at Thompson and since leaving there, plus a check list to indicate what the respondent is doing or had done after leaving Thompson. Another part of the instrument to determine teacher turnover includes five open-ended questions. These questions were devised in the hope of getting some interpretation of the respondent's thinking on what would help the Thompson School System to retain a larger portion of its staff and what would induce the respondents to return to Thompson. The questions in this section were also aimed at getting some idea of what influenced people to go to Thompson to teach initially, and for

how long they expected to stay there. The last question in this part of the measuring instrument was pointed directly at the matter of isolation, as it was felt this was a significant factor of sufficient magnitude to warrant more consideration from the respondents than simply including it as one of the seventy-five factors in the questionnaire.

The main body of the questionnaire is located in a list of seventy-five factors which seem to relate to teacher mobility or turnover. Most of the factors were worded so that it was directed to the person involved by using the personal pronoun "I". These factors were set out on a continuous pattern in the questionnaire under no classification, but actual headings were considered when the measuring instrument was developed. The factors could be classified under the following headings:

- A. Personal and Family Factors;
- B. Economic Factors;
- C. Community Factors;
- D. School Factors;
- E. Pupil Factors;
- F. School Board Factors.

The seventy-five factors were each printed on a separate card two inches by three and a half inches, orange in color. The respondents were given instruction through an instruction sheet as to the procedure to follow in selecting and recording the factors related to their

turnover. Extra green cards were included for respondents to use to record factors causing their turnover that were not included on the questionnaire.

II. DISTRIBUTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES

In order to get the names and addresses of the teachers who had left the Thompson School System in the period from the inception of the district to 1968 or from 1958 to 1968, it was necessary to go to the school records at Thompson. The present Superintendent and administrative staff helped this study immeasurably by preparing an initial list of teachers who had left the school system. The preparation of this list created problems in that it had to be prepared from old records, and through the ten-year period leadership in administration had changed several times. This lack of continuity in administration did not permit any specific person to be in a position to select and analyze those persons who could be actually classified as members of the teaching body at Thompson.

The original list as submitted from Thompson was checked against records in both the Department of Education and The Manitoba Teachers' Society for two purposes. The first reason was to determine if the person named was an actual teacher at Thompson; and secondly, to try to find a correct mailing address for the individual. The records in the Department of Education and The Manitoba Teachers' Society provided some information in verification of teaching personnel, but they gave very

little assistance in providing the mailing address. In this respect a slow process of contacting former Thompson teachers now located in Winnipeg and Brandon, was started. By this person-to-person contact, largely by telephone, the mailing address for many teachers was determined. One of the heartening features of this study was the excellent cooperation and support received from this group of people who supplied mailing addresses.

The original list from Thompson included one hundred and eighty-three names. This list was finally reduced to one hundred and forty-eight. The reasons for the reduction from one hundred and eighty-three to one hundred and forty-eight was that some of the people on the list were actually not teachers who had taught at Thompson under contract but rather they had applied for positions through application or they had been used as substitutes. The most significant reason for reduction, however, was the impossibility of getting a valid mailing address for several teachers. Thirty-one teachers were in this group. It seemed as if some teachers who had taught at Thompson had broken all contact with this province. It was those teachers who had left the province who presented the greatest problem.

Of the one hundred and forty-eight teachers to whom the questionnaire was sent, ninety-eight replied. The post office authorities returned eighteen envelopes. The original address had been changed in some cases by the postal authority to no effect. Envelopes had notations on them, such as on one envelope - "Return to sender - Ireland -

some place." Five people replied who should not have been on the original list, though they had some contact with the Thompson School System, but not as a teacher under contract; consequently, from the one hundred and forty-eight questionnaires sent, only one hundred and twenty-five could possibly have received them as actual teacher respondents. From this group of one hundred and twenty-five, replies were received from ninety-eight.

The initial mailing included the three parts of the questionnaire with the instructional sheet. A result sheet was included on which the respondents recorded their selection of factors that influenced their leaving Thompson. They were asked to place these factors in rank order from the most important influence to the least. They were also asked to record on the result sheet those factors in combination that may have caused them to leave. A letter to the respondents was sent with this original mailing explaining the purpose of the study and asking for their cooperation in achieving the desired results. A follow-up letter was sent on November 8, 1968 to those people who had not replied or whose questionnaire had not been returned by the postal authorities. Seventy-six letters were sent in this second mailing. In the meantime considerable contact of former Thompson teachers was made by telephone to solicit support for this study.

The figures in Table I show that 125 teachers were contacted, though probably some of the questionnaires unaccounted for did not reach the participants, and 98 replied who were eligible to participate. On a percentage basis, this gives a 78.4 per cent participation. This proportion of response, which is almost equivalent to four out of

five, is generally accepted as adequate to establish validity for causes of teacher turnover from Thompson.

TABLE I
TABULATION OF SURVEY RETURNS

	Number of Questionnaires	Percent of Total Group
Returned undelivered	18	12.1
Returned not usable	5	3.4
Used in present study	98	66.3
Questionnaires unaccounted for	27	18.2
Total questionnaires mailed	148	100.0

CHAPTER IV

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

The distribution of males and females in this study, with 28.6 per cent male to 71.4 per cent female was representative of the Thompson school system, as shown in Table II. The 1968-1969 teaching staff at Thompson included 35 males and 90 females to give a division of 28 per cent male and 72 per cent female. These figures give support to the validity of this investigation in that it was not weighted to either sex insofar as it applied to the existing teaching staff at Thompson.

Our respondents were a young group, as indicated by Table III. The modal age for males was between twenty-eight and twenty-nine; for females it was between twenty-four and twenty-five. As a check on these figures the ages of teachers in three schools at Thompson were consulted through the Department of Education records and it was found the modal age for the females was from twenty-two to twenty-three in the three schools. As only males were located in one school the modal age there was very close to twenty-seven. These figures would indicate the Thompson staff is young in age and the group that left the system was no older than the people who remained, or the staff personnel as presently constituted. The important point to be recognized in this study is that the respondents are basically a group of young teachers but their age is equivalent to the age of the total Thompson staff and for that reason it is representative of the school system.

TABLE II
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SEX

Male	Percent	Female	Percent	Total Respondents
28	28.6	70	71.4	98

TABLE III
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY AGE WHEN LEAVING THOMPSON

Age	Male	Female
20-24	9	30
25-28	5	19
29-32	5	6
33-36	4	5
37-40	2	2
41-44	-	1
45-50	-	1
51-55	1	1
56-60	1	-
	—	—
Total	27	65

In considering years of teaching service at Thompson, as shown in Table IV, it must be remembered there were schools only from 1958; and during the early years of operation of the system the number of actively engaged teachers was small. The annual report of the Department of Education for 1960, which would be based on the enrolment figures for the 1960-61 school year, shows only twenty students in Grades IX-XII. These figures would indicate a small number of teachers were actually engaged in high school work. It is not surprising then that only one teacher had sufficient years of service at Thompson to go back to the early years of operation of the school system.

TABLE IV
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY YEARS OF SERVICE AT THOMPSON

Years	Male	Female
1 year	10	28
2 years	10	20
3 years	4	9
4 years	1	4
5 years	3	7
6 years	0	1
7 years	0	0
8 years	0	1
Total	28	70

There is one point that leads to considerable concern in this set of figures on tenure where thirty-eight of the respondents left after only one year of service. Another thirty left after two years of teaching performance for a total of sixty-eight in the first and second years of teaching. However, it is important to note that twenty-eight teachers with three to five years of tenure at Thompson, gave one hundred and nine actual years of teaching service to the system.

Table V has some importance in this study in that it reveals fifty of the total ninety-eight teachers involved here have taught since they left Thompson. Some explanation is needed to clarify an apparent disparity that exists in comparison to Table IX where it shows only forty-one teachers as having taught for either a school board in Manitoba or another province or state after leaving Thompson. The disparity between fifty and forty-one is explained through a number of the teachers as having left Thompson as married women to take up home duties or to take further training and then later returning to teaching. Other information is available from this study to indicate that the actual net loss to the teaching profession of the ninety-eight respondents involved in this study is much smaller than originally expected. In fact the Thompson School System stands to get a number of these respondents back into service at a later date if information given by respondents in the questionnaire has any accuracy.

In reviewing the total experience of the respondents, including both the experience at Thompson and since, it is to be expected, as

TABLE V
 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY YEARS TAUGHT
 SINCE LEAVING THOMPSON

Year	Male	Female
1 year	8	20
2 years	3	5
3 years	2	4
4 years	4	0
5 years	0	2
6 years	0	1
7 years	1	0
8 years	0	0
9 years	0	0
Total	18	32

shown in Table VI, that the bulk of the participants are clustered in the group from two to eight years. This table does indicate that a number of the teachers involved did have considerable experience before going to Thompson to teach, but it also shows quite clearly with the other Tables IV and V that the majority of the teachers had limited or no experience. These Tables IV, V, and VI also show with other information collected that the teachers being assessed have for the most part a

TABLE VI
 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY TOTAL YEARS
 OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE UNTIL PRESENT

Year	Male	Female
1 year	2	5
2 years	4	10
3 years	1	8
4 years	1	8
5 years	1	14
6 years	3	6
7 years	3	3
8 years	3	4
9 years	0	1
10 years	0	2
11 years	1	2
12 years	0	0
13 years	2	1
14 years	1	1
15 years	2	0
16 years	1	0
17 years	0	0
18 years	0	0
19 years	0	1
20 years	1	0
Over 20 years	2	4
	---	---
Total	28	70

broken record of continuity in teaching. Their years of teaching experience tend to be built up in parts or intervals.

Tables VII and VIII, when compared, would reveal that drop-out from teaching after leaving the profession at Thompson is not confined to any specific group of teachers, though the highest ratio of loss exists at the elementary level, which is designated here as including Grades IV to VI. The loss does seem to be fairly well distributed over all grade levels. It should be pointed out that respondents in some cases did not reply to the questions submitted to complete Table VII. The important point to be recognized here as far as this study is concerned, is the turnover of teachers is not confined to any specific grade area. According to numbers of people under consideration in each grade area, and the people leaving with their re-employment in other school jurisdictions, a normal situation seems to prevail. There does seem to be a rather sharp loss in a limited area of personnel, designated as Principal. A variety of reasons exist for each individual in the reduction of the number from five to one that seem to have no significant relevance to this study. In other words, the reason for principals leaving is apropos to the same reasons as applies to the total body of teachers.

As mentioned in relation to Table V where figures show fifty teachers having gained experience after leaving Thompson in comparison to Table IX, where only forty-one teachers are specified, does create some disparity. This discrepancy can be explained in that Table IX only applies to what teachers did in the first year after leaving

TABLE VII
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY GRADES TAUGHT AT THOMPSON

Grade	Male	Female
Primary	0	23
Elementary	8	21
Junior High	10	7
Senior High	7	7
Principal	3	2
Total	28	60

TABLE VIII
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY GRADES TAUGHT
SINCE LEAVING THOMPSON

Grade	Male	Female
Primary	0	15
Elementary	3	6
Junior High	7	3
Senior High	6	3
Principal	1	0
Total	17	27

TABLE IX
 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY OCCUPATION
 IN YEAR AFTER LEAVING THOMPSON

	Male	Female
1. Teaching for another school board in Manitoba	12	20
2. Teaching for another school board in a different province (state)	4	5
3. Becoming married and starting house-keeping	-	5
4. Married women returning to home duties (pregnancy)	-	29
5. Taking further training	8	6
6. Retired or superannuated	1	1
7. In non-teaching occupation	2	3
8. Special assignment (temporary)	1	1
Total	28	70

Thompson. For instance, the two teachers who are classified as pursuing a special assignment are working on a church project of one year duration only. Some of the teachers taking further training had finished their course and have returned to teaching. Married women who returned to home-making tended to come back to teaching at different times.

The interesting feature of Table IX is the small actual loss to the total teaching force. Only the seven teachers who retired or who went to a non-teaching occupation can be counted as on the debit side in number of teachers. Some of the teachers who are presently taking further training or who are involved with home duties have stated they plan to return to teaching at Thompson when courses are completed or home duties are less demanding.

Table X will be used to substantiate what will be shown in Chapter V when the various factors are analyzed on the basis of total responses. The respondents indicated quite significantly their desire to get to a larger urban centre with university facilities and other amenities of life. Twenty-seven of the forty-nine who responded went to a larger centre to teach after leaving Thompson. In such a group of teachers, as under consideration here, there are those who want to meet the challenge of the north and they are prepared to leave Thompson for more isolated and smaller population points.

TABLE X
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE OF COMMUNITY
IN WHICH TEACHING WAS DONE
AFTER LEAVING THOMPSON

	Male	Female
Less than 500	3	4
501 to 1000	3	2
1001 to 5000	6	2
5001 to 10,000	1	1
Greater than 10,000	7	20
Total	20	29

CHAPTER V

AN ANALYSIS OF THE TOTAL RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL FACTORS AND GROUPS OF FACTORS

As indicated in Chapter III the individual factors were submitted to the respondents on small cards with a single question on each card. No organized arrangement of factors on the cards was followed as related to: (1) personal and family factors (2) economic factors (3) community factors (4) school factors (5) pupil factors or (6) school board factors. The identity of any factor as related to any grouping was not made known with the expectation that each factor would be treated equally and individually.

The questionnaire contained the seventy-five statements shown in Table XI. All teachers contacted were asked to participate in this portion of the total measuring instrument. Eighty-five of the ninety-eight teachers participating responded to the questionnaire. Those who did not respond included married women who simply stated they were returning to home duties and they felt there was no point in completing this portion of the measuring instrument. Two principals did not complete this section as one was retiring from teaching and the other did not wish to continue in administration. It is a point of interest that the other three principals participating in this study could be associated with teaching as well as administration in the Thompson school system and they did complete the questionnaire.

TABLE XI

DISTRIBUTION OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS BY SIZE OF SCORE

Number	Factor	Responses				Total Responses	Total Score
		4	3	2	1		
18.	I wish to be closer to a university.	20	7	2	1	30	106
20.	I preferred to be closer to my husband's (wife's) or boy friend's (girl friend's) place of employment.	24	1	1	2	28	99
8.	I felt isolated being in Thompson.	15	8	3	5	31	95
31.	I found the cost of travelling to larger population centres was too high.	12	10	5	6	33	94
21.	I like to move around.	17	5	2	1	25	88
61.	I felt that specialized supervisory or consultative staff were unavailable.	13	7	5	4	29	87
17.	I wanted to be closer to a large urban centre.	13	8	4	2	27	86
22.	I wanted to broaden my experiences.	14	5	3	3	25	80

Number	Factor	Responses				Total Responses	Total Score
		4	3	2	1		
33.	I found the cost of rent or boarding accommodation was too high.	10	9	2	6	27	77
48.	I felt that relations between the principal and the staff were characterized by lack of trust and confidence.	13	7	1	0	21	75
6.	Cultural opportunities were inadequate.	6	8	9	3	26	69
38.	I believe that too many innovations and changes in teaching methods and techniques were introduced at Thompson.	9	8	3	0	20	66
32.	I found the cost of food too high.	10	4	4	3	21	63
24.	I believe that the pupils were lacking in respect for the teacher's position in the community.	4	10	7	2	23	62
46.	I felt that I did not have the necessary teaching aids and equipment to do a good job.	12	4	0	2	18	62
39.	I felt that I needed more time for teaching, preparation, planning and evaluation.	12	3	1	2	18	61
56.	I felt that new teachers were not given adequate help or leadership by school administration.	9	5	3	2	19	59

Number	Factor	Responses				Total Responses	Total Score
		4	3	2	1		
51.	I felt that administrative paper work was unnecessarily burdensome.	9	4	4	2	19	58
52.	There was a major deficiency in clerical help for teachers.	5	8	5	4	22	58
3.	Housing was overpriced.	8	6	1	3	18	55
34.	I felt that teachers' salaries were too low in comparison to salaries of other people.	7	6	1	3	17	51
23.	I found that there was no variety in shopping facilities.	7	5	1	5	18	50
43.	I felt in-service programs were not useful, appropriate and convenient as to frequency and time.	6	4	4	4	18	48
30.	I found that classes were too large and it made it impossible to give each pupil adequate help and guidance.	4	7	3	4	18	47
4.	Housing was inadequate.	9	2	1	2	14	46
44.	It seemed to me that school administration was more concerned with administrative trivia than with good teaching.	3	8	4	2	17	46
37.	I felt that I spent too much time on trivial supervisory duties.	6	5	2	2	15	45
66.	I felt that the future outlook for improvement in working conditions was discouraging.	8	3	2	0	13	45

Number	Factor	Responses				Total Responses	Total Score
		4	3	2	1		
19.	I wanted to be nearer my home town (or place of family residence).	7	4	2	0	13	44
36.	I found that the school system required me to adopt a standardized approach to teaching.	6	5	2	1	14	44
1.	I felt restricted because the community lacked recreational and entertainment facilities.	3	6	4	2	15	40
35.	I felt that teachers' salaries were too low in comparison to salaries of teachers in other districts.	3	8	0	1	12	37
42.	I believe that staff meetings were so controlled that they were of little value.	4	5	3	0	12	37
27.	I believe that educational goals were not appropriate for pupils in this particular community.	2	6	3	2	13	34
9.	I found that the people of the community were not sufficiently stimulating.	3	6	1	1	11	33
28.	I found that parents showed little interest in the scholastic progress of their children.	3	4	4	1	12	33
50.	I was not given the opportunity to attend conferences and other forms of professional development.	3	4	2	2	11	30

Number	Factor	Responses				Total Responses	Total Score
		4	3	2	1		
45.	I found that teachers were primarily interested in salary and fringe benefits.	2	6	0	2	10	28
47.	I felt that new teachers did not receive orientation to their work and the community.	3	2	4	1	10	27
74.	I felt that some school board members were representative of pressure groups or blocs in the community.	2	3	4	2	11	27
11.	It seemed to me that the community was not interested in school affairs.	4	2	1	3	10	27
40.	I felt that I had little or no opportunity to participate in developing policies for grouping, promotions and control of pupils.	2	4	2	2	10	26
5.	Boarding facilities were unacceptable.	3	3	0	2	8	23
53.	I felt that new teachers were not made to feel welcome by older teachers.	2	5	0	0	7	23
29.	I felt that I was given insufficient time away from the pupils during the day.	4	1	1	1	7	22
10.	I found that the people of the community tended to regard teaching as an easy and overpaid job.	1	2	5	1	9	21

Number	Factor	Responses				Total Responses	Total Score
		4	3	2	1		
63.	Incompatibility which existed between other staff members and myself resulted in unpleasant relationships and occurrences.	5	0	0	0	5	20
7.	I believe that the community tended to restrict the personal or social behavior of the teacher.	1	3	2	2	8	19
41.	I felt that I had little or no opportunity to participate in program development in the school.	3	0	3	1	7	19
62.	I believe there were excessive numbers of meetings to attend as staff, workshop, Teacher Society and Home and School.	2	3	0	2	7	19
68.	I felt that the principal and superintendent failed to appreciate and praise desirable results produced by staff members.	2	2	2	1	7	19
14.	I felt that a religious bias existed in the school.	2	2	1	1	6	17
25.	I found there were too many dull pupils and consequent poor achievement.	1	3	0	3	7	16
59.	I felt that supervision was too authoritarian.	3	1	0	0	4	15
2.	There was little opportunity for unmarried teachers to meet members of the opposite sex.	1	2	1	2	6	14

Number	Factor	Responses				Total Responses	Total Score
		4	3	2	1		
26.	Pupils had a poor educational background for my class.	2	1	1	0	4	13
69.	I felt that pressure groups in the community were able to exert unfair influence on the school.	1	0	3	3	7	13
65.	It seemed to me that class interruptions were so frequent as to interfere with my teaching.	2	1	0	1	4	12
54.	I was required to teach subjects for which I had little or no background.	2	1	0	0	3	11
15.	I felt that a religious bias existed in the community.	1	0	3	0	4	10
67.	I felt that classroom visits by administration personnel were too frequent.	2	0	1	0	3	10
71.	I felt that school board members actually did not understand education.	1	1	0	2	4	9
72.	I believe that some school board members actually did not understand education.	1	1	0	1	3	8
60.	I believe that supervision was too arbitrary.	1	1	0	0	2	7
70.	It seemed to me that I was never accepted as a member of the community through its organizations and social life.	1	0	1	1	3	7

Number	Factor	Responses				Total Responses	Total Score
		4	3	2	1		
75.	I felt that outstanding teachers were not recognized and rewarded by the school board.	1	0	1	1	3	7
12.	I found that the school imposed restrictions on free enquiry and discussion in the classroom.	0	2	0	0	2	6
49.	I usually found out about important matters through the grapevine.	0	2	0	0	2	6
57.	I found that the school at which I taught was too small in number of teachers.	0	1	0	2	3	5
64.	I felt that the work load was not distributed fairly among staff members.	0	1	1	0	2	5
73.	I found that the school board members were not willing to make educationally sound decisions when faced with community opposition.	1	0	0	1	2	5
58.	I felt supervision tended to be too rigid.	1	0	0	0	1	4
16.	I felt that the community was too small for me to pursue my anticipated teaching career.	1	0	0	0	1	4
13.	I felt that there was an unreasonable community restriction on free enquiry and discussion in the classroom.	0	1	0	0	1	3
55.	I was unable to make use of my specialized training.	0	0	1	0	1	2

The total number of responses to each of the seventy-five items were placed on a weighted four-point ordinal scale. The raw score for each item was calculated and ranked as shown in Table XI. This score was determined by allowing 4 points for each of the first 5 choices per factor, 3 points for each of the next 5 choices, 2 points for each of the next 5 choices and 1 point for each selection beyond the 15th choice. As tabulated the scores ranged from 106 to 2. No item was scoreless so all items with their related response and score are included in the table. The total response for each item is also shown and because the score is determined on a four-point ordinal scale the responses, therefore, are not listed on a ranking scale by responses but rather, as mentioned, the ranking is done on total score.

An analysis of the data would indicate the first twenty-five responses selected are the most significant and those that warrant the most careful examination. The score varies over these twenty-five responses from the high of 106 to 46 for the twenty-fifth response. The other fifty responses are grouped in a range from two to forty-five which seems to indicate the importance of the first twenty-five responses.

Respondents in this study were asked to write down those factors in combination, rather than factors just singly, which may have caused them to leave. Of the eighty-five respondents to this part of the study only twenty-seven responded by writing down factors in combination. The responses are shown in Table XII.

Of these twenty-seven respondents to a group of factors twenty-

TABLE XII
 NUMBER OF FACTORS SELECTED IN COMBINATION

Factors	Number of Teachers
2	4
3	10
4	4
5	1
6	5
7	1
8	1
9	-
10	1
Total teachers replying	27

five of them listed their grouping as they selected their single factors in rank order. Only two participants departed from the rank order selection. On the basis of these results it would seem advisable to place the emphasis for interpretation of results on the selection of individual factors. The factors selected in the groupings or clusters all fall with very few exceptions among those factors that rank one to twenty-five in the scores. As the emphasis will be placed on these

factors in interpretation this would seem a further reason for placing the groups of factors with the individual selection. Individual comment, if deemed significant, will be made about those groups or parts of groups that fall outside the factors that are not in the ranking one to twenty-five.

Considerable comment was written by respondents on the result sheet. Some of this comment is in support of their selection of factors. Others used it for various reasons as expressing criticism, explaining circumstances peculiar to their problem, extolling the Thompson school system or simply stating a personal grievance. There is nevertheless some interesting comment in these various statements and insofar as information seems related to this study an attempt will be made to use some of this material.

In addition to the seventy-five cards included in the measuring instrument there were ten blank cards for the respondents to use in order to express any factor related to their mobility but which was not listed in the printed group. Respondents used these extra cards sparingly and in most cases where they did use them it was simply a means of saying the same thing in another way as already listed in a factor. However, one omission became obvious in the questionnaire when a specific question or factor on climate was not included. The respondents reacted to this oversight by including climate on either the blank card or making a comment on the result sheet. Some interesting comment, with an expression of ideas, merits considerable reflection and examination as written on the result sheet by the respondents.

In considering individual factors selected by teachers it is generally recognized that teachers do identify certain factors as having a greater influence on their leaving a location than other factors. However, where teacher turnover is high, as it would seem to apply at Thompson, Blocker and Richardson (1963) have indicated there was usually a multiplicity of contributing factors rather than a specific cause of turnover. In this study only six of the eighty-five respondents who replied on the result sheet, used a single factor as a cause of turnover. In these six cases five of them were personal causes. For this reason plus various comments made by respondents and the closeness of the scores it would seem advisable not to try to justify any one factor as being greater than another amongst the top ten scores. The same procedure would seem to be advisable in analyzing the next fifteen factors. At the same time it must be recognized as previously pointed out that only twenty-seven of the eighty-five respondents in this section of the questionnaire used the grouping of factors to give their answer. This means that fifty-eight teachers in this study were prepared to rank list their selection of factors. Rather than try to isolate individual factors and analyze them one by one it may be advisable to look at them in groups according to the type of factor represented. With this procedure in mind an analysis will be made first of those factors which come under the heading of personal factors. Though there were only six questions of a personal nature in the questionnaire, five of these six questions were ranked amongst the first ten factors as shown in Table XIII.

TABLE XIII

PERSONAL AND FAMILY FACTORS AS CAUSES OF TEACHER TURNOVER

Number	Factors	Number of Responses	Score
18.	I wished to be closer to a university.	30	106
20.	I preferred to be closer to my husband's (wife's) or boy friend's (girl friend's) place of employment.	28	99
21.	I like to move around.	25	88
17.	I wanted to be closer to a large urban centre.	27	86
22.	I wanted to broaden my experiences.	25	80
19.	I wanted to be nearer my home town (or place of family residence).	13	44

Personal and family factors, as a whole, were definitely indicated as the most important causes of teacher turnover. Only factor No. 19 was not given top priority in selection and even here it was listed on the top half of the scale at thirty-four.

In looking at the first two selections No. 18 and No. 20 it is significant to see that they received thirteen number one responses and twenty-one number one responses respectively which adds up to thirty-four of the possible eighty-five responses for the first selection. In isolating these two factors it was evident that male teachers were prone to select No. 18 and likewise females selected No. 20.

Responses to these two items indicated that teachers felt them to be very significant causes of teacher movement. Factors 21 and 22 also indicate much influence on teacher turnover. It would seem as if the teachers selecting these factors had a personal desire which could not be satisfied if they remained in their present teaching position. This same influence was discussed in related literature in Chapter II of this study. However, personal desire for change, to move around, to broaden one's experience is something ingrained in a human being and it is difficult to determine what creates the desire and what could be done in a school system to meet those personal wishes and whims. All that can be deducted from this study is that there is a considerable group of teachers in the teaching profession today who are prone to change and who like to move around.

The other personal factor (No. 17) that received a good measure of attention from the respondents is one that has been suggested at various times as a contributing factor to teacher movement from rural and remote areas to urban centres. This study seems to support such a supposition. There is also some related information to this desire to be closer to a large urban centre as shown in Table X, Chapter IV. As pointed out these twenty-seven of the forty-nine teachers who responded went to a large urban centre to teach. Others, of course, went to larger centres for various other reasons.

Individual comments by teachers on the result sheet seemed to support the priority given to personal factors. One teacher wrote that

"she enjoyed her year at Thompson and she was most impressed with the progressiveness of the school system" but as her selections of factors indicated and as she admitted she left for personal reasons.

The next group of factors to receive some attention by the respondents were economic factors. Only six factors belong to this group but five of the factors were selected in the first twenty-five scores. They are produced in Table XIV in order of total score and indicated rank for consideration and study.

TABLE XIV
ECONOMIC FACTORS AS CAUSES OF TEACHER TURNOVER

Number	Factors	Number of Responses	Score
31.	I found the cost of travelling to larger population centres was too high.	33	94
33.	I found the cost of rent or boarding accommodation was too high.	27	77
32.	I found the cost of food too high.	21	63
3.	Housing was over priced.	18	55
34.	I felt that teachers' salaries were too low in comparison to salaries of other people.	17	51
35.	I felt that teachers' salaries were too low in comparison to salaries of teachers in other districts.	12	37

These economic factors point to the high cost of food, housing, rent or boarding accommodation and travelling to outside centres. It was somewhat surprising to see that the two factors (No. 34 and No. 35) which are related to salaries were placed at the twenty-first and thirty-third ranking in total scores. Thompson does have some differential in its teacher salary schedule in comparison to the City of Winnipeg but the variation is only from \$300 to \$700 greater depending on where a person is on the schedule. Four teachers made complaints about the high cost of living at Thompson on the result sheet but they did not seem to emphasize this point. Probably the most significant information coming from this part of the study rests in the selection of factor No. 31 as the third highest in the total score and the point to be noted is not its economic importance but rather the question of transportation into remote areas. Communication and transportation though not mentioned as specific factors seem to be intertwining themselves into this study as important influences in the whole area of turnover. An attempt will be made to deal with these key areas in a succeeding chapter.

Thirteen community factors were included in the questionnaire but only two factors on the basis of total score could be classified as being of primary importance. Factor No. 8 related to community isolation was ranked fourth with a value count of ninety. The other factor of primary importance (No. 6) received a score of sixty-nine. There is a relationship here to the first ranking factor No. 18 which could point

to isolation being not so much a geographical separation from other communities and people but rather the failure to bring certain amenities of life as the university and live television to Thompson. Two other factors as shown in Table XV did receive some response from the participants but actually community factors did not seem to be a real cause of dissatisfaction. Several respondents added written comment to the result sheet expressing their gratification of various aspects of the community while pointing out certain local defects. Six teachers made reference to the climate which was inadvertently omitted from the factor list as previously mentioned. But even here the criticism was not harsh as one teacher mentioned "the late springs with continued rain and snow" but she also said "that I didn't find the winters too severe." The community does not seem to be the disadvantage that has been found to be associated with remote communities in other studies of mobility such as Lundrigan's (1966) study of teacher mobility in Newfoundland.

TABLE XV
COMMUNITY FACTORS AS CAUSES OF TEACHER TURNOVER

Number	Factors	Number of Responses	Score
8.	I felt isolated being in Thompson.	31	95
6.	Cultural opportunities were inadequate.	26	69
23.	I found that there was no variety in shopping facilities.	18	50

TABLE XV (CONTINUED)

Number	Factors	Number of Responses	Score
4.	Housing was inadequate.	14	46
1.	I felt restricted because the community lacked recreational and entertainment facilities.	15	40
9.	I found that the people of the community were not sufficiently stimulating.	11	33
11.	It seemed to me that the community was not interested in school affairs.	10	27
5.	Boarding facilities were unacceptable.	8	23
10.	I found that the people of the community tended to regard teaching as an easy and overpaid job.	9	21
7.	I believe that the community tended to restrict the personal or social behavior of the teacher.	8	19
2.	There was little opportunity for unmarried teachers to meet members of the opposite sex.	6	14
15.	I felt that a religious bias existed in the community.	4	10
16.	I felt that the community was too small for me to pursue my anticipated teaching career.	1	4
13.	I felt that there was an unreasonable community restriction on free enquiry and discussion in the classroom.	1	3

There were thirty-four school factors included in the questionnaire, as shown in Table XVI. Response to these factors tended to be

sporadic. In the ranked scores from one to forty, twenty school factors appear and these are almost evenly split between below twenty and above twenty to forty. The highest ranked school factor is number 61 which placed sixth for total score. Respondents made a fair amount of comment about various changes, innovations, new methods, etc., at Thompson. This comment tended to be complimentary for the most part interspersed with occasional criticism. However, there was a definite emphasis from most respondents whether critical or complimentary on the need for more specialized supervisory or consultative staff. Factor No. 48 was given a score of 75 to be placed tenth on the list of factors and it has to be considered important. There may be some connection between factors No. 61 and No. 48. The conclusion could be formed here that principals were not functioning successfully in such a role as instructional leader to provide the type of help the teachers felt they needed with new courses and methods. There is a point to be considered in this area of school factors as related to administration in that comments by participants indicated a growing satisfaction with the system in recent years as compared to a good deal of criticism in the earlier years of operation. Further comment will be made on this point under school board factors.

The other factors that had concern for the teachers involved seemed to be normal for any situation. Reference was made in the factors which are found in the score rating from the twelfth to eighteenth ranking to such things as "too many innovations and changes," "lack of teaching aids and equipment," "insufficient time for preparation and planning," "not enough clerical help" and so forth. Factor

No. 56 which was ranked seventeenth seems to support what has been already said about the need from principals for more instructional leadership and supervisory help. Other school factors in this study did not seem to carry very much weight with the participants.

TABLE XVI
SCHOOL FACTORS AS CAUSES OF TEACHER TURNOVER

Number	Factors	Number of Responses	Score
61.	I felt that specialized supervisory or consultative staff were unavailable.	29	87
48.	I felt that relations between the principal and the staff were characterized by lack of trust and confidence.	21	75
38.	I believe that too many innovations and changes in teaching methods and techniques were introduced at Thompson.	20	66
46.	I felt that I did not have the necessary teaching aids and equipment to do a good job.	18	62
39.	I felt that I needed more time for teaching, preparation, planning and evaluation.	18	61
56.	I felt that new teachers were not given adequate help or leadership by school administration.	19	59
51.	I felt that administrative paper work was unnecessarily burdensome.	19	58
52.	There was a major deficiency in clerical help for teachers.	22	58
43.	I felt that in-service programs were not useful, appropriate and convenient as to frequency and time.	18	48
30.	I found that classes were too large and it made it impossible to give each pupil adequate help and guidance.	18	47
44.	It seemed to me that school administration was more concerned with administrative trivia than with good teaching.	17	46
37.	I felt that I spent too much time on trivial supervisory duties.	15	45

TABLE XVI (CONTINUED)

Number	Factors	Number of Responses	Score
66.	I felt that the future outlook for improvement in working conditions was discouraging.	13	45
36.	I found that the school system required me to adopt a standardized approach to teaching.	14	44
42.	I believe that staff meetings were so controlled that they were of little value.	12	37
50.	I was not given the opportunity to attend conferences and other forms of professional development.	11	30
45.	I found that teachers were primarily interested in salary and fringe benefits.	10	28
47.	I felt that new teachers did not receive orientation to their work and the community.	10	27
40.	I felt that I had little or no opportunity to participate in developing policies for grouping, promotions and control of pupils.	10	26
53.	I felt that new teachers were not made to feel welcome by older teachers.	7	23

Only five pupil factors No. 24 to No. 28 inclusive were included in the questionnaire. As shown in Table XVII the response to these factors was not significant except for factor No. 24. There was some concern about lack of pupil respect for the teacher's position in the community indicated by factor No. 24 with a score of 62. Otherwise it is necessary to go to the thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth rating in the scale to get a response to pupil factors.

The factors related to the school board, as reported in Table XVIII, were placed at the end of the questionnaire. Whether this placement had anything to do with their selection is doubtful as the questions

TABLE XVII
PUPIL FACTORS AS CAUSES OF TEACHER TURNOVER

Number	Factors	Number of Responses	Score
24.	I believe that the pupils were lacking in respect for the teacher's position in the community.	23	62
27.	I believe that educational goals were not appropriate for pupils in this particular community.	13	34
28.	I found that parents showed little interest in the scholastic progress of their children.	12	33
25.	I found that there were too many dull pupils and consequent poor achievement.	7	16
26.	Pupils had a poor educational background for my class.	4	13

TABLE XVIII
SCHOOL BOARD FACTORS AS CAUSES OF TEACHER TURNOVER

Number	Factors	Number of Responses	Score
74.	I felt that some school board members were representative of pressure groups or blocs in the community.	11	27
71.	I felt that school board members actually did not understand education.	4	9
72.	I believe that some school board members actually did not understand education.	3	8
75.	I felt that outstanding teachers were not recognized and rewarded by the school board.	3	7
73.	I found that the school board members were not willing to make educationally sound decisions when faced with community opposition.	2	5

were on cards; nevertheless with the exception of factor No. 74 they received little attention from the respondents. Factor No. 74 did receive a score of 27 but this score placed it well down the list at fortieth ranking and the criticism here could be aimed at pressure groups as much as the school board.

Comment was made previously under school factors as to criticism by several respondents of administration in the earlier period of school operations. It was somewhat difficult to distinguish from the written reports as to whether the criticism was located with administration through the principals or with employer control through school board or official trustee. One respondent probably summed up the situation best by stating the problem thus: "Inadequacy of supervisory staff at the principal's and superintendent's level as well as the control of the entire educational system on the local level vested in a single individual. (Too difficult for one individual, new to the province, and therefore to its educational system, to be responsible for the administration of education in the vast number of other duties--town administrator, official trustee, etc.)."

In contrast to the earlier period the response to the questionnaire was limited in relation to administration and school board control in recent years. This response was generally complimentary rather than critical in this same period and it can only be assumed from these results that neither administration nor school board were significant factors in teachers leaving Thompson.

CHAPTER VI

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

This chapter will review and analyze the answers to the five open-ended questions included in one part of the questionnaire.

The first question to which the respondents were asked to reply dealt with changes in the Thompson School System that would help to retain a larger portion of its staff. Table XIX is used to give information related to this question.

Fourteen suggestions were made singly by teachers, or one per teacher, but these have not been included in the list of proposals. This figure with the total of fifty-one replies shown in Table XIX, indicates that sixty-five teachers responded to the open-ended question on what they thought would help Thompson to retain more teachers.

It is interesting to note that limited reference was made here to the first five choices of individual factors. However, in analyzing the factors with the highest five scores, it is evident that teachers could not make practical suggestions for change to improve or reduce the cause of these factors. Isolation and a university location are controlled by geographical distance and population figures.

On the basis of total number of respondents to the question of changes for improvement, economic factors received greater emphasis here than they did in the questionnaire. Nineteen teachers suggested improved salaries, long service salary bonus or cheaper housing.

TABLE XIX

CHANGES SUGGESTED BY RESPONDENTS THAT WOULD HELP TO RETAIN
A LARGER PORTION OF THE THOMPSON STAFF

Suggestions	Number of Teachers Making Suggestions
Better teacher preparation before trying new methods.	12
More attractive salary schedule.	10
Lower priced housing.	7
Efficient and professional administrators (better principals).	7
More preparation time - clerical help.	3
Better accommodation for married teachers.	2
Opportunity for greater teacher participation in operation of system.	2
Long service salary bonus.	2
Fewer innovations and changes introduced all at once.	2
Better transportation.	2
More married men and women.	2
	--
Total suggestions with 2 or more responses	51

Salaries were ranked twenty-first and thirty-second on the questionnaire results. The suggestions for improvement seem to be realistic and they are sufficiently significant to deserve consideration.

There were two comments made by teachers to the open-ended question being reviewed that seem to merit inclusion at this time. One teacher reported:

Turnover is so great because it is a 'young' town, with many 'young,' single teachers who do not have homes and families there. I can think of fifteen teacher friends who left the same year as myself, and none left because of the school system.

The other comment was:

A constant developing system can and should be able to retain teachers.

Generally speaking, the teachers were not critical of the school system and they seemed to have difficulty in making suggestions to improve the system beyond the suggestion as pointed out here and in the questionnaire, that teachers needed more help in preparing for new courses through more specialized and better supervisory and consultative staff.

The second question in this section of the measuring instrument, is actually a follow-up to the first question. It deals with changes that could induce the respondent to return to the Thompson School System.

Sixty teachers gave an answer to the question. Twenty-six teachers of this group replied that no changes would induce them to return, but very few of these answers were in the form of a firm negative. Many of the respondents replied that no changes were needed in the system and they made comments complimentary to the school establishment. Only four people submitted critical answers with a pointed comment

to say they would not return.

Better salaries received support from eight teachers. Suitable housing was suggested by six teachers, and a good road to Winnipeg was selected by four teachers as a change to bring them back to Thompson. Other changes receiving some support were: more clerical help, university courses offered at Thompson, and teacher assistance of a supervisory nature.

The information gained from this question supports in good part what was said in relation to question 1, except that more emphasis seemed to emerge in answers to question 2 on matters of transportation and university facilities. Question number three asked the respondents "What influenced you to go to Thompson, initially, to teach?" This question brought a reply from eighty people. Forty-five of the group replied to the effect that they went because of a spirit of adventure, to see the North or to be a modern pioneer. The following reply from a teacher best exemplifies the replies received from this large group who went north for adventure when she said: "The adventure of being a modern pioneer and growing with a new town greatly influenced me."

A husband being transferred to Thompson or being employed there was given as a reason by twenty people to go there, initially. Four teachers mentioned salary as an influence and the same number mentioned the opportunity to get away from a small town. These people mentioned Thompson offered something different without going to Winnipeg.

One person mentioned getting there through a promotional opportunity and another said a dream influenced her to go to Thompson.

TABLE XX

HOW LONG DID YOU INTEND TO REMAIN IN THOMPSON?

Years	Number
One year	17
Two years	28
Three years	5
Four years	0
Five years	1
Undecided	19
Permanent or several years	9
Total	79

As indicated in Table XX, there was a good response to question four on how long the respondents intended to remain in Thompson. It is interesting to compare the results to this question with the actual years of service shown in Table IV. The main difference in the two tables is revealed under the one year of service where only seventeen teachers proposed to stay for one year and actually thirty-eight left in 1968 after one year of service. This group with one year of teaching experience seems to be in good part responsible for the high rate of turnover. It would seem as if the nineteen people who went to Thompson undecided as to how long they were going to stay, must have

left after one year of service.

On the other hand, twenty-eight respondents indicated they intended to stay for two years. According to Table IV thirty left after two years of service. If these figures have any significance, it means many teachers going to Thompson carried through on their original intention as to their length of tenure there.

The serious part of the situation is revealed when the figures for one year, two years and undecided are combined to get sixty-four teachers who initially did not intend to remain beyond two years. In comparison as shown in Table IV, sixty-eight teachers left with only one or two years of service. The question being considered in this section on how long teachers proposed to remain at Thompson, tends to demonstrate the weakness of the school system in holding power of teachers with one and two years of experience.

A comment by a teacher seemed to symbolize the trend to leave after a short period of teaching. This teacher wrote: "Like most teachers or employees in Thompson we treated this as an experience and thought in terms of one or two years."

A check was made on participants who replied to this question to see if any variation existed between male and female as to proposed length of service. There did not seem to be any significant variation.

The last question, in this group of five, was related to the matter of isolation, with the related distance from a larger urban centre with the loss of a university and cultural advantages. This question received a good response when eighty-eight teachers replied.

These replies are tabulated in Table XXI.

TABLE XXI

HOW IMPORTANT WAS THE WHOLE MATTER OF ISOLATION, WITH THE LONG DISTANCE FROM A LARGE URBAN CENTRE WITH ITS AMENITIES OF LIFE AS A UNIVERSITY, AND CULTURAL ADVANTAGES, IN YOUR DECISION TO LEAVE THOMPSON?

Suggestions	Number of Replies by Teachers
No importance	35
Very important	18
Not too influential	16
Small importance	4
Isolation depressing but not a factor	1
Need a better road to Thompson	2
Need a university	12
Total replies	88

The responses to this question give a fairly clear interpretation of the reaction of the respondents to this whole matter of isolation. The eighteen teachers who mentioned isolation as being very important likely include the same people who selected it in the questionnaire, where it received a score of ninety-five to be ranked third in selection of factors.

Several teachers mentioned in their replies that isolation was not a factor in leaving, as they accepted the condition of living away from large population areas when they went to Thompson. Others mentioned that Thompson has many modern conveniences which help to compensate for any isolation factor. The following three excerpts from comments by teachers to this question on isolation, tend to be self-explanatory of the total issue. They are as follows:

A better road out of Thompson would induce many to go there, because initially, it is a beautiful, modern, new clean city.

For its size, Thompson is as advanced in this area as could be expected. They'll never compete with Toronto, New York, Venice, etc., so why try.

It was not isolation at all. The isolation factor was not a reason for leaving. All the necessities for comfort, plus modern conveniences, were available.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

This study was undertaken with the intention of trying to determine what was correlated with teacher turnover in the town of Thompson, or the School District of Mystery Lake. Though attention was focused on a specific district in this study, the problem of teacher turnover or mobility, seems to be one of provincial, national and even international dimensions. Specifically, the research undertaken was aimed at determining the major causes of why teachers decided to move from the schools in which they were teaching at Thompson in the period from 1958 to 1968.

To measure the factors instrumental in creating teacher turnover, a questionnaire including seventy-five questions was constructed. These questions were related to;

- A. Personal and Family Factors;
- B. Economic Factors;
- C. Community Factors;
- D. School Factors;
- E. Pupil Factors;
- F. School Board Factors.

A mailing list of one hundred and forty-eight teachers was prepared after encountering considerable difficulty in getting accurate

addresses for the teachers involved. Twenty-three teachers could not be reached in this total group, which left a possible one hundred and twenty-five respondents, from which ninety-eight replied to the questionnaire.

The measuring instrument was devised in three parts. The questionnaire including the seventy-five questions contained the main part of the instrument. The other parts included questions related to personal and professional information and five open-ended questions which provided respondents the opportunity to offer personal ideas and advice on questions and suggested changes connected with the Thompson school system.

This study, on the basis of the information provided through the three parts of the measuring instrument, attempted to identify the factors or clusters of factors which induced teachers to leave their teaching position at Thompson.

Certain points need to be recognized when interpreting the conclusions of this study with any related implications and recommendations. The first point to be remembered is that conclusions are based on responses to individual factors, personal and professional information and comments offered by respondents. The second significant point to be noted is that the measurement instrument may not have adequately measured certain factors that might be closely related to mobility and certain factors may have been omitted completely, such as climate in the list of seventy-five questions. Another point to be taken into consideration rests in the total number of respondents who constitute only about

two-thirds of the teachers who have taught at Thompson. However, over seventy-five per cent of the teachers replied who were contacted. The fourth point to be remembered at this time is that an attempt is being made to present an assessment of only the major findings with related implications. Finally, the conclusions formed here are based on the entire period of operation of the Thompson School System and it is not confined to a limited period of time.

II. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclusion

The participants in this study were a young group of people. A modal age level of slightly more than twenty-eight years was reported for males, and a modal age level of just over twenty-four years was given for females. The Thompson School System has a young staff. The modal age for the present teachers is close to a year younger for males and about a year and a half for females. According to other studies on turnover, age is a critical determinant of turnover patterns. It seems that teachers during the initial stages of their careers generally have more opportunities and alternatives available to them. These choices that exist to young people, must be accepted as facilitating their mobility. Thompson is a "young" town or city, with many young teachers who constitute a situation suggestive to change and turnover.

Implication

The Thompson School System is vulnerable to teacher turnover on

the basis of the age level of their teachers. Information gathered from this study points out that young people going to Thompson to teach had determined in advance their intention of remaining for only a year or two years of service.

Conclusion

A group of teachers exist, such as presently teach at Thompson, who are prone to change and who like to move around. Factors as "I like to move around," and "I wanted to broaden my experiences" were placed high on the list in the selection of individual causes of movement. A large number of the respondents indicated they went to Thompson initially because of a spirit of adventure, to see the North. This propensity to move helped to create a desire to go to a northern community originally, but it seems to be a factor likewise in taking the same people away from the original community. The information obtained here adds support to the theory that certain teachers are characteristically "turnover prone."

Implication

The administration responsible for staffing could accept the propensity on the part of teachers to move as a natural occurrence and consequently, anticipate a higher rate of turnover where youth and inexperience prevails. However, there does seem to be an area here which needs study and research to find out just what creates this desire to move and to determine if anything can be done to satisfy this

personal need and thus increase the holding power for a particular district in retention of teachers.

Conclusion

Usually a number of factors influence a teacher's decision to move. Related literature on turnover points to a multiplicity of factors influencing a person to move. This situation, where a group or cluster of factors affects a decision to move, did not seem to prevail to the same extent at Thompson as in other localities where turnover has been studied. Only twenty-seven respondents selected a group of factors and all but two of them put their grouping in the same rank order as their single factors.

The single factors selected ranged over a fairly extensive area. Approximately half of the respondents selected one to ten factors and the other half from ten to twenty. Only six respondents selected a single factor.

Implication

The teachers involved in this study seemed to be able to select on the basis of rank order the factors responsible for their turnover. Their selection points to various causes with related factors. There exists a need to consider the problem of turnover in the total setting in which the teacher works.

Conclusion

The personal and professional characteristics of the respondents

varied in the selection of a few factors, particularly the two factors which rated one and two in total score. However, these two factors tend to apply to a particular sex as related to selection. The differences in teacher response to most factors were not significant on the basis of personal and professional characteristics and it has to be concluded here that selected variables as sex, size of school, school system, grades taught and size of community did not reveal important differences to teacher response.

Implication

The conclusion reached here does not rule out the implication that the solution to a problem must be determined in accordance with the particular situation under review and the individual teachers concerned. There does not seem to be a universal or general solution that is applicable to the problem of turnover.

Conclusion

The selection of factors by respondents with individual comment by teachers seem to add up to a problem area associated with transportation and communication. The problem was not spelled out specifically in the results of the study, but when you start to put pieces together an inevitable conclusion materializes. The lack of university facilities, the desire for cultural needs, the inability to travel to any marked extent determined by poor road conditions, and a high cost factor for other means of transportation and general restrictions on the whole area of communication, with particularly the urban areas, all combined

as reasons to create a major problem area in transportation and communication. A recent study, by the Educational Field Services and the Faculty of Education of the University of Calgary in Wheatland County, on teacher turnover points out transportation or condition of the roads as an important factor in teacher retention. The problem of isolation which was ranked third on the list of contributing factors to turnover is, in itself, deeply linked to the associated problem areas of transportation and communication. It seemed to be impossible to avoid the conclusion in this study that restrictions imposed on what has come to be accepted as modern day transportation and communication facilities, contributed substantially to teacher movement from Thompson.

Implication

Transportation and communication contribute indirectly to teacher movement and it is difficult to pin-point them as specific causes. Furthermore, they are not controllable factors insofar as the teachers or the school system are concerned.

These factors, if they exist to the extent believed or assumed in this study, need attention and careful consideration from provincial and national authorities and institutions.

Conclusion

Usually a group of extremely dissatisfied teachers, or what may be called "chronic complainers," emerge in a study of this type. Outside of three or four participants at the most, such a group was not

prominent in this work on turnover. In fact, the opposite attitude seemed to prevail on the part of the respondents in that quite a number of them were very complimentary in their comments about the school system. This reaction seems to point to the conclusion that many teachers, particularly in recent years, did not find too many reasons for complaint in the actual operation of the school system itself. Most of the criticism, of a harsh nature, was almost invariably aimed at the school system in its early years of operation.

In the selection of factors related to the school, the responses could not be interpreted as condemnation. The factors that received attention as the need for specialized supervisory and consultative staff, the introduction of many innovations and changes and the lack of necessary teaching aids and equipment are all indications of a healthy vibrant system that is trying to do something for education. The one school factor where the response has a touch of criticism, is aimed at the relationship that existed between principals and staff and their failure to give sufficient help and desired leadership.

It was significant that teachers seemed to have some difficulty in developing suggestions as to how the school system could be improved. The operation of the school system at present received considerable support. It is inevitable to conclude that the school system in itself, is not a strong contributing factor in teachers leaving Thompson.

Implication

The school system needs to assess its administration and supervision

policies insofar as these areas relate to teacher support, guidance and consultation. It could be suggested that introduction of innovations and changes need to be slowed down or supervisory and consultative support increased. Information available here would point to the continued development of the school system within the framework of present policy. The implication is also evident that it is within this area of school direction that improvements can continue to be made, in that factors of concern to teachers are at least partially controllable. Through these continued improvements and the development of an invigorating and larger school system, teacher turnover will likely decrease. Teachers are reporting to the effect that they intend to return to the system at a later date.

Conclusion

Teachers indicated that economic circumstances related to high cost of living accommodations and the generally high cost of living at Thompson, influenced their turnover. Complaints by respondents were not aimed at the salary schedule so much in itself, but the feeling seemed to exist that something in the way of a bonus should be granted to compensate for the extra cost of living in a northern area. The present salary schedule does not seem to make sufficient allowance over the provincial schedules, according to the people involved in this study, to compensate for the extra cost of living at Thompson. The suggestions made were to link a compensatory feature of economic return to the schedule.

Implication

This finding suggests that if the Thompson school system wants to increase the possibility of retaining staff, then consideration might be given to a system of bonuses as a supplement to their present salary schedule.

Conclusion

After consideration of the responses by teachers to individual factors and the comments offered by them, it seems inevitable to conclude that personal and family factors are key reasons in teacher turnover. They seemed to be the most influential group of causes in teacher turnover wherein respondents indicated a strong desire to maintain their family units, to improve their education, to gain a more varied teaching experience; and to broaden their opportunity for personal participation in more activities; and to observe a wider range of events.

Implication

Personal and family factors, though influential in teacher turnover, are probably the least controllable. These factors in part were discussed in the conclusion as related to problem areas of transportation and communication. There does not seem to be much that local authorities can do at present to alleviate personal and family factors. The Thompson area through rapid growth, improved transportation and communication, will probably reach a size and location in the near future that will help to dissipate several of the present causes of personal and family factors creating turnover.

Conclusions

Many of the findings connected with this study do not correlate with results of research in related literature. For instance, administrative factors have been identified in related literature as a major cause of mobility, but this study does not reveal such results. Pupil factors and working conditions have been rated highly in some studies but they did not receive strong support here. School and community factors, through receiving a fair amount of support in this study, were given greater recognition in other studies. Certain aspects of economic factors as low salaries, were not given the same support as given by teachers in related studies. Factors associated with religious bias in school and community received limited support in this study in comparison with selections otherwise.

Implications

Geographical location could be a determinant in locating causes for teacher turnover. Authorities should exercise caution in attempting to explain turnover problems in terms of research done in other geographical areas.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Present school board policy should be continued, for the most part. Reports from respondents to this study are encouraging, and the Thompson School System seems to be developing, in recent years, considerable teacher support and favorable comment. On the basis

of this teacher judgment, recruitment and retention should improve as the reputation of the system continues to receive good publicity and favorable recognition.

2. There seems to be a need for beneficial orientation programs for the staff generally and for new teachers in particular. The services of consultants and instructional supervisors on an increasing scale are suggested to authorities. A little praise and appreciation from administration, particularly the principals, would probably render substantial dividends in light of the large number of young and beginning teachers on staff in a geographically remote area away from their families.
3. The concept of the principal's authority and status in the school system should be reviewed. As the prestige, influence and power of the principal increases, it is suggested they need to be more fully acquainted with the theory of educational administration; they may need help in re-assessing and re-drafting their own concepts so they may provide the administrative and instructional leadership that teachers feel they are not getting at present. Lines of communication within the school need to be studied and in some cases, re-opened.
4. In several instances it is known that creative and innovative teachers are drawn to a system which seems to be pioneering new ideas in education. Experimental conditions provide motivation for certain people. It is suggested the Thompson School System could increase its power of retention by continuing to develop and promote

an experimental situation. It is necessary to qualify this suggestion by recommending that sufficient and qualified instructional and supervisory services be likewise provided.

5. Other recommendations that could be considered are:

- (a) The Thompson School System may be too selective in endeavoring to recruit the best beginning teachers. This type of teacher is usually the first to leave.
- (b) The school system should endeavor to keep in contact with former teachers with an open invitation to return to duty. Several teachers indicated their intention to return when circumstances were favorable to them.
- (c) There seems to be a need to increase the modal age of teachers. It is suggested older teachers with more experience be recruited. Besides increasing retention it would possibly give better balance to the total teaching staff.
- (d) On the basis of information developed in this study there seems to be a fair number of teachers who support the idea of a "loyalty" or "long-service" bonus.
- (e) A "pre-determination" interview should be incorporated into recruitment procedures. An endeavor should be made to determine how long the applicant intended to remain if offered a position on staff. Applicants who proposed to remain beyond two years should be given preference over other teachers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, S. A. and R. S. Conville. "Teacher Turnover in Coles County, Illinois," Educational Administration and Supervision XXXXII (1956), pp. 10-19.
- Annual Report of the Department of Education, Province of Manitoba, Winnipeg, June 1960.
- Annual Survey of Teacher Retention and Losses, Manitoba Teachers' Society, Winnipeg, September 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968.
- Baer, M. F. "Why People Move." Personnel and Guidance Journal 45, January 1967, pp. 524-525.
- Blocker, C. E. and R. C. Richardson. "Twenty-five Years of Morale Research, A Critical Review." Journal of Educational Psychology, 37, January 1963, p. 208.
- Brayfield, A. H. and H. F. Rothe. "An Index of Job Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology, 35, October 1951, pp. 307-311.
- Bruce, W. C. "Teacher Turnover." The American School Board Journal, 149, November 1964, p. 29.
- Butefish, W. L. "An Analysis of Causative Factors in Teacher Mobility." (Doctoral Thesis, Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas, 1967).
- Chamchuk, N. J. Teacher Mobility and Retention in Alberta, Department of Education, Edmonton, May 1966.
- Chamchuk, N. J. "Descriptive and Comparative Survey of Drop-outs From the Active Teaching Profession in Alberta in 1965." (Master's Thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966).
- Charters, Jr., W. W. "What Causes Teacher Turnover?" School Review, October 1956, pp. 294-299.
- Chase, Francis. "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching." Phi Delta Kappan XXXIII, November 1951, pp. 127-132.
- Dey, Glen R. and Henry M. Reitan. "Geographical Mobility: A Needed Dimension." Vocational Guidance Quarterly, June 1967, pp. 289-292.
- Gardell, Dr. Bertil. International Joint Seminar on Geographical and Occupational Mobility of Manpower. Manpower and Social Affairs Division, Paris, 1963.

- Hardin, E. "Job Satisfaction and the Desire for Change." Journal Applied Psychology, 51, February 1967, pp. 20-27.
- Hart, J. W. "Socially Mobile Teachers and Classroom Atmosphere." Journal Educational Research, 59, December 1965, pp. 166-168.
- Hohn, Eric G. "A Study of the Causes of Teacher Transfer in a School System." (Master's Thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964).
- Hutchinson, T. and A. Roe. "Studies of Occupational History: Attractiveness of Occupational Groups of the Roe System." Journal Counseling Psychology, 15, March 1968, pp. 107-110.
- Koch, E. L., et al. Teacher Mobility Study in a Rural Alberta County System, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Calgary, 1967.
- Lundigran, J. H. "Factors Related to Inter-School Mobility Among Certificated Teachers in Newfoundland." (Master's Thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966).
- McCarty, D. J. and V. C. Nuccio. "Joint Study of Personal Relationships." (Mimeographed - presented to Third Annual Conference of New York State Association of School District Administrators, October 1963, pp. 6-9.
- Minnesota Manpower Mobilities - Bulletin No. 10. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, U.S.A., 1950.
- Palmer, Gladys L. Labor Mobility in Six Cities. A Report on the Survey of Patterns and Factors in Labor Mobility. Social Science Research Council, New York, 1954.
- Parai, Louis. Immigration and Emigration of Professional and Skilled Manpower During the Post-War Period. Economic Council of Canada, June, 1965.
- Parnes, Herbert S. Research on Labor Mobility, Bulletin 65. Science Research Council, New York, 1954.
- Peques, F. J. "Mobility and the Expansion of Quality." Journal Higher Education, 37, March 1966, pp. 163-165.
- Phillips, B. N., E. Bonk and J. R. Mitchell. "Can We Reduce Teacher Turnover?" Phi Delta Kappan, 38, April 1957, p. 272.
- Polianski, A. N. Main Patterns of Net Migratory Moves in Canada Between 1956 and 1961. Economics and Research Branch, Department of Labour, Ottawa, 1965.

Report on Teacher Mobility. Manitoba Association of School Trustees, 1965-68.

Report on Teacher Recruitment. Edmonton, The Department of Education, October 1965.

Schutze, R., J. Artis, and J. A. Beegle. "The Measurement of Community Satisfaction and the Decision to Migrate." Rural Sociology, 28, September 1963, pp. 279-283.

Stewart, E. C. "Factors Involved in the Withdrawal of Teachers Who Held the Same Position in Indiana." From 1951 to 1958. (Doctoral Thesis, University of Indiana, Bloomington, Indiana, 1963).

Van Zwoll, James A. School of Personnel Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964, pp. 312-313.

White, K. "Socio-Economic Factors and the Mobility of Beginning Elementary Teachers." Teachers College Journal, 37, March 1966, pp. 177-178.

Young, J. E. M. A Survey of Teachers Attitudes Toward Certain Aspects of Their Profession. Canadian Educational Research. D.7. June 1967, pp. 112-129.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE, INSTRUCTION SHEET

AND RESULT SHEET

The Questionnaire included the following 75 factors, each printed on a separate orange-colored card. Ten extra green blank cards were also included.

1. I felt restricted because the community lacked recreational and entertainment facilities.
2. There was little opportunity for unmarried teachers to meet members of the opposite sex.
3. Housing was over priced.
4. Housing was inadequate.
5. Boarding facilities were unacceptable.
6. Cultural opportunities were inadequate.
7. I believe that the community tended to restrict the personal or social behavior of the teacher.
8. I felt isolated being in Thompson.
9. I found that the people of the community were not sufficiently stimulating.
10. I found that the people of the community tended to regard teaching as an easy and overpaid job.
11. It seemed to me that the community was not interested in school affairs.
12. I found that the school imposed restrictions on free enquiry and discussion in the classroom.
13. I felt that there was an unreasonable community restriction on free enquiry and discussion in the classroom.
14. I felt that a religious bias existed in the school.
15. I felt that a religious bias existed in the community.
16. I felt that the community was too small for me to pursue my anticipated teaching career.
17. I wanted to be closer to a large urban centre.
18. I wished to be closer to a university.

19. I wanted to be nearer my home town (or place of family residence).
20. I preferred to be closer to my husband's (wife's) or boy friend's (girl friend's) employment.
21. I like to move around.
22. I wanted to broaden my experiences.
23. I found that there was no variety in shopping facilities.
24. I believe that the pupils were lacking in respect for the teacher's position in the community.
25. I found there were too many dull pupils and consequent poor achievement.
26. Pupils had a poor educational background for my class.
27. I believe that educational goals were not appropriate for pupils in this particular community.
28. I found that parents showed little interest in the scholastic progress of their children.
29. I felt that I was given insufficient time away from the pupils during the day.
30. I found that classes were too large and it made it impossible to give each pupil adequate help and guidance.
31. I found the cost of travelling to larger population centres was too high.
32. I found the cost of food too high.
33. I found the cost of rent or boarding accommodation was too high.
34. I felt that teachers' salaries were too low in comparison to salaries of other people.
35. I felt that teachers' salaries were too low in comparison to salaries of teachers in other districts.
36. I found that the school system required me to adopt a standardized approach to teaching.
37. I felt that I spent too much time on trivial supervisory duties.

38. I believe that too many innovations and changes in teaching methods and techniques were introduced at Thompson.
39. I felt that I needed more time for teaching, preparation, planning and evaluation.
40. I felt that I had little or no opportunity to participate in developing policies for grouping, promotions and control of pupils.
41. I felt that I had little or no opportunity to participate in program development in the school.
42. I believe that staff meetings were so controlled that they were of little value.
43. I felt that in-service programs were not useful, appropriate and convenient as to frequency and time.
44. It seemed to me that school administration was more concerned with administrative trivia than with good teaching.
45. I found that teachers were primarily interested in salary and fringe benefits.
46. I felt that I did not have the necessary teaching aids and equipment to do a good job.
47. I felt that new teachers did not receive orientation to their work and the community.
48. I felt that relations between the principal and the staff were characterized by lack of trust and confidence.
49. I usually found out about important matters through the grapevine.
50. I was not given the opportunity to attend conferences and other forms of professional development.
51. I felt that administrative paper work was unnecessarily burdensome.
52. There was a major deficiency in clerical help for teachers.
53. I felt that new teachers were not made to feel welcome by older teachers.
54. I was required to teach subjects for which I had little or no background.
55. I was unable to make use of my specialized training.

56. I felt that new teachers were not given adequate help or leadership by school administration.
57. I found that the school at which I taught was too small in number of teachers.
58. I felt supervision tended to be too rigid.
59. I felt that supervision was too authoritarian.
60. I believe that supervision was too arbitrary.
61. I felt that specialized supervisory or consultative staff were unavailable.
62. I believe there were excessive numbers of meetings to attend as staff, workshop, Teacher Society and Home and School.
63. Incompatibility which existed between other staff members and myself resulted in unpleasant relationships and occurrences.
64. I felt that the work load was not distributed fairly among staff members.
65. It seemed to me that class interruptions were so frequent as to interfere with my teaching.
66. I felt that the future outlook for improvement in working conditions was discouraging.
67. I felt that classroom visits by administration personnel were too frequent.
68. I felt that the principal and superintendent failed to appreciate and praise desirable results produced by staff members.
69. I felt that pressure groups in the community were able to exert unfair influence on the school.
70. It seemed to me that I was never accepted as a member of the community through its organizations and social life.
71. I felt that school board members actually did not understand education.
72. I believe that some school board members actually did not understand education.

73. I found that school boards members were not willing to make educationally sound decisions when faced with community opposition.
74. I felt that some school board members were representative of pressure groups or blocs in the community.
75. I felt that outstanding teachers were not recognized and rewarded by the school board.

INSTRUCTIONS

You will find in your envelope a deck of 75 cards and pieces of paper asking for general responses and a response sheet.

1. Pick up the deck of cards. Each card has printed on it a statement of something that could have influenced your leaving Thompson. There are also ten blank cards.
2. Sort the printed deck into two piles -- one pile will contain statements describing factors that did influence your leaving, the other pile will contain ones that did not.
3. If you need to, write on the blank cards anything that did cause you to leave that isn't included already.
You **MUST** return those cards you write on. **DO NOT** return the printed cards.

4. Now take the pile of factors that did influence you and sort it into rank order, i.e., from the most important influence to the least.

RECORD THIS RANK ORDER ON THE SHEET PROVIDED, USING THE NUMBER OF EACH STATEMENT.

Thus if you thought statement 27 was the most critical reason why you left Thompson, mark a 27 opposite position 1, and so on, till you have entered all the cards in the "influences" pile.

5. It is obvious that factors in combination, rather than factors just singly, may have caused you to leave. Write down in the space to the right of the rank-order column the numbers of statements that represent, in combination, the influence that caused you to leave.
6. Return this "Results Sheet," any cards you have written on, and the questionnaire in the envelope provided.

COLUMN 1	COLUMN 2
Rank Order of Influence	Statement Number
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.
12.
13.
14.
15.
16.
17.
18.
19.
20.
21.
22.
23.
24.
25.
26.
27.
28.
29.
30.
31.
32.
33.
34.
35.
36.
37.
38.
39.
40.

RESULT SHEET

.....Name (print)

COLUMN 3

(In this space. list that single combination of factors that was most influential in your leaving Thompson.)

If more space is needed, write on back.

APPENDIX B

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE

AND

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DATA

DIRECTIONS:

The information given herein will be treated as grouped data and it will not reflect the individual position of the respondent. Your anonymity will be definitely protected and preserved.

1. Your name:
2. Your sex: Male Female

INFORMATION BASED ON TEACHING EXPERIENCE AT THOMPSON:

3. Your age when you left Thompson:
4. The year in which you left Thompson:
5. Number of years you taught at Thompson:
6. Grade or grades you taught at Thompson:
7. Number of teachers in school, where you taught, at Thompson:

INFORMATION BASED ON TEACHING EXPERIENCE SINCE THOMPSON:

8. How many years have you taught since leaving Thompson?.....
9. What grade or grades are you teaching now?
10. Which is the approximate population of the community in which you taught immediately after leaving Thompson?
11. How many years of teaching experience have you?.....
What job(s) have you had since leaving Thompson?
.....
.....
.....

Check the item which will describe your occupation or activity for the school year after leaving Thompson.

1. Teaching for another school board in Manitoba.
2. Teaching for another school board in a different province.
3. Becoming married and starting housekeeping.

4. Married woman returning to home duties.
5. In a non-teaching occupation (specify).
6. Taking further training (academic or professional).
7. Retiring or superannuated.
8. Other (specify)

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

.....
Name

Please respond to each of the following questions:

1. What changes in the Thompson School System do you think would help to retain a larger portion of its staff?
.....
.....
.....
2. What changes could induce you to return to the Thompson School System?
.....
.....
.....
3. What influenced you to go to Thompson, initially, to teach?
.....
.....
.....
4. How long did you intend to remain when you originally went to Thompson to teach?
.....
.....
.....
5. How important was the whole matter of isolation, with the long distance from a large urban center with its amenities of life as a university and cultural advantages, in your decision to leave Thompson?
.....
.....
.....

APPENDIX C

INTRODUCTORY LETTER

AND

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

September 30, 1968.

Avenue,
Winnipeg 16, Manitoba.

Dear Teacher:

In making choices to move into or out of a job or a community, there are many factors which, singly or in combination, influence our decisions. By means of the enclosed instrument it is hoped to gain some insights into the factors which led to your deciding to leave the teaching profession in Thompson. We hope to do these things: (a) identify factors which did influence your decision to leave teaching in Thompson; (b) to identify the most and least important of these factors taken singly; and (c) to identify the critical combination of circumstances that led to your leaving teaching in Thompson.

This is part of a nation-wide survey of teacher turnover in frontier communities. We want to find out if there are conditions common to all such communities that lead to teacher turnover, and after identifying these conditions it may be possible to make administrative decisions to alleviate circumstances for future generations of teachers.

This survey is being done in collaboration with Interdisciplinary Research at the University of Manitoba. It is being supported by the Manitoba Educational Research Council. This study of teacher turnover at Thompson has been discussed with the President and General Secretary of the Manitoba Teachers' Society and they have expressed themselves as in favour of it. I am an Inspector of Schools with the Department of Education located in Metropolitan Winnipeg with no duties to perform in the Thompson area. I have been granted permission from the Department of Education to pursue this study and to endeavour to obtain my Masters degree in Education through the thesis based on this project.

Your co-operation is sincerely requested in the completion of the attached questionnaire and related information. Please feel free to respond to the instrument carefully and with complete frankness. Your identity will be absolutely kept in secret.

Thank you for your participation in this study.

Yours truly,

D. H. Stewart,
Inspector of Schools.

/mg
Enc.

November 8, 1968.

Avenue,
Winnipeg 16, Manitoba.

Dear Teacher or Former Teacher:

An instrument to determine causes of teacher turnover or mobility as related to the town of Thompson was sent to you some time ago. Considerable difficulty developed in getting the correct mailing addresses for the one hundred and eighty teachers who have left Thompson since the inception of the school system. It is possible the instrument was delayed through faulty addressing in getting to you and you have needed extra time to complete it. To make this study successful a good return from the respondents is needed. If you can possibly find a few minutes to complete the questionnaire and send the results in the previously enclosed envelope, your cooperation and support would be very much appreciated. An extra one cent stamp is included to meet increased postal rates.

I could mention that I entered into this study with the Faculty of Education and Interdisciplinary Research at the University of Manitoba with the understanding that this type of research was going to be of value to the general cause of education and to the teaching profession. The successful completion of this first step in the total plan of research is absolutely necessary if further studies connected with various aspects of teacher mobility are to be continued as presently planned. I am now concerned that the whole project shall fail unless a better response to the questionnaire develops. We do need your help and support. I will readily admit I do not like answering questionnaires any more than you do but this is one time when I do need your assistance.

Your contribution to this study on mobility is humbly solicited and I would like to thank you for your help.

Yours truly,

D. H. Stewart,
Inspector of Schools.

/mg