

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

### **University Microfilms**

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

72-23,115

STONE, Bert, 1938-  
THE EFFECT OF CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS ON TEACHER  
SELECTION DECISIONS.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1972  
Education, administration

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© 1972

BERT STONE

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA  
GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE EFFECT OF CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS ON  
TEACHER SELECTION DECISIONS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

BERT STONE

Norman, Oklahoma

1972

THE EFFECT OF CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS ON  
TEACHER SELECTION DECISIONS

APPROVED BY

*Jack F. Parker*

*Mary Clare Petty*

*Phil B. ...*

*Donald ...*

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have

indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

DEDICATED TO:

BARBARA

A wonderful person, a dear wife, and an able  
research assistant. Without her encour-  
agement, gentle prodding, and timely  
criticisms this study would not  
have been possible.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to the many people who contributed their time and efforts to help make this study possible. The most significant such person is my advisor, Dr. Jack F. Parker, whose patience and understanding must surely rival that of Job. His guidance, encouragement, and criticisms at various stages of the study were invaluable to me.

Appreciation is also in order for Dr. Mary Clare Petty, Dr. Robert Bibens, and Dr. Gerald Kidd, the other members of my graduate committee. All were quite generous with their time, advice, and assistance. It is doubtful that this study could have been completed without their cooperation.

Special recognition is due Dr. Ralph B. Butler and Dr. Bill Perry, two friends who contributed great amounts of time and energy helping me conduct the research necessary for this study. I would also like to thank Dr. Gene Shepard, Assistant Professor of Education, University of Oklahoma; Dr. Vernon McAllister, Director of Personnel, Midwest City, Oklahoma, Public Schools; Mr. Lester N. Reed, Superintendent

of Schools, Norman, Oklahoma; and Mr. John Sadberry, Director of Secondary School Personnel, Oklahoma City Public Schools for taking time out from their busy schedules to serve as subjects. Recognition is also due the graduate students of Dr. Parker's first semester, 1970-71 class in school personnel administration who so graciously consented to serve as subjects in this study.

Last, I would like to thank my mother and my father for the many sacrifices which they have made in order to provide me with educational opportunities. Whatever success I might enjoy as an educator in the years to come will be due largely to their efforts. My much belated "thank you" is poor tribute for those efforts.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	
Background and Need for the Study.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	8
Limitations of the Study.....	8
Definition of Terms.....	9
Organization of the Study.....	11
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	12
Introduction.....	12
The Use of Personality Traits and Char- acteristics for the Prediction of a Teacher Candidate's Future Teaching Success.....	17
The Interview as a Teacher Selection Tool.....	29
The Observation of Teaching.....	43
Summary.....	45
III. METHODOLOGY.....	47
Design.....	47
Participants.....	49
Instrumentation.....	52
Data Collection.....	56
Statement of Hypotheses.....	59
Treatment of Data.....	63
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	70

Introduction.....	70
Presentation and Analysis of Data....	70
Summary.....	93
V.    SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOM- MENDATIONS.....	94
Introduction and Summary.....	94
Findings.....	96
Conclusions.....	98
Recommendations.....	100
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	101
APPENDICES	
A.    University Placement Service Letter of Transmittal.....	109
B.    University Transcript.....	110
C.    Co-operating Teacher's Report on Student Teacher.....	111
D.    Letter of Recommendation.....	113
E.    Confidential Ratings Based on Applicant's Personality.....	115
F.    Teacher Application Form.....	116
G.    Checklist of Questions.....	119
H.    Teacher Interview Record Sheet.....	121
I.    Classroom Observation Guide.....	123
J.    Teacher Selection Consolidation Sheet.....	125

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Qualifications of Student Judges.....	50
2. Results of Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance (W) Analyzing the Agreement Which Existed Among the Judges of the Control Group After Completing All Phases of Selection Processing.....	72
3. Results of Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance (W) Analyzing the Agreement Which Existed Among the Judges of Experimental Group 1 After Completing All Phases of Selection Processing.....	73
4. Results of Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance (W) Analyzing the Agreement Which Existed Among the Judges of Experimental Group 2 After Completing All Phases of Selection Processing.....	75
5. Final Suitability Order Assignments Made to Teacher Candidates by the Student Judges of Each Group and Those Made by the Judges of Each Group Who Were Professional Educational Administrators.....	76
6. Results of Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient Analyzing the Association Which Existed Between the Final Suitability Order Assignments Made by the Student Judges of Each Group and Those Made by the Judges of Each Group Who Were Professional Educators.....	77

7.	Results of Kendall's Coefficient Concor- dance (W) Analyzing the Agreement Which Existed Among the Average Suitability Order Assignments Made to Teacher Candi- dates by the Judges of the Three Groups Based Upon the Evaluation of Interviews...	78
8.	Results of Spearman's Rank Correlation Co- efficient Analyzing the Association Which Existed Between the Interview Rank Order Assignments Made to Teacher Candidates by the Judges of Each of the Three Groups.	79
9.	Results of Kendall's Coefficient of Concor- dance (W) Analyzing the Amount of Agree- ment Which Existed Among the Final Suita- bility Order Assignments Made by the Judges of the Three Groups.....	80
10.	Results of Spearman's Rank Correlation Coef- ficient Analyzing the Association Between the Final Rank Order Assignments Made to Teacher Candidates by Judges of the Con- trol Group Based Upon the Evaluation of Interviews and Those Made by the Judges of Experimental Group 1 After Considering Both Interviews and Live Observations.....	82
11.	Results of Spearman's Rank Correlation Coef- ficient Analyzing the Association Which Existed Between the Final Rank Order As- signments Made to Teacher Candidates by Judges of the Control Group and Those Made by the Judges of Experimental Group 2 After Considering Both Interviews and Classroom Observations (Via Video-Tape)...	84
12.	Results of Spearman's Rank Correlation Coef- ficient Analyzing the Association Which Existed Between the Final Rank Order As- signments Made to Teacher Candidates by Judges of Experimental Groups 1 and 2 After Evaluating Both Interviews and Teaching Performance.....	85

13.	Results of Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient Analyzing the Association Which Existed Between Interview and Observation Suitability Order Assignments Made to Teacher Candidates by Judges of Experimental Group 1.....	87
14.	Results of Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient Analyzing the Association Which Existed Between the Interview and Final Suitability Order Assignments Made to Teacher Candidates by the Judges of Experimental Group 1.....	88
15.	Results of Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient Analyzing the Association Which Existed Between the Observation and Final Suitability Order Assignments Made to Teacher Candidates by the Judges of Experimental Group 1.....	89
16.	Results of Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient Analyzing the Association Which Existed Between Interview and Observation Suitability Order Assignments Made to Teacher Candidates by the Judges of Experimental Group 2.....	90
17.	Results of Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient Analyzing the Association Which Existed Between the Interview and Final Suitability Order Assignments Made to Teacher Candidates by the Judges of Experimental Group 2.....	91
18.	Results of Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient Analyzing the Association Which Existed Between the Observation and Final Suitability Order Assignments Made to Teacher Candidates by the Judges of Experimental Group 2.....	93

THE EFFECT OF CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS ON  
TEACHER SELECTION DECISIONS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Need for the Study

Few Americans in 1972 would question the relevance of the comments made over fifty-six years ago by Ervin Eugene Lewis, Superintendent of Schools, Flint, Michigan, concerning methods available to the public school administrator for improving the quality of his school system. Lewis stated that: "The best means of improving a school system is to improve its teachers. One of the most effective means of improving the teacher corps is by wise selection."<sup>1</sup>

Benjamin Wood voiced similar sentiments in the foreword to a 1952 publication pertaining to teacher selection. He stated that:

---

<sup>1</sup>Ervin Eugene Lewis, Personnel Problems of the Teaching Staff (New York: The Century Company, 1925), p. 116.

. . . it is certainly a universally accepted truism that a school can hardly be better than its teachers. Even if this often repeated truism were only half true, all friends of education would agree that the selection and retention in our school of effective teachers is a crucial problem if democracy is to survive in the world.<sup>2</sup>

Harold E. Moore and Newell B. Walters reinforced that point of view in 1955 when they stated that: "The effectiveness of the schools . . . depends upon their adequate staffing by competent teachers."<sup>3</sup> Emery Stoops succinctly summarized that school of thought in 1968 when he compared teachers with other components of the educational team. In the foreword to a monograph pertaining to the recruitment and selection of teachers he asserted that:

Teachers are the most important employees of the educational enterprise; counselors, administrators, and classified staff are important in order that the teacher may perform more effectively. Buildings, buses, school supplies, and equipment are items which make the environment of the teacher conducive to good instruction.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>American Association of Examiners of Educational Personnel, Principles and Procedures of Teacher Selection, with a Foreword by Benjamin Wood (Cincinnati: Tri-State Off-set Company, 1952), p. v.

<sup>3</sup>Harold E. Moore and Newell B. Walters, Personnel Administration in Education (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959), p. 118.

<sup>4</sup>Carroll L. Lang, Teacher Recruitment--Problems, Practices, and Proven Methods, with a Foreword by Emery Stoops (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1968), p. 1.

The acceptance of that evaluation of the importance of the role played by teachers in the educational enterprise would seem to suggest that only the best college students be admitted to teacher education programs. It would also suggest that school personnel administrators select only the best teachers for the classroom, thus assuring the provision of the best possible educational services for the community. The practice actually followed, however, has often failed to resemble that ideal. School administrators have not yet developed a valid scheme for the selection of good teachers. They have not discovered which criteria were valid and reliable as predictors of the future performance of prospective teachers. Allen and Wagschall described that problem as follows:

The criteria for admitting young people into the teaching profession have been a source of much confused argument over the past few decades. And despite J. B. Conant's recent and widely read publication on the subject, it would still be safe to say that there is as little agreement on the relevant criteria for accepting teachers as there was in times past on the number of angels that could dance on the head of a pin. As a point of fact, no one yet has any idea of the criteria of performance (as opposed to "units" of any given course) that a person ought to meet in order to be a successful teacher at any level or in any subject matter field.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Dwight W. Allen and Peter Wagschall, "A New Look at Credentialing," Clearing House, 44 (November, 1969), p. 137.



While much of the literature has been devoted to teacher selection, little constructive work has been done to validate selection methods and devices against reliable criteria. In fact, no reliable criteria have yet been identified. James A. Van Zwoll summarized that dilemma as follows:

At best, the procedures or basis for selecting personnel cannot be drawn up reliably until the characteristics of good teaching have been identified and a system has been devised for measuring the degree to which a teacher applicant has those characteristics. . . . the frequency with which an item appears as a basis for selection is no evidence of its merits or relative value in the selection procedure. . . . probably fully as important as the basis is the way in which it is used. It is very likely that for some time to come it will be necessary to rely heavily upon the professional judgment of the top level professional men in the school system.<sup>6</sup>

It was apparent that more research aimed at the validation of teacher selection devices was needed. School administrators, however, could not suspend the teacher selection function pending the perfection of those devices. Their development depended upon the positive identification of those criteria which characterize the effective teacher. The problem was complicated further by the fact that:

" . . . there is probably no one pattern of traits or behavior which characterize good teaching in all subjects, under

---

<sup>6</sup>James A. Van Zwoll, School Personnel Administration (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Division of Meredith Publishing Company, 1964), p. 107.

all conditions, for all types of children, for all purposes."<sup>7</sup>

Harry B. Gilbert, et al., after their 1963 study of teacher selection policies and procedures used by large public school systems in the United States, concluded that most selection procedures were determined by what was easily obtained rather than by what might be important to assess.<sup>8</sup> That observation reinforced a similar conclusion reached earlier by Harold L. Alderton after he studied the methods and procedures used by thirty-eight public school systems to select teachers.<sup>9</sup>

Though school personnel administrators might have been able to assess certain characteristics and personality traits through a subjective appraisal of an applicant's credentials and application form and through keen observation during the selection interview, the degree of their presence or absence in a given individual appeared to mean little.

---

<sup>7</sup>Kenneth E. McIntyre, "How to Select Teachers," The National Educational Association Journal, 47 (April, 1958), p. 250.

<sup>8</sup>Harry B. Gilbert, et al., "Teacher Selection Policies and Procedures in the United States" (unpublished study conducted by the New York City Board of Education, 1966), p. 52.

<sup>9</sup>Harold L. Alderton, "Selection of Teachers" (unpublished seminar study, University of Maryland, College Park, June, 1958). Cited in Van Zwoll, School Personnel Administration, p. 265.

Serious questions could be raised concerning the validity of the practice of placing such great emphasis upon those subjective criteria as a basis for teacher selection.

It appeared that school personnel administrators must continue for some time to make subjective selection judgments based upon these easily observable criteria. Therefore, it seemed imperative that they make maximum use of devices and techniques which were available to assist them in more accurately appraising those attributes in teacher candidates. The observation of a candidate's performance while teaching in a classroom situation, according to the professional literature in education, was one such technique.

Van Zwoll recommended that several classroom observations of teacher candidates be made without their knowledge that those observations were in reference to another job.<sup>10</sup> Other writers in the area of school personnel administration generally agreed.<sup>11</sup> However, there was little evidence available to substantiate the alleged advantages of the classroom observation as a teacher selection tool. Even if such data

---

<sup>10</sup>Van Zwoll, p. 110.

<sup>11</sup>American Association of Examiners of Educational Personnel, pp. 20-21; Ward G. Reeder, The Fundamentals of Public School Administration (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1951), p. 128.

did exist, it would have been difficult if not financially impossible for large public school systems to make live observations of every teacher candidate which they considered for employment. The additional staff personnel required and travel expenses involved would have rendered the implementation of such a procedure prohibitive.

An indication of the financial implications involved in visiting the classrooms of all teacher candidates being considered for employment was obtained from a brief perusal of the teacher selection trends of local school districts. According to Gilbert, et al., the larger the school system, the greater was the tendency to select new teachers from an area outside of a twenty-five mile radius of the selecting school system.<sup>12</sup> The Los Angeles Public School System, for example, reported that out of a total of approximately 3,000 new classroom teachers hired in 1966, half were from out-of-state.<sup>13</sup> The problem was magnified by the fact that many of the remaining 1,500 teachers hired by the Los Angeles Public System in that year undoubtedly were recruited from distant areas of the state rather than from the Los Angeles

---

<sup>12</sup>Gilbert, et al., pp. 48-49.

<sup>13</sup>Charles S. Benson, The Economies of Education (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968), p. 322.

area alone. It would have been extremely costly and perhaps even physically impossible for the personnel director and his staff to perform the travel which would have been necessary to observe the performance of all candidates being considered for employment.

Obviously, then, if the observation of candidates teaching in the classroom had merit as a teacher selection device, it should have been used more extensively by public school systems. And, since most public school systems operated on a rather limited budget, it appeared that there was need for a less time consuming substitute for live classroom observation. Perhaps video-taped mini-teaching units provided by prospective teachers as a part of their credentials could have adequately filled that need.

#### Statement of the Problem

The problem in this study was to determine whether or not the live observation of teaching or observations made via video-tape significantly affected final selection decisions made by school personnel administrators.

#### Limitations of the Study

This study was limited by the manner in which subjects were chosen. None were selected at random. Instead,

availability was the determining factor. The subjects involved in this study did not necessarily represent a valid cross-section of school personnel administrators and teachers. Therefore, uncritical generalizing of results could not be defended.

#### Definition of Terms

The following terms were used in the study:

1. Judges: all subjects who ranked teacher candidates in order of their suitability for employment.
2. Student judges: doctoral students at the University of Oklahoma who were enrolled in the first semester, 1970-71 class in school personnel administration (Education 6272) and who served as judges in this study.
3. Professional judges: practicing school personnel administrators and professors of education who served as judges in this study.
4. School personnel administrator: any school official, regardless of title, who was responsible for the administration of teacher personnel in a local public school system.
5. Teacher applicant: one who applied for a teaching position with a local public school system.
6. Teacher candidate: one who had applied for a

teaching position with a local school system and was being seriously considered by that system for employment.

7. Traditional teacher selection methods: selection based upon the administrator's scrutiny of a candidate's credentials plus a personal interview.

8. Average group rank order: average group consensus of suitability for employment achieved by adding together all of the ranks assigned to candidates by the judges and ranking the totals obtained, with the lowest total being awarded the rank "1" and the largest score being awarded the rank "6."

9. Interview rank order: the rank order assigned to teacher candidates by the judges of the three groups as a result of their evaluations of interviews.

10. Classroom observation rank order: the rank order assigned to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Groups 1 and 2 as a result of their observations of classroom teaching performance.

11. Final rank order or final order of suitability: the rank order assigned to teacher candidates by the judges of each of the three groups after considering all phases of the teacher selection schemes prescribed for their particular groups.

### Organization of the Study

The report of this study was organized to present material as follows:

1. Chapter I: Introduction
2. Chapter II: Review of Related Literature
3. Chapter III: Methodology
4. Chapter IV: Presentation and Analysis of Data
5. Chapter V: Summary, Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations



## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

#### Introduction

The literature was replete with "how to" articles concerning the selection of teachers. A sizable number of those articles either recommended procedures which their authors felt should have been used in hiring teachers or else described teacher selection schemes which had been used "successfully" by certain school systems over the years. Few of them, however, offered any evidence in support of the plans which they espoused. Instead, with few exceptions, the authors of those articles relied quite heavily upon intuition and professional judgment when assessing the worth of the teacher selection plans which they endorsed.

A survey of the professional literature in education revealed the reason why the "how to" articles failed to cite empirical data in support of their hypotheses concerning the value of the various selection schemes. Few meaningful studies had been devoted to teacher selection. Therefore,

little was known about that subject. Gilbert, after surveying the number of teacher selection studies in progress in 1967, concluded that the interest in that topic must be judged minimal if one used the number of studies in progress at that time as criteria for making such a judgment.<sup>1</sup> He observed further that:

Professional teacher selection practices are rarely employed. In large school systems that presume to be using selection techniques, screening is actually what is being done. In smaller, affluent school districts, hunch rejections and global perusals, sometimes actual observation, serve as selection techniques.<sup>2</sup>

A similar impression was recorded by Paul Fitzgerald in an article concerned with the recruitment and hiring of teachers. He noted that neither a great deal of time nor effort was put into teacher selection by most school districts. He reached that conclusion after comparing the average cost of hiring teachers with the average cost incurred by fourteen business corporations in hiring professionals. He found that the average cost of hiring a new teacher was \$146.00, while the average expense incurred by the fourteen

---

<sup>1</sup>Harry B. Gilbert, "Needed Research in the Area of Teacher Selection" (unpublished paper presented at conference on teacher selection methods, New York Board of Education, June, 1967), p. 107.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

business corporations in hiring professionals was roughly \$1,822.00.<sup>3</sup>

An examination of teacher selection trends tended to support the conclusions reached by R. M. Hall and A. M. Vincent after their review of the teacher selection literature in 1960.<sup>4</sup> They reported that: (1) administrators appeared to rely heavily on the interview as a primary method of gathering data concerning the qualifications of teacher candidates, (2) written examinations were becoming increasingly important as selection devices, and (3) letters of recommendation, although considered to be of dubious value, were widely used in the selection of teachers.

Similar observations were made by Lance N. Hodes in 1968 when he reviewed the literature on teacher selection.<sup>5</sup> Hodes, however, concluded that candidates for teaching positions were either selected or rejected mainly on the strength

---

<sup>3</sup>Paul Fitzgerald, "Recruitment of Teachers," Personnel Journal, 49 (April, 1970), pp. 312-14.

<sup>4</sup>R. M. Hall and A. M. Vincent, "Staff-Selection and Appointment," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. by C. W. Harris (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1960), pp. 1375-77.

<sup>5</sup>Lance N. Hodes, "The Development of an Instrument to Aid in the Selection of Effective Teachers" (unpublished dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, Department of Education, 1968), p. 1.

of the information contained in their application forms. He considered the interview to be an additional means of selection which consisted " . . . largely of the retrieval of information which can be obtained from the application of the candidate."<sup>6</sup>

Hall and Vincent concluded their review of the teacher selection literature with strong words of caution. They warned that even though a wide variety of techniques and instruments had been used in the past to select teachers, little could be done to validate those tools and procedures until more was known about predicting teacher effectiveness.<sup>7</sup>

Gilbert, et al.,<sup>8</sup> after conducting one of the more comprehensive surveys concerned with the identification of teacher selection techniques used by various school systems throughout the United States, reported conclusions similar to those reached by Hall and Vincent. Two other less comprehensive surveys of teacher selection methods revealed similar types of information and generated similar conclusions.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Hall and Vincent, p. 1377.

<sup>8</sup>Gilbert, et al.

<sup>9</sup>Mervin D. Rudisill, "A Study of Practices and Procedures Used by Public Schools in Pennsylvania to Recruit and Employ Teachers" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Temple

Rudisill, who conducted one of those surveys, made an important additional observation. He noted that school administrators placed great emphasis upon the observation of a candidate's teaching performance in the classroom setting. He concluded that the observation of a candidate's teaching ability was one of the most important factors in the selection process.<sup>10</sup>

Most writers in the field of teacher selection tended to agree with Rudisill, and suggested at least one observation of a candidate's teaching performance prior to selection. However, there was little evidence available to substantiate the validity of that recommendation. Few research studies were found that had been devoted to the validation of the classroom observation as a tool in teacher selection. Instead, the vast majority of research on teacher selection had been concerned with the identification, measurement, and use of certain personality traits and characteristics as criteria for the prediction of future teaching success.

Numerous studies were devoted to the selection interview. Few of those studies, however, were concerned with

---

University, 1966), p. 145; H. Charles Shultz, "A Study of Recruitment and Selection of School Teachers in one Selected Area of Pennsylvania (unpublished dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1964).

<sup>10</sup>Rudisill, p. 145.

teacher selection. Most of them were oriented toward the selection of personnel for business, industrial, and governmental positions. However, the results of many of those studies appeared to have some relevance for the selection of teachers.

Some research data were located on both the observation of teaching and the use of audio visual media as a substitute for direct observation. The majority of that research, however, was addressed to the study of teacher education techniques rather than to the study of teacher selection methods and procedures. Therefore, that body of data appeared to be of limited value to school administrators and researchers concerned with teacher selection.

The remainder of this chapter was devoted to a discussion of relevant ideas obtained from a review of the literature on teacher selection. It was organized to present information as follows: (1) the use of personality traits and characteristics for the prediction of future teaching success, (2) selection interviewing, and (3) the observation of teaching.

The Use of Personality Traits and Characteristics  
for the Prediction of a Teacher Candidate's  
Future Teaching Success

No valid device could be located which could be used

by school personnel administrators to predict a teacher candidate's future teaching success. Most of the studies concerned with the hiring of teachers revealed that those traits and characteristics which were most easily accessible and which could be measured most accurately were those which generally served as the basis for teacher selection.<sup>11</sup> Such tangible factors as certification status, years of experience, degrees held, major and minor areas of concentration, grade point average, and personal appearance seemed to constitute the major determinators in the selection of candidates for employment. Administrators used those and other similar types of information as the basis for teacher selection, despite the fact that there was little proof that they were the qualities which actually characterized good teachers.<sup>12</sup>

The use of such easily observable characteristics as the basis for employee selection was not limited to the field of education alone. Kermit Kent Johnson, while studying the employee selection techniques used by 219 business and industrial firms, found that the following characteristics, all easily observable and of unproven validity in the prediction of future job success, were the ones most often looked for by

---

<sup>11</sup>Hall and Vincent, p. 1376.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

personnel administrators when interviewing job applicants:<sup>13</sup>

1. Likable and cooperative manner
2. Enthusiasm and vitality
3. Alertness
4. Tact
5. Verbal fluency

According to Harry S. Broudy, the search for a valid set of personality or behavioral traits which would uniquely characterize the good teacher is a blind alley to be avoided.<sup>14</sup> Many other authorities in the field of school personnel administration generally agreed with that conclusion. Nevertheless, numerous characteristics which might serve as predictors of future teaching effectiveness have been proposed and studied. Ryans,<sup>15</sup> after reviewing the available literature on teacher effectiveness, reported a list of those predictor characteristics most frequently

---

<sup>13</sup>Kermit Kent Johnson, "An Investigation of Employment Techniques With Special Reference to the Selection of College Graduates by Business and Industry" (unpublished dissertation, Bradley University, 1956), p. 74.

<sup>14</sup>Harry S. Broudy, "The Continuing Search for Criteria," Changing Dimensions in Teacher Education, Yearbook of the American Association for Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: 1967), pp. 31-32.

<sup>15</sup>David G. Ryans, "Predictions of Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. by C. W. Harris (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1960), p. 1488.



investigated and for which measurement had been attempted.

They were:

1. Scores on tests of verbal and other cognitive abilities.
2. Scores on achievement tests.
3. Academic grade point average.
4. Ratings and grade for student teaching.
5. Level of general and professional education.
6. Scores achieved on inventories and/or projective tests designed to measure various personality traits and emotional and social adjustment.
7. Scores on aptitude tests designed to measure teacher-student relationships.
8. Age.
9. Sex.
10. Experience.
11. Marital status.
12. Socio-economic status.
13. Voice and speech characteristics.
14. Factors which influence one to enter the teaching profession.
15. Extent to which one participates in social events.
16. A person's preference for various types of activities.

Harold J. Keeler, in a 1956 doctoral study, attempted to determine whether or not certain selected individual characteristics and abilities could be used to predict the effectiveness of graduates of the State University of New York Teachers' Colleges during their first year of teaching in elementary schools.<sup>16</sup> He formulated ten hypotheses which dealt with the relationship between teacher effectiveness and the following variables:

1. Scholastic attitude.
2. Personality.
3. Vocational interest.
4. Professional knowledge.
5. High school and college co-curricular activities in which the individual participated.
6. Frequency and kinds of experience with children before entering college.
7. Number of elective offices held by the individual in high school and college.
8. Number of children in the family and birth order position occupied by the individual.
9. Academic achievement in college.

---

<sup>16</sup>Harold J. Keeler, "Predicting Teacher Effectiveness of the State University of New York Teachers Colleges" (unpublished dissertation, Cornell University, 1956).

## 10. Occupation of parents.

Keeler concluded that it was impossible to predict teacher effectiveness from the presence or absence of those characteristics in individuals.

Rudisill,<sup>17</sup> while doing a study of the practices and procedures used by public school systems of Pennsylvania to recruit and select teachers, found that the rank order of the most important qualities looked for in teacher candidates was as follows:

1. Attitude toward work.
2. Emotional stability.
3. Knowledge of subject matter.
4. Ability to plan and organize.
5. Ability to think logically.
6. Positive personality.
7. Good speech habits.
8. Poise, bearing, and tact.
9. Good philosophy of education.
10. Good speaking voice.

Rudisill also found that the college academic record was one of the most important factors in the teacher selection process.

---

<sup>17</sup>Rudisill, pp. 145-47.

Girard Paul Gaugham,<sup>18</sup> after analyzing the contents of ninety-six tape recorded preliminary teacher selection interviews held on a New Jersey state college campus, reported findings similar to those of Rudisill. He reported that the factors which administrators considered most frequently in deciding whether to employ or reject a teacher applicant were the applicant's attitude toward teaching and the impressions the administrator formed as to how the applicant would get along with students.

None of the numerous studies which were examined isolated any specific body of traits or characteristics which could be used to identify effective teachers. Rather, the results of most studies tended to reinforce the conclusions reached by Roy S. Steinbeck after he studied the differences in the background, attitudes, experience, and professional preparation of two groups of elementary school teachers who had contrasting records of teaching success.<sup>19</sup> He found that teaching success appeared to depend on a number of complex

---

<sup>18</sup>Girard Paul Gaugham, "An Analysis of the Content of Preliminary Teacher Selection Interviews" (unpublished dissertation, Rutgers University, 1967), p. 87.

<sup>19</sup>Roy S. Steinbeck, "A Study of Some Differences in Background, Attitudes, Experience, and Professional Preparation of Selected Elementary Teachers With Contrasting Local Success Records" (unpublished dissertation, Indiana University, 1954).

factors, none of which were totally differentiating. He also found that the student teaching experience appeared to contribute directly to teaching success, but that the total amount of college work taken by the individual, though it made a positive contribution toward teaching success, did not in itself offer any assurance of success. He noted further that teaching success appeared to be positively related to wholesome and constructive attitudes toward children and toward professional activities and responsibilities.

James A. Johnson and Byron F. Radebaugh<sup>20</sup> adopted a new approach. They did not prescribe in advance any specific criteria to be used in judging teacher excellence. Instead, they permitted the participants of their study to utilize their own criteria. Students, teachers, and administrators of four northern Illinois public high schools were asked to list the teachers in their schools which they felt to be the very best. Those teachers who were classified in the "excellent" category most often by students, teachers, and administrators were considered to be excellent teachers for the purposes of the study.

Next, the teachers involved in the study were asked

---

<sup>20</sup>James A. Johnson and Byron F. Radebaugh, "Excellent Teachers: What Makes Them Outstanding?" Clearing House, 44 (November, 1969), pp. 152-54.

to complete a questionnaire which presented certain variables thought to be positively related to teaching excellence. The data obtained revealed that excellent teachers, more often than other teachers, tended to:

1. Use class discussion techniques (.01 level of significance).
2. Be males, be older teachers, have more experience, and devote more hours to teaching (.05 level of significance).
3. Agree with the idea that investigations and critical thinking were necessary ways of getting at the truth (.05 level of significance).
4. Refrain from using audio tapes or programmed materials (.05 level of significance).
5. Reject the idea that allowing the exchange of any and all opinions on social issues should be avoided because it tended to weaken the country (.10 level of significance).
6. Disagree with the idea that attempts should be made to change the thinking of others who did not believe in their way of life without first listening to their arguments (.10 level of significance).
7. Agree with the idea that those affected by decisions made in the school should have some voice in making those decisions (.10 level of significance).

8. Refrain from writing letters to editors to present their views on social issues (.10 level of significance).

9. Have earned 31 or more graduate credits and belong to four or more professional associations (.10 level of significance).

10. Place themselves in a lower middle class socioeconomic status (.20 level of significance).

11. Attend a greater number of professional association meetings devoted to the improvement of their teaching areas (.20 level of significance).

12. Refrain from the use of slides as teaching aids but used more film loops (.20 level of significance).

13. Spend more time reading newspapers and professional books (.20 level of significance).

Johnson and Radebaugh also found that certain characteristics, traits, and other variables, many of which ranked high on the list of determining items considered by school personnel administrators when assessing teacher candidates, appeared to have little positive correlation with teacher excellence. Those items were:

1. Marital status.
2. Age when first teaching assignment was accepted.
3. Undergraduate grade point average.

4. Number of civic, fraternal, or social organizations the individual belonged to.
5. Highest level of education attained by the mother.
6. Social class of parents.
7. Frequency with which letters were sent to elected representatives.
8. The time and effort devoted to the election of public officials.
9. Frequency of attendance at political party meetings.
10. The frequency of the use of motion pictures, filmstrips, overhead projectors, resource people, opaque materials, records, lectures, independent study, or problem-projects in class.
11. The identification of a general overall educational objective.
12. The extent to which televised material was used in classes.
13. The extent to which popular magazines were read.
14. A teacher's judgment of his own sense of humor.

The majority of the available evidence appeared to support the conclusions reached by Hall and Vincent. They maintained that school personnel administrators placed great



reliance upon the measurement of easily accessible variables when hiring teachers rather than on what might be important to assess.<sup>21</sup>

Similar observations were made earlier by Alderton<sup>22</sup> after he studied the methods and procedures used by thirty-eight school districts to select teachers. He found that school personnel administrators placed the following characteristics, all of which were easily observable, high on their list of variables to be considered in the selection of teachers.

1. Personality (as determined from personal references and from the selection interview).
2. Appearance.
3. Special talents.
4. Age.
5. Sex.
6. Experience.
7. Scholastic record (high).
8. Interest in people/children.
9. Desire for knowledge.
10. Regard for teaching as a career.

---

<sup>21</sup>Hall and Vincent, p. 1376.

<sup>22</sup>Alderton, p. 265.

### The Interview as a Teacher Selection Tool

According to Harold Mayfield, there were only three sources of information available to employers who wished to assess the qualifications of their job applicants. They were (1) the application form, (2) comments from co-workers and acquaintances, and (3) the selection interview.<sup>23</sup> All of those sources were used by public school administrators in the selection of teachers. Many employers, however, including local school districts, relied most heavily upon the selection interview as their primary source of information for selection decisions.<sup>24</sup>

The interview has been used for many years by school administrators as a teacher selection tool. Gilbert, et al., after completing their survey of the methods and procedures used by large public school systems in the United States to select teachers in 1966, reported that:

All LPSS [large public school systems] interview teacher candidates. The interviews are conducted by a committee in 46% of the school systems; in 53.4% of the systems, one individual interviews all candidates.

---

<sup>23</sup>Harold Mayfield, "Employee Selection: How Much Does Personality Count?" Supervisory Management, 11 (March, 1966), p. 25.

<sup>24</sup>Dale S. Beach, Personnel: The Management of People at Work (2nd ed.; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970), p. 271; Hall and Vincent, p. 1377; Rudisill.

The director of personnel (or a member of his staff) was listed by 38.4% of LPSS as the individual most likely to serve as the sole interviewer. The interview committee composes most commonly the principal (38.8%), the director of personnel (32.2%), and the director of elementary or secondary education (24.7%). The vast majority of LPSS . . . provided their interviewers with training in the interviewing process. Interviewers were almost always (37.5%) or usually (26.4%) trained rather than almost never (15.6%) or occasionally (14.4%). The time allotted to the interview ranges from 10 minutes (1.6%) to over one hour (4.1%). Typically, 20-30 minutes are devoted to the interview by 55.0% of LPSS.<sup>25</sup>

Gilbert, et al. found that the characteristics of teacher candidates most often appraised by interviewers were as follows:<sup>26</sup>

1. Personal appearance . . . . . 98.1%
2. Speech. . . . . 96.9%
3. Attitude toward teaching. . . . . 93.4%
4. Interest in children/youth. . . . . 90.0%
5. Philosophy of education . . . . . 85.0%
6. Potential for professional growth . . 79.1%
7. Extent of cultural background . . . . 76.6%
8. Ability to think logically. . . . . 75.0%
9. Ability in subject matter area. . . . 71.6%
10. Extent of outside interests . . . . . 65.9%
11. Extent of democratic outlook. . . . . 49.4%

---

<sup>25</sup>Gilbert, et al., p. 22.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., p. 23.

12. Knowledge of current affairs. . . . 47.8%
13. Extent of community contacts. . . . 46.2%

A number of writers questioned the validity of the interview as a personnel selection device. R. F. Wagner,<sup>27</sup> after reviewing over 100 articles on selection interviewing in 1949, concluded that there was little evidence to suggest the validity of selection interviews. Donald P. Schwab<sup>28</sup> reached the same conclusion in 1969 after reviewing all of the relevant literature on interviewing published since Wagner's study. Similar conclusions were reached by E. C. Mayfield,<sup>29</sup> who reviewed over 300 articles on selection interviewing in 1964, and by L. Ulrich and D. Trumbo,<sup>30</sup> who conducted a similar review in 1965.

There were some who disagreed with the conclusions reached by Wagner, E. C. Mayfield, Ulrich and Trumbo, and Schwab. Edwin E. Ghiselli, for instance, when writing about the predictive validity of selection interviews in 1966,

---

<sup>27</sup>R. F. Wagner, "The Employment Interview: A Critical Summary," Personnel Psychology, 2 (Spring, 1949), pp. 17-46.

<sup>28</sup>Donald P. Schwab, "Why Interview? A Critique," Personnel Journal, 48 (February, 1969), p. 127.

<sup>29</sup>E. C. Mayfield, "The Selection Interview: A Re-evaluation of Published Research," Personnel Psychology, 17 (Autumn, 1964), p. 239.

<sup>30</sup>L. Ulrich and D. Trumbo, "The Selection Interview Since 1949," Personnel Bulletin, 63 (February, 1965), p. 112.

stated that the distrust which industrial psychologists held for the employment interview as a device for appraising the qualifications of job applicants was questionable. He maintained that it was based on obsolete research data collected over half a century ago. He argued that contemporary interviewers had more education, a greater knowledge of the nature of individual differences, and more experience than did interviewers of earlier times. Therefore, he maintained, the superficial information obtained by contemporary interviewers could be used to make valid predictions of future job success.<sup>31</sup>

Ghiselli's arguments were based to a great extent on his own experiences as an employment interviewer. After interviewing 507 applicants for the job of stock broker and observing the performance of those hired over a period of seventeen years, he concluded that the validity of employment interviews was at least equal to if not greater than the validity of tests in personnel selection.

Similar observations were recorded by other investigators. In 1954 Eleanor Cecelia Delaney<sup>32</sup> evaluated the

---

<sup>31</sup>Edwin E. Ghiselli, "The Validity of a Personnel Interview," Personnel Psychology, 19 (Winter, 1966), p. 389.

<sup>32</sup>Eleanor Cecelia Delaney, "Teacher Selection and Evaluation: With Special Attention to the Validity of the Personnel Interview and the National Teacher Examinations," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1954).

validity of the interview as a device for selecting teachers in the Elizabeth, New Jersey public schools. Eighty-one elementary school teachers were interviewed by a committee which rated them on personality characteristics. The scores awarded to teachers during the interviews were correlated with the ratings given them by their building principals, who had observed their classroom performance over a period of time. The results of that study indicated that highly significant correlation existed between the scores recorded by the two groups of evaluators. Delaney concluded that some personality factors could be assessed with a reasonable degree of accuracy in a standardized, planned interview which considered specific characteristics listed on a standard form. She identified those characteristics as follows:

1. Voice and speech.
2. Appearance.
3. Ability to present ideas.
4. Alertness.
5. Judgment.
6. Emotional stability.
7. Self-confidence.
8. Personal fitness for the position.
9. Friendliness.

Delaney did not consider the correlation between the interview and actual job performance to be high enough to warrant its consideration as a significant predictor of teaching success. She did, however, consider it to be high enough to make the interview valuable as a technique for selection screening.

A. Ordini, Jr.,<sup>33</sup> who offered no empirical evidence in support of his arguments, was much more elaborate in his praise of the interview as a tool for the selection of personnel. In discussing its merits he stated that:

There is no machine that can measure the meaning of a raised eyebrow, no computer that can measure a man's stability and predict his actions or reactions to a particular set of dynamics. The interview is the only feasible way to bring forth certain required facts and to appraise important personal characteristics.<sup>34</sup>

The available evidence did not appear to support Ordini's contention that an interviewer can: ". . . predict with a high degree of certainty the success of the interviewee."<sup>35</sup>

Herbert J. Chruden and Arthur W. Sherman, Jr. classified selection interviews as follows: (1) unplanned inter-

---

<sup>33</sup>A. Ordini, Jr., "Why Interview?" Personnel Journal, 47 (June, 1968), pp. 430-32.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., p. 430.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid.

views, (2) planned interviews involving no special techniques, (3) patterned interviews, and (4) non-directive interviews.<sup>36</sup> Their classifications were based upon the methods or approaches used. They defined the patterned interview as being: ". . . a well planned and organized interview designed to overcome many of the faults and limitations of ordinary interviewing procedures."<sup>37</sup> In patterned interviews the interviewer is trained in the use of special interview and evaluation forms as tools for obtaining and evaluating information about job applicants. The patterned interview is much more highly structured than the planned interview, in which the interviewer simply outlines in advance the areas he wishes to explore.<sup>38</sup> Business and industrial firms which used patterned interviews claimed to have much greater success in predicting an applicant's job performance than they did before patterned interviews were adopted.<sup>39</sup>

Robert N. McMurray, who developed the patterned interview, listed its advantages as follows:

---

<sup>36</sup>Herbert J. Chruden and Arthur W. Sherman, Jr., Personnel Management (3rd ed.; Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Company, 1968), pp. 151-54.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 151.

<sup>38</sup>Beach, p. 277.

<sup>39</sup>Chruden and Sherman, p. 151.



1. It provides for the complete and systematic coverage of all of the information necessary for predicting an applicant's probable success on the job.
2. It guides the interviewer in getting the facts.
3. It provides a set of principles for use in interpreting the facts which are obtained.
4. It provides a means for minimizing the interviewer's personal biases and prejudices.<sup>40</sup>

In the nondirective interview the applicant is asked broad questions by the interviewer, and is given considerable leeway in expressing himself and in determining the course of the discussion. Chruden and Sherman described the nondirective interview as follows:

. . . the nondirective approach is characterized by such interviewer behavior as listening carefully, not arguing, using questions sparingly, not interrupting or changing the subject abruptly, phrasing responses briefly, and allowing pauses in the conversation. . . . The greater freedom afforded in the nondirective interview provides an opportunity for him /the job applicant/ to discuss in depth any points he would like to talk about. This may be particularly valuable in bringing to the interviewer's attention . . . information, attitudes, or feelings that are often concealed by more rapid questioning of the applicant. On the other hand, the interviewer should not come to a nondirective interview without some objectives to be achieved.<sup>41</sup>

Most employment interviews, maintained Chruden and

---

<sup>40</sup>Robert N. McMurray, Tested Techniques in Personnel Selection (Chicago: The Dartnell Corporation, 1955), cited in Chruden and Sherman, p. 151.

<sup>41</sup>Chruden and Sherman, pp. 153-54.

Sherman, would be either patterned or nondirective in nature or a modification of one or the other, such as board and group interviews. They maintained that the unplanned interview had no place in personnel selection, and that the planned interview which involved no special techniques for the systematic appraisal of applicants was of limited value in predicting future job success.<sup>42</sup>

The available evidence appeared to support Samuel G. Trull's claim that a lack of planning was one of the greatest single faults of the selection interview.<sup>43</sup>

Other factors besides poor planning were identified as playing a significant role in decision-making during the employment interview. Johnson, after completing his study of the employment techniques used by 219 business and industrial firms, concluded that the personality, prejudices, and idiosyncrasies of interviewers played an important role in hiring. He speculated that perhaps the interviewee's ability to adjust to the biases of the interviewer might be one of the chief determinants of suitability for employment.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup>Ibid.

<sup>43</sup>Samuel G. Trull, "Strategies of Effective Interviewing," Personnel Management Abstracts, 10 (Spring, 1964), p. 31.

<sup>44</sup>Johnson, p. 75.

Similar conclusions were reached by P. Wentworth in 1953 after he made a study of decision-making in employment interviews. He played the same recorded interview before members of various occupational groups and had each individual in each of the occupational groups record his impressions on a questionnaire. Despite the fact that each rater was exposed to the same information, raters differed greatly in their responses to each item on the questionnaire. Wentworth concluded that the greatest single weakness of the employment interview was interviewer bias.<sup>45</sup>

A study of attitude congruency between principals and teacher candidates made by Daniel L. Merritt<sup>46</sup> tended to confirm the observations reported by Wentworth. In that study principals were exposed to written information about teacher candidates and then asked to make judgments as to the qualifications of candidates for employment. Merritt found that principals preferred candidates who possessed attitudes similar to their own, regardless of whether candidates possessed high or low qualifications. The principals involved in the study

---

<sup>45</sup>P. Wentworth, "How to Improve Employment Interviews," Personnel Journal, 32 (June, 1953), pp. 36-39.

<sup>46</sup>Daniel L. Merritt, "Attitude Congruency and Selection of Teacher Candidates," Administrator's Notebook, 19 (February, 1971), pp. 30-31.

showed a greater preference for highly qualified candidates only when those candidates shared their attitudes. Merritt concluded that ". . . attitude congruency is an important factor in the imprecise impressions which interviewers form of candidates."<sup>47</sup>

B. M. Springbett, after conducting two studies concerned with decision-making in employment interviewing in 1958, concluded that the selection interview was primarily a search for negative information.<sup>48</sup> Subsequent studies by B. I. Bolster and Springbett reinforced that observation, and indicated in addition that interviewers who were most ready to commit themselves to a decision were the quickest to return to a noncommittal position when information of a derogatory nature was presented.<sup>49</sup> Other studies by E. C. Mayfield and R. F. Carlson and by J. W. Miller and Patricia M. Rowe reflected similar results.<sup>50</sup> They provided evidence which indicated

---

<sup>47</sup>Merritt, p. 30.

<sup>48</sup>B. M. Springbett, "Factors Affecting Decision-Making in the Employment Interview," Canadian Journal of Psychology, 12 (March, 1968), pp. 21-22.

<sup>49</sup>B. I. Bolster and B. M. Springbett, "The Reaction of Interviewers to Favorable and Unfavorable Information," Journal of Applied Psychology, 45 (April, 1945), p. 103.

<sup>50</sup>E. C. Mayfield, p. 253; E. C. Mayfield and R. F. Carlson, "Selection Interview Decisions: First Results From

that negative information impinged much more heavily upon the interviewer's selection decision than did positive information.

Springbett reached several other conclusions concerning decision-making in the employment interview. He concluded that:

1. Information contained in the application form contributed most to the final decision.
2. The applicant's chances of selection were low (about one in 10) unless he was assessed favorably on both the application form and on his personal appearance.
3. When both the application form and personal appearance were rated favorably, the applicant's chances of being selected for the job were better if his application form was rated before his appearance.
4. The appearance of the applicant and his application form provided information in the first two or three minutes of the interview which decisively affected the selection decision in 85% of the cases studied.<sup>51</sup>

A similar observation regarding the amount of time required by an interviewer to make a selection decision was

---

a Long-Term Research Project, "Personnel Psychology, 19 (Spring, 1960), pp. 41-45; J. W. Miller and Patricia M. Rowe, "Influence of Favorable and Unfavorable Information Upon Assessment Decisions," Journal of Applied Psychology, 51 (October, 1967), p. 434.

<sup>51</sup>Springbett, p. 22.

made by R. S. Driver in 1944. While studying the factors involved in employment interviewing, he noted that prolonging an interview beyond a certain point added little to an interviewer's ability to make a decision.<sup>52</sup>

Many argued that, in addition to having poor predictive validity, the interview lacked reliability as a technique for the selection of personnel. One of the first such studies was reported by W. D. Scott in 1915. In that study thirty-six applicants for sales positions were interviewed by six personnel managers. Each personnel manager ranked the applicants in the order of their suitability for employment. There was little relationship between the rankings which were assigned by the six personnel managers. Scott, therefore, concluded that the employment interview was a very unreliable device for measuring the potential of job candidates.<sup>53</sup>

Similar results were reported in subsequent studies by H. L. Hollingworth, A. J. Snow, and S. M. Corey.<sup>54</sup> In

---

<sup>52</sup>R. S. Driver, "Research on the Interview," Office Management Series, Number 102 (New York: American Management Association, 1944), pp. 20-31.

<sup>53</sup>W. D. Scott, "The Scientific Selection of Salesmen," Cited by E. C. Mayfield, p. 239.

<sup>54</sup>H. L. Hollingworth, Judging Human Character (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1928), pp. 62-66; A. J. Snow, "An Experiment in the Validity of Judging Human Ability," Journal of Applied Psychology, 8 (August, 1924), pp. 339-46;

Hollingworth's study fifty-seven applicants for sales positions were interviewed by twelve sales managers. The applicants were ranked by the sales managers in the order of their suitability for employment. The twelve sales managers disagreed greatly in their estimates of the suitability of individual applicants. One applicant, for example, was ranked first by one judge and last by another.<sup>55</sup> Similar types of evidence caused E. C. Mayfield to conclude in 1964 that:

A general suitability based on an unstructured interview with no prior information provided has extremely low inter-rater reliability, especially in the employment situation. . . . In other words, the interview, as normally conducted in the selection situation, is of little value.<sup>56</sup>

Mayfield contended that material was not consistently covered in an unstructured interview. He maintained that this was probably one of the reasons why the selection interview lacked reliability.<sup>57</sup> Wentworth believed the problem of reliability to be further complicated by the fact that, even though interviewers might obtain the same information, they were many times prone to weigh it differently.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup>Hollingworth, p. 65.

<sup>56</sup>E. C. Mayfield, p. 249.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid.

<sup>58</sup>Wentworth, pp. 36-39.

Evidence was found which indicated that the reliability of selection interviews could be improved through structuring. Wagner, E. C. Mayfield, and Wright, the authors of three articles which summarized the results of selection interview research, all agreed on that point. They cautioned, however, that the relatively high reliability reported for structured selection interviews did not necessarily guarantee predictive validity.<sup>59</sup>

The available evidence appeared to be weighed heavily against the selection interview as a device for the prediction of future job success. Still, school administrators have relied heavily upon it as a major technique for the selection of teachers.

#### The Observation of Teaching

Most writers in the area of school personnel administration maintained that one of the best devices for the selection of teachers was the observation of candidates actually teaching in a classroom setting.<sup>60</sup> Hall and Vincent, however, after reviewing the literature on teacher selection in 1960, found that school administrators seldom employed the classroom

---

<sup>59</sup>E. C. Mayfield, p. 251; Wagner, p. 44; Wright, pp. 391-411.

<sup>60</sup>Hall and Vincent, p. 1376.



observation as a technique for the acquisition of information upon which to base selection decisions.<sup>61</sup>

Similar observations were reported by Gilbert, et al. in 1966. Their survey of teacher selection policies and procedures used by large public school systems in the United States revealed that 59.1 per cent of the large public school systems usually did not observe the classroom performance of candidates as a part of teacher selection. They reported that one observation was made by 20.3 per cent of the large public school systems, while only 6.2 per cent made more than one observation. They reported that almost half of the large public school systems observed local candidates who were readily accessible. Their data indicated that four-fifths of the nation's large public school systems rarely (36.9 per cent) or never (41.6 per cent) observed candidates located outside of twenty-five mile radius of the boundaries of their school districts.<sup>62</sup>

Despite the support given to classroom observation as a teacher selection device, there was little evidence available to support the validity of its use. The absence of such a body of data prompted Irving A. Yevish to refer to the

---

<sup>61</sup>Ibid.

<sup>62</sup>Gilbert, et al., p. 13.

notion of the classroom observation as a fallacy. He argued that: ". . . observation is an act of taking notice, and if the wrong things are noticed (as they generally are) . . . observation as a technique of supervision becomes a misleading exercise."<sup>63</sup> Therefore, he concluded, the concept of classroom observation as: ". . . one of the most useful techniques of supervision needs careful scrutiny."<sup>64</sup>

#### Summary

A large number of "how to" articles were found concerning the selection of teachers. The majority of the studies reviewed revealed that certain characteristics, all of which were easily observable and could be measured most accurately, generally served as the basis for teacher selection. Hall and Vincent described that body of characteristics as follows:

They are such tangible things as certification status, years of experience, degrees held, major and minor areas in preparation, age, and personal appearance. There is little proof, however, that these are the qualities which characterize good teachers.<sup>65</sup>

The fact that most school personnel administrators

---

<sup>63</sup>Irving A. Yevish, "The Observation Fallacy," The Education Digest, 33 (April, 1968), p. 51.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid.

<sup>65</sup>Hall and Vincent, p. 1376.

tended to rely upon the selection interview as their primary source for the acquisition of information concerning those traits and characteristics was well established in the literature. Also established was the fact that classroom observation, though seldom used by school personnel administrators, was generally considered to be a necessary supplemental source of information which should be tapped by school personnel administrators prior to making final selection decisions. Most writers agreed that, though important information about teacher qualifications was obtained during the selection interview, the actual observation of a candidate's teaching performance was necessary before an administrator could make realistic predictions about future teaching success.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### Design

Twenty-six judges were required to rank six teacher candidates in the order of their suitability for employment as high school American history teachers. The judges were divided into three groups, each of which used different methods to evaluate the qualifications of teacher candidates. One group, which used traditional teacher selection methods only, served as the Control Group. The other two groups used a combination of traditional plus other innovative methods to evaluate the six teacher candidates. They were, therefore, considered to be Experimental Groups 1 and 2 respectively.

The teacher selection methods and procedures employed by the three groups of judges were as follows:

1. The Control Group. - The Control Group used traditional teacher selection methods. Each member of the group examined the credentials, including the completed application forms, of each of the six teacher candidates. They also

observed the interview of each candidate, and on the basis of that information they assigned a rank to each of the six candidates, from most to least suitable for employment. Each judge evaluated and ranked candidates independently of other judges in his group.

2. Experimental Group 1. - Experimental Group 1 followed the same procedure as the Control Group. In addition, this group made live observations of teacher candidates as they taught mini-teaching units in a classroom setting.

3. Experimental Group 2. - Experimental Group 2 followed the same procedure as the Control Group. In addition, instead of observing the live presentation of mini-teaching units as did Experimental Group 1, the members of this group viewed video taped recordings of the class sessions observed live by Experimental Group 1.

A checklist of questions was used to assist interviewers in conducting selection interviews. Special rating forms were used by the judges to record their impressions and to guide them in the systematic assessment of teacher candidates. The judges were not restricted by the scores recorded on their scales when making their decisions as to overall suitability for employment. They were not required to assign a rank order of "1" to the candidate who achieved the highest

score on rating scales and a rank order of "6" to the candidate with the lowest score. Instead, since all judges were experienced educational administrators and/or doctoral students in educational administration, wide latitude was allowed for professional judgment.

## Participants

### Teacher Candidates

The six teacher candidates who participated in this study were all female, were certified by the state of Oklahoma to teach history in its public schools, and ranged from 25 to 50 years of age. They were selected at random from a list of substitute teachers maintained by the Norman, Oklahoma Public School System.

### Judges

Student Judges. - Twenty of the 26 judges involved in the study were doctoral students majoring in educational administration at the University of Oklahoma. All were male, and all were enrolled in a course in school personnel administration during the first semester of the 1970-71 school year. A summary of the qualifications of those student judges is contained in Table 1.

Professional Judges. - Three of the remaining six

TABLE 1

## QUALIFICATIONS OF STUDENT JUDGES

Judges	Experienced Interviewer	Experienced Teacher <sup>a</sup>	Administrative Experience <sup>b</sup>
<u>Control Group</u>			
1	X	X(A)	X(2,3,5)
2		X(A)	X(2,3)
3		X(B)	
4		X(A)	X(1)
5	X	X(A)	X(2,3)
6	X	X(A)	X(2,3)
7	X	X(A)	X(2,3)
<u>Experimental Group 1</u>			
1	X	X(B)	X(6)
2		X(A)	X(2)
3	X	X(A)	X(3,5,6)
4	X	X(A)	X(3,4)
5		X(A)	X(2)
6		X(A)	X(1)
<u>Experimental Group 2</u>			
1	X	X(A)	X(2,3)
2	X	X(A)	X(2,3)
3		X(A)	
4	X	X(A)	X(4)
5	X	X(A)	X(2)
6		X(A)	X(3)
7	X		X(6)

<sup>a</sup>(A)=3 or more years of teaching experience; (B)= less than 3 years of teaching experience.

<sup>b</sup>1=counseling experience; 2=experience as an assistant principal; 3=experience as a public school principal; 4=experience as an assistant superintendent; 5=experience as public school superintendent; 6=experience in business, industry, military service, or other areas.

judges were practicing public school administrators responsible for the selection of secondary school teachers in their districts. The other three were former public school administrators who had joined the faculty at the University of Oklahoma's College of Education. These six judges were used in the study for control purposes. Their judgments of suitability for employment were compared with those of student judges in order to determine the amount of agreement which existed between the opinions of relatively inexperienced doctoral students and experienced public school administrators.

Assignment of Judges to Groups. - Judges were randomly assigned to groups. Assignments were made by category to insure that each of the three groups contained one professor of education, one practicing public school administrator, and several doctoral students in educational administration.

### Interviewers

An experienced interviewer was added to each of the three groups to conduct teacher selection interviews. Interviewers did not participate in either the evaluation or the ranking of teacher candidates. They were used in the study to free judges from the responsibility of interacting with teacher candidates so that they could devote their full attention to the observation of interviewees and to the evaluation of their



responses to the interviewer. Orman R. Wright, Jr., who reviewed the literature on selection interviewing published between 1964 and 1969, cited several studies which indicated that independent judges (those who observed rather than actively participated in interviews) could assess interviewee behavior as validly and as accurately as could the participant interviewer.<sup>1</sup>

### Instrumentation

#### Teacher Credentials

Teacher credentials similar to those prepared by the Teacher Placement Office at the University of Arizona for students entering the teaching profession were prepared for each of the six teacher candidates involved in this study. Included in those dossiers were the following:

1. A letter of transmittal (Appendix A).
2. A record of all college grades; data were recorded on a form specifically designed for this study (Appendix B).
3. Cooperating teachers' evaluations of the candidates' performances as student teachers (Appendix C).
4. Recommendations from at least five people familiar with the qualifications of candidates.

---

<sup>1</sup>Orman R. Wright, Jr., "Summary of Research on the Selection Interview Since 1964," Personnel Psychology 22 (Winter, 1969), p. 407.

In most instances actual evaluations of student teaching experiences were not available. Therefore, teacher candidates made self-evaluations of their performances as student teachers. Those appraisals were included in each set of credentials in lieu of actual evaluations made by cooperating teachers.

The form letter which was used to obtain recommendations from persons familiar with the qualifications of candidates (Appendix D) was the same as a form letter that was being used for that purpose by the Employment Services Office, University of Oklahoma. Each candidate was asked to obtain five recommendations. Those recommendations were recorded on a summary sheet designed and used by the Teacher Placement Office, University of Arizona, for similar purposes (Appendix E).

#### Teacher Application Form

According to Gilbert, et al., all except one of the 320 large public school systems included in their study of teacher selection policies and procedures used some type of application form in selecting teachers.<sup>2</sup> Those forms most commonly solicited the following types of information:

---

<sup>2</sup>Gilbert, et al., p. 21.

Education	99.7 per cent
Personnel data	99.1 per cent
Experience	98.4 per cent
Types of positions desired	95.0 per cent
References	94.7 per cent
Statement of interests	89.4 per cent
Travel experience	81.3 per cent

Each of the teacher candidates involved in this study completed a teacher application form. That form (Appendix F) was patterned after the teacher application form used by the Oklahoma City Public School System, one of the 320 large public school systems whose teacher selection policies and procedures were studied by Gilbert, et al. It solicited all of the data cited by Gilbert, et al., as being the information most often required by application forms.

#### Checklist of Questions and Interview Record Sheet

All of the large public school systems examined by Gilbert, et al., in their survey interviewed teacher candidates.<sup>3</sup> Although the literature reflected general agreement among educators as to what constituted a good teacher selection interview,<sup>4</sup> there was no such agreement as to exactly how

---

<sup>3</sup>Gilbert, et al., p. 13.

<sup>4</sup>Van Zwoll, p. 114.

the interview should be conducted or what instruments should be used to assist interviewers. Most authorities agreed, however, that either highly-structured or non-directive planned interviews were permissible if used properly.

According to Harold E. Moore, the purpose of the interview was the factor which governed its kind and nature.<sup>5</sup> The interviews used in this study were intended to convey identical information about the qualifications of teacher candidates to the judges of each of the three groups. Therefore, highly structured interviews were used to sample each candidate's personality, character traits, and other qualifications for teaching. A checklist of questions (Appendix G) was used to standardize the interviews, to guide their sequence, and to assist interviewers in soliciting identical types of information about the qualifications of teacher candidates.

An interview record sheet (Appendix H) was used by the judges as a guide to the systematic observation of interviews. It was designed to be used as a recording instrument only, not as a precise grading scale. The difficulties associated with determining exactly how much weight should be given to each

---

<sup>5</sup>Harold E. Moore, The Administration of Public School Personnel (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1966), p. 43.

item listed on that instrument precluded any attempt to use it for precise measurement and evaluation. Therefore, it was used simply to assist judges in the systematic observation and recording of those traits, characteristics, and qualities normally assessed in teacher selection interviews.

#### Classroom Observation Guide

A classroom observation guide (Appendix I) was used by judges to assist them in the systematic observation of the mini-teaching units taught by teacher candidates. That instrument was the same as one that was being used for that purpose by individual professors and instructors at the University of Oklahoma's College of Education. The difficulties associated with determining how much weight should be assigned to each item listed on this instrument prevented its use as a precise measuring device. Its purpose was to assist judges in the systematic observation and evaluation of teaching.

#### Rank Order Consolidation Sheet

A rank order consolidation sheet (Appendix J) was used by judges to report their opinions as to final order of suitability for employment.

#### Data Collection

The purposes, methods, and procedures of the study

were explained to all subjects prior to the commencement of data collection. All judges were asked to familiarize themselves with the instruments which would be used by them to evaluate teacher candidates. A question and answer session was conducted in order to clarify areas of doubt.

### The First Data Collection Session

Teacher selection interviews were conducted during the first phase of data collection. Each candidate was interviewed three times, once before each of the three groups of judges. All interviews were approximately fifteen minutes in duration.

The purpose of holding three separate interviews for each candidate rather than one interview per candidate before all twenty-six judges was to provide each group with the opportunity for close observation. Such items as appearance, mannerisms, composure, and facial expressions would not have been as easily observable had only one interview been conducted before the assembled group of twenty-six judges.

The judges were given copies of each candidate's credentials and application form for perusal prior to the commencement of her interview. Those documents remained in the possession of judges until the interview was completed.

All interviews were held in classrooms which were

arranged to resemble the office of a school personnel administrator. Interviews were conducted at the front of the classrooms by the interviewers assigned to each group. Only the interviewers were allowed to interact with teacher candidates. Judges observed from positions outside the direct line of vision of persons being interviewed. They recorded their observations while the interviews were in progress.

Upon the completion of all interviews the judges making up each group ranked teacher candidates in the order of their suitability for employment. The Control Group, having completed its task, was released from the study. Experimental Groups 1 and 2 were asked to assemble again in order to observe and evaluate the teaching performance of teacher candidates.

#### Second Data Collection Session

During the second data collection session each teacher candidate taught a mini-teaching unit to a group of high school students from the high school section of the University of Oklahoma laboratory school. The mini-teaching units were approximately ten minutes in duration and were rehearsed before being presented. Each teacher candidate was asked to use at least one visual teaching aid when presenting her mini-teaching unit. All mini-teaching units were video-taped while they were being taught.

The judges of Experimental Group 1 made live observations of the teaching performance of teacher candidates. The video-taped mini-teaching units were simultaneously transmitted via closed-circuit television to a monitor located in another classroom, where they were viewed by the judges of Experimental Group 2. The judges making up Experimental Groups 1 and 2 recorded their impressions of each candidate's performance as she taught her mini-teaching unit. All opinions were recorded on the classroom observation sheets provided for that purpose.

After all mini-teaching units had been taught and observed, the judges of Experimental Groups 1 and 2 assigned order of suitability to teacher candidates based on classroom observations alone. Next, the judges were asked to review the interview record sheets which they had completed on each candidate during the first phase of data collection. They were asked to consider and evaluate the data contained thereon in conjunction with the data which they had just recorded while observing the presentation of mini-teaching units. On the basis of all of that information they assigned final order of suitability to teacher candidates.

#### Statement of Hypotheses

The following 15 hypotheses were tested in this study:

1. Statistically significant agreement will exist



among the final suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of the Control Group, which used traditional teacher selection methods alone to determine suitability for employment.

2. Statistically significant agreement will exist among the final suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 1, which made live observations of classroom teaching performance in addition to using traditional teacher selection methods to determine suitability for employment.

3. Statistically significant agreement will exist among the final suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 2, which, in addition to using traditional methods to determine suitability for employment, viewed video-taped recordings of the mini-teaching units observed live by Experimental Group 1.

4. Statistically significant association will exist between the final suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the student judges of each group and those made by the judges of each group who were professional educational administrators.

5. Statistically significant agreement will exist both among and between the suitability order assignments made to

teacher candidates by the judges of each of the three groups based upon the evaluation of interviews.

6. Statistically significant agreement will not exist among the final suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of the three groups.

7. Statistically significant association will not exist between the final suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of the Control Group based upon the observation of interviews and those made by the judges of Experimental Group 1 after considering both interviews and classroom observations.

8. Statistically significant association will not exist between the final suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of the Control Group based upon the evaluation of interviews and those made by the judges of Experimental Group 2 after considering both interviews and classroom observations made via video-tape.

9. Statistically significant association will exist between the final suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Groups 1 and 2 after evaluating both interviews and classroom teaching performance.

10. Statistically significant association will not

exist between the suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 1 based upon the evaluation of interviews and those made by the judges of that group based upon the live observation of teaching performance.

11. Statistically significant association will not exist between the suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 1 based upon the evaluation of interviews and the final suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of that group after considering both interviews and live classroom observations.

12. Statistically significant association will exist between the suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 1 based upon the live observation of teaching performance and the final suitability order assignments made to candidates by the judges of that group after considering both interviews and live observations.

13. Statistically significant association will not exist between the suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 2 based upon the evaluation of interviews and the suitability order

assignments made by the judges of that group based upon the observation of video-taped recordings of mini-teaching units.

14. Statistically significant association will not exist between the suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 2 based upon the evaluation of interviews and the final suitability order assignments made by the judges of that group after considering both interviews and classroom observations made via video-tape.

15. Statistically significant association will exist between the suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 2 based upon the observation of video-taped recordings of mini-teaching units and the final suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of that group after considering both interviews and mini-teaching units.

#### Treatment of Data

First, the suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the individual judges of each group were analyzed statistically in order to determine the amount of internal group agreement which existed. Next, the data were averaged and ranked by group to obtain average group consensus and tested in order to analyze the between and among group

relationships which existed. The averaging of ranked data reported by several groups to obtain average group consensus is recommended by Fred N. Kerlinger as a defensible procedure for use in determining agreement among and between groups when the numbers of judges in groups differ.<sup>6</sup>

Next the rankings assigned by student judges were added together by group, averaged, and ranked in order to determine the group consensus of judges in that category. A similar procedure was employed with the rankings assigned by the judges of each group who were professional educators. Those data were then analyzed statistically in order to determine the amount of agreement which existed among and between groups and categories of judges.

#### Determining Rank Order Relationships Which Existed Between Groups

Spearman's coefficient of rank correlation was developed for use in determining the degree of relationship which existed between two sets of ranked data. It was used in this study to test Hypotheses 4 and 5 and Hypotheses 7 through 15, all of which required the testing of two sets of ranked data to determine the amount of association which existed. The

---

<sup>6</sup>Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), p. 255.

following formula was used in the computation of that statistic:<sup>7</sup>

$$r_s = 1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}$$

where  $r_s$  represented the coefficient of rank correlation,  $d^2$  the sum of the squares of the differences in ranks, and  $N$  the number of subjects ranked.

The Spearman rank correlation coefficient expresses association on a scale ranging from minus 1.00 to plus 1.00, with minus 1.00 indicating a perfect negative relationship and plus 1.00 indicating a perfect positive relationship. A zero indicates the existence of an independent relationship.

#### Determining Rank Order Relationships Which Existed Among Groups

Kendall's coefficient of concordance,  $W$ , was specifically designed to determine the amount of agreement which existed among three or more sets of ranked data.<sup>8</sup> It was used in this study to test Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6, all of

---

<sup>7</sup>Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956), p. 204.

<sup>8</sup>George A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education (2d ed.; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), p. 225.

which required the testing of three or more sets of ranked data to determine the amount of agreement which existed. Hypothesis 5 required the determination of rank order relationships both among and between groups.

In those instances where two or fewer tied ranks existed, the following formula was used to compute Kendall's coefficient of concordance:<sup>9</sup>

$$W = \frac{S}{1/12 k^2 (n^3 - n)}$$

where S represented the sum of the deviations squared of the totals of the ranks from their mean, k represented the number of ranks, and n represented the number of judges.

In those cases involving more than two tied observations a correction factor (T) was introduced. The following formula was used for the computation of the correction factor.<sup>10</sup>

$$T = \frac{\sum (t^3 - t)}{12}$$

A correction factor was calculated for each of the k sets of ranks. Correction factors were then added together

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 226.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 227.

over the k sets of ranks to obtain the sum of T. A formula for the computation of Kendall's coefficient of concordance which incorporated the correction factor was then applied. That formula was as follows:<sup>11</sup>

$$W = \frac{S}{1/12k^2(N^3 - N) - k \Sigma T}$$

Kendall's coefficient of concordance expresses agreement among ranks on a scale ranging from .00 to 1.00. A rank order coefficient will be near zero if there is no association whatsoever among ranks. The coefficient will be significantly different from zero when there is agreement.

### Tests of Significance

After considering the criteria recommended by J. P. Guilford as a guide for the establishment of significance levels in hypothesis testing,<sup>12</sup> the .05 level was adopted for use in this study. The specific methods used to determine significance are indicated below.

Significance of rs in Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient. The critical values of rs when N equals 30 or

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (3d ed.; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956), pp. 215-16.



fewer subjects in Spearman's rank correlation coefficient are contained in Table G of Ferguson.<sup>13</sup> That source was used to determine the significance of the computed  $r_s$  in Hypotheses 4 and 5 and in Hypotheses 7 through 15, since in each test computed in connection with those hypotheses  $N$  equaled fewer than 30 subjects.

Significance of  $W$  in Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance When  $K$  Consisted of More Than 20 Sets of Ranked Data.

According to Kerlinger, the  $F$  ratio may be used to determine the significance of the computed  $W$  in Kendall's coefficient of concordance when  $k$  consists of more than 20 rankings.<sup>14</sup> Therefore, when testing Hypothesis 5 and 6, both of which required the use of more than 20 sets of ranked data in computing Kendall's coefficient of concordance, the computed  $W$  was converted to an  $F$  ratio in order to determine its significance. The following formula was used to compute the  $F$  ratio:<sup>15</sup>

$$F = \frac{(k-1)w}{1-w}$$

---

<sup>13</sup>Ferguson, p. 414.

<sup>14</sup>Kerlinger, pp. 267-68.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 268.

Significance of S in Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance When K Consisted of 20 or Fewer Rankings. The critical values of S in Kendall's coefficient of concordance when k equals 20 or fewer sets of rankings and N equals seven or fewer subjects are contained in Table R of Siegel.<sup>16</sup> That table was used to determine the significance of the computed S in tests conducted in connection with hypotheses 1, 2 and 3, all of which required fewer than 20 judges to rank the six teacher candidates.

---

<sup>16</sup>Siegel, p. 286.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

#### Introduction

Twenty-six judges were randomly assigned to three groups, each of which used different methods to evaluate and rank six teacher candidates in the order of their suitability for employment as American history teachers. Each judge performed his evaluations independently of other judges.

The data obtained from the individual judges were used to test the fifteen hypotheses stated in Chapter III. All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance. The purpose of this chapter was to analyze and interpret the results of the statistical tests to which the data were subjected.

#### Presentation and Analysis of Data

##### Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis stated that statistically significant agreement would exist among the final rank order assign-

ments made to teacher candidates by the judges of the Control Group. The data which were used to test that hypothesis are contained in Table 2. Kendall's coefficient of concordance was computed from those data in order to determine the amount of agreement which existed. An S value of 575.5 and a W value of .406 were obtained.

Table R of Siegel<sup>1</sup> was used to determine the critical value of the computed S. It was found to be significant at the .01 level. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was accepted. The acceptance of the first hypothesis at the .01 level of significance indicated that the judges of the Control Group, most of whom had some experience in school administration, were in significant agreement as to the order of suitability of teacher candidates for employment.

### Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis stated that statistically significant agreement would exist among the final rank order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 1, which made live observations of classroom teaching performance in addition to using traditional teacher selection methods to determine suitability for employment.

---

<sup>1</sup>  
Ibid.

TABLE 2

RESULTS OF KENDALL'S COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE (W)  
ANALYZING THE AGREEMENT WHICH EXISTED AMONG THE  
JUDGES OF THE CONTROL GROUP AFTER COMPLETING  
ALL PHASES OF SELECTION PROCESSING

Teacher Candidates	Rankings Assigned by Judges									$\Sigma X$	$\Sigma X^2$
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8*	9**		
A	1	2	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	15	225
B	5	1	1	2	4	3	4	1	5	26	676
C	4	4	4	4	2	1	3	3	6	31	961
D	6	3	3	1	3	4	5	4	2	31	961
E	2	6	5	6	6	6	2	5	3	41	1681
F	3	5	6	5	5	5	6	6	4	45	2025

\* Professor of education  $\Sigma X_t = 189$

\*\* Practicing school personnel  
administrator  $\Sigma X_t^2 = 35,721$

$\Sigma X_t^2/N = 5,953.5$

$\Sigma (\Sigma X^2) = 6,529$

S = 575.5

W = .406

P < .01

The data used to test that hypothesis are contained in Table 3. Kendall's coefficient of concordance was computed from those data in order to determine the amount of agreement which existed. An S value of 682 and a W value of .607 were computed.

Table R in Siegel<sup>2</sup> was used to determine the critical

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

TABLE 3

RESULTS OF KENDALL'S COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE (W)  
ANALYZING THE AGREEMENT WHICH EXISTED AMONG THE  
JUDGES OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUP 1 AFTER COM-  
PLETING ALL PHASES OF SELECTION PROCESSING

Teacher Candidates	Rankings Assigned by Judges								$\Sigma X$	$\Sigma X^2$
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7*	8**		
A	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	10	100
B	2	1	4	2	4	2	2	2	19	361
C	3	6	3	5	5	5	5	4	36	1296
D	6	5	6	6	6	6	4	3	42	1764
E	5	4	2	4	3	3	3	5	29	841
F	4	3	5	3	1	4	6	6	32	1024

  

* Professor of Education	$\Sigma X_t$	=	168
** Practicing school personnel administrator	$\Sigma X_t^2$	=	28,224
	$\Sigma X_t^2/N$	=	4,704
	$\Sigma (\Sigma X^2)$	=	5,386

$$S = 682$$

$$W = .607$$

$$P < .01$$

value of the computed S. It was found to be significant at the .01 level. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was accepted. The acceptance of the second hypothesis at the .01 level of significance indicated that the judges of Experimental Group 1, most of whom had some experience in school administration, were in significant agreement as to the order of suitability of teacher candidates for employment.

Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis stated that statistically significant agreement would exist among the final suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 2, which, in addition to using traditional selection methods to determine suitability for employment, viewed video-taped recordings of the mini-teaching units which the judges of Experimental Group 1 observed live. The data used to test that hypothesis are contained in Table 4. Kendall's coefficient of concordance was computed from those data in order to determine the amount of agreement which existed. An S value of 1,139.5 and a W value of .804 were computed. The S value, when checked against the table of critical values of S in the Kendall coefficient of concordance, was found to be significant at the .01 level.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was accepted.

The acceptance of the third hypothesis at the .01 level of significance indicated that the judges of Experimental Group 2, most of whom had some experience in school administration, were in substantial agreement as to the order of suitability of teacher candidates for employment.

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

TABLE 4

RESULTS OF KENDALL'S COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE (W)  
ANALYZING THE AGREEMENT WHICH EXISTED AMONG THE  
JUDGES OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUP 2 AFTER COMPLET-  
ING ALL PHASES OF SELECTION PROCESSING

Teacher Candidates	Rankings Assigned by Judges										$\Sigma X$	$\Sigma X^2$
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8*	9**			
A	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	2	12	144	
B	3	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	1	18	324	
C	2	3	5	4	2	5	3	3	4	31	961	
D	5	4	3	2	4	3	4	4	3	32	1024	
E	4	5	6	5	5	4	5	5	5	44	1936	
F	6	6	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	52	2704	

\* Professor education  $\Sigma X_t = 189$

\*\* Practicing school personnel  
administrator  $\Sigma X_t^2 = 35,721$

$\Sigma X_t^2/N = 5,953.5$

$\Sigma (\Sigma X_t^2) = 7,093$

S = 1,139.5

W = .804

P < .01

#### Hypothesis 4

The fourth hypothesis stated that statistically significant association would exist between the final rank order assignments made to teacher candidates by the student judges of each group and those made by the judges of each group who were professional educational administrators. The data used to test that hypothesis are contained in Table 5.



TABLE 5

FINAL SUITABILITY ORDER ASSIGNMENTS MADE TO TEACHER  
CANDIDATES BY THE STUDENT JUDGES OF EACH GROUP  
AND THOSE MADE BY THE JUDGES OF EACH GROUP  
WHO WERE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

Teacher Candidates	Student Judges			Professional Educational Administrators		
	Control Group	XG1	XGx	Control Group	XG1	XG2
A	1	1	1	1	1	1.5
B	2	2	2	2.5	2	1.5
C	3	5	3	5	5	3
D	4	6	4	2.5	6	4
E	5	4	5	4	3	5
F	6	3	6	6	4	6

Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was computed from those data for the two categories of judges of each group in order to determine the amount of association which existed. The results of those tests are contained in Table 6. Although positive rank correlation existed between the student judges and the professional educational administrators of each group, only that obtained for Experimental Groups 1 and 2 was statistically significant.<sup>4</sup> The correlation which existed between the two categories of judges in the Control Group approached significance at the .05 level.

Since statistically significant coefficients were

---

<sup>4</sup>Ferguson, p. 414.

TABLE 6

RESULTS OF SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT  
ANALYZING THE ASSOCIATION WHICH EXISTED BETWEEN  
THE FINAL SUITABILITY ORDER ASSIGNMENTS MADE  
BY THE STUDENT JUDGES OF EACH GROUP AND  
THOSE MADE BY THE JUDGES OF EACH GROUP  
WHO WERE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS

Group	Coefficient Obtained	Significance
Control Group	.786	P > .05
Experimental Group 1	.943	P < .01
Experimental Group 2	.986	P < .01

obtained for only two of the three tests required by Hypothesis 4, the hypothesis was rejected.

#### Hypothesis 5

The fifth hypothesis stated that statistically significant agreement would exist both among and between the average suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of the three groups based upon the evaluation of interviews. The data used to test that hypothesis are contained in Table 7. Kendall's coefficient of concordance was computed from those data in order to determine the amount of agreement which existed among groups. A W of .960 was computed. That value was converted to an F ratio in order to evaluate its significance. An F ratio of 48 was obtained.

TABLE 7

RESULTS OF KENDALL'S COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE (W)  
ANALYZING THE AGREEMENT WHICH EXISTED AMONG THE  
AVERAGE SUITABILITY ORDER ASSIGNMENTS MADE TO  
TEACHER CANDIDATES BY THE JUDGES OF THE  
THREE GROUPS BASED UPON THE EVALU-  
ATION OF INTERVIEWS

Teacher Candidates	Control Group	Experimental Group 1	Experimental Group 2	$\Sigma X$	$\Sigma X^2$
A	1	1	1	3	9
B	2	2	2	6	36
C	3.5	3	3	9.5	90.25
D	3.5	4.5	4	12	144
E	5	4.5	5	14.5	210.25
F	6	6	6	18	324

$$\Sigma X_t = 63 \quad \Sigma X_t^2 = 3969 \quad \Sigma X_t^2/N = 661.5$$

$$\Sigma (\Sigma X)^2 = 813.50$$

$$S = 152 \quad W = .960 \quad F = 48 \quad P < .01$$

That figure, when checked against the table of critical values of F contained in Ferguson,<sup>5</sup> was found to be significant at the .01 level.

Next Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was used to analyze the agreement which existed between groups. The results of those tests are reflected in Table 8. All of the coefficients which were computed were found to be significant at the .01 level.<sup>6</sup> Therefore, since significance was obtained

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., pp. 408-9.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 414.

TABLE 8

RESULTS OF SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT  
ANALYZING THE ASSOCIATION WHICH EXISTED BETWEEN  
THE INTERVIEW RANK ORDER ASSIGNMENTS MADE TO  
TEACHER CANDIDATES BY THE JUDGES OF  
EACH OF THE THREE GROUPS

Groups	Coefficient Obtained	Significance
Control Group & Experimental Group 1	.957	P $\sphericalangle$ .01
Control Group & Experimental Group 2	.986	P $\sphericalangle$ .01
Experimental Groups 1 and 2	.986	P $\sphericalangle$ .01

when both among and between groups agreement was analyzed, Hypothesis 5 was accepted.

The acceptance of Hypothesis 5 at the .01 level indicated that, though separate teacher selection interviews were held for each of the three groups of judges involved in the study, a high level of agreement nevertheless existed both among and between groups as to the order of suitability of teacher candidates for employment.

The acceptance of Hypothesis 5 also suggested that any significant disagreement noted either among or between groups when final judgments of suitability were analyzed could be assumed to have been caused by the classroom observations employed by Experimental Groups 1 and 2 as supplemental teacher selection techniques.

Hypothesis 6

The sixth hypothesis stated that statistically significant agreement would not exist among the final suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of the three groups involved in the study. The data used to test that hypothesis are contained in Table 9. Kendall's coefficient of concordance was computed from those data in

TABLE 9

RESULTS OF KENDALL'S COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE (W)  
ANALYZING THE AMOUNT OF AGREEMENT WHICH EXISTED  
AMONG THE FINAL SUITABILITY ORDER ASSIGNMENTS  
MADE BY THE JUDGES OF THE THREE GROUPS

Teacher Candidates	Control Group	Experimental Group 1	Experimental Group 2	$\Sigma X$	$\Sigma X^2$
A	1	1	1	3	9
B	2	2	2	6	36
C	3.5	5	3	11.5	132.25
D	3.5	6	4	13.5	182.25
E	5	3	5	13	169
F	6	4	6	16	256

$$\Sigma X_t = 63 \quad \Sigma X_t^2 = 3939 \quad \Sigma X_t^2 / N = 661.5$$

$$\Sigma (\Sigma X^2) = 784.5$$

$$S = 123 \quad W = .781 \quad F = 7.13 \quad P < .01$$

order to determine the amount of agreement which existed. An S score of 123 and a W value of .781 were computed. The W value was converted to an F ratio in order to evaluate its significance. An F ratio of 7.13 was computed. That figure,

when checked against the table of critical values of  $F$  in Ferguson,<sup>7</sup> was found to be significant at the .01 level. Therefore, Hypothesis 6 was rejected. Statistically significant agreement did exist.

The fact that the judges of the three groups agreed significantly among themselves as to the final order of suitability of teacher candidates for employment could be misleading. Kendall's coefficient of concordance tests for agreement among three or more sets of ranked data. It does not test for agreement between groups. Therefore, it was possible that highly significant agreement might have existed between the suitability order assignments made by two of the three groups involved in the study, whereas the third group might not have agreed significantly with the suitability order assignments made by either of the other two. The high level of agreement which might have existed between the first two groups might have been sufficient to reflect significant agreement among all three sets of suitability assignments when tests for among groups agreement were conducted using Kendall's coefficient of concordance. The results of subsequent tests of between groups agreement using Spearman's rank correlation coefficient revealed that such was the case (Hypotheses 7, 8 and 9).

---

<sup>7</sup>Ferguson, pp. 408-9.

Hypothesis 7

The seventh hypothesis stated that statistically significant association would not exist between the final suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of the Control Group based upon the observation of interviews and those made by the judges of Experimental Group 1 after considering both interviews and live observations. The data used to test that hypothesis are contained in Table 10.

TABLE 10

RESULTS OF SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT ANALYZING THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE FINAL RANK ORDER ASSIGNMENTS MADE TO TEACHER CANDIDATES BY JUDGES OF THE CONTROL GROUP BASED UPON THE EVALUATION OF INTERVIEWS AND THOSE MADE BY THE JUDGES OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUP 1 AFTER CONSIDERING BOTH INTERVIEWS AND LIVE CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS

Teacher Candidates	Control Group	Experimental Group 1	d	d <sup>2</sup>
A	1	1	0	0
B	2	2	0	0
C	3.5	5	-1.5	2.25
D	3.5	6	-2.5	6.25
E	5	3	2	4
F	6	4	2	4

$$\sum d^2 = 16.50 \quad rs = .575 \quad P > .05$$

Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was computed from those data in order to determine the amount of association

which existed. A coefficient of .575 was obtained. That figure was not significant at the .05 level.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, Hypothesis 7 was accepted. The two groups of judges did not agree as to the final order of suitability of teacher candidates for employment.

#### Hypothesis 8

The eighth hypothesis stated that statistically significant association would not exist between the final suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of the Control Group based upon the evaluation of interviews and those made by the judges of Experimental Group 2 after considering both interviews and classroom observations made via video tape. The data used to test that hypothesis are contained in Table 11. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was computed from those data in order to measure the relationship which existed. A coefficient of .986 was obtained. That figure, when checked against Table G of Ferguson,<sup>9</sup> was found to be significant at the .01 level. Therefore, Hypothesis 8 was rejected. Despite the fact that different assessment procedures were used by the Control Group

---

<sup>8</sup>Ferguson, p. 414.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.



and by Experimental Group 2 in arriving at final order of suitability decisions, the judges of both groups were in agreement at the .01 level as to the final order of suitability of teacher candidates for employment.

TABLE 11

RESULTS OF SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT ANALYZING THE ASSOCIATION WHICH EXISTED BETWEEN THE FINAL RANK ORDER ASSIGNMENTS MADE TO TEACHER CANDIDATES BY JUDGES OF THE CONTROL GROUP AND THOSE MADE BY THE JUDGES OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUP 2 AFTER CONSIDERING BOTH INTERVIEWS AND CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS (VIA VIDEO-TAPE)

Teacher Candidates	Control Group	Experimental Group 2	d	d <sup>2</sup>
A	1	1	0	0
B	2	2	0	0
C	3.5	3	+ .5	.25
D	3.5	4	- .5	.25
E	5	5	0	0
F	6	6	0	0

$$\sum d^2 = .50 \quad r_s = .986 \quad P < .01$$

### Hypothesis 9

Earlier in this study it was speculated that the viewing of video-taped samples of classroom teaching performance might be a feasible substitute for live observation in the selection of teachers. If so, it was reasoned, then high positive correlation should exist between final order of suitability decisions reported by judges involved in the study

who made live classroom observations and those reported by judges who viewed video-taped recordings of the same classroom teaching performances. In order to test that assumption it was hypothesized that statistically significant association would exist between final order of suitability decisions reported by the judges of Experimental Group 1, which made live observations, and those reported by the judges of Experimental Group 2, which observed via video-tape.

The data used to test Hypothesis 9 are contained in Table 12. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was computed from those data in order to determine the amount of association which existed. A coefficient of .543 was obtained.

TABLE 12

RESULTS OF SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT ANALYZING THE ASSOCIATION WHICH EXISTED BETWEEN THE FINAL RANK ORDER ASSIGNMENTS MADE TO TEACHER CANDIDATES BY JUDGES OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS 1 AND 2 AFTER EVALUATING BOTH INTERVIEWS AND TEACHING PERFORMANCE

Teacher Candidate	Experimental Group 1	Experimental Group 2	d	d <sup>2</sup>
A	1	1	0	0
B	2	2	0	0
C	5	3	+ 2	4
D	6	4	+ 2	4
E	3	5	- 2	4
F	4	6	- 2	4

$$\sum d^2 = 16$$

$$r_s = .543$$

$$P > .05$$

Table G of Ferguson<sup>10</sup> was used to determine its significance. It was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, Hypothesis 9 was rejected. The two groups of judges were not in significant agreement as to the final order of suitability of teacher candidates for employment.

#### Hypothesis 10

The tenth hypothesis stated that statistically significant association would not exist between the suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 1 based upon the evaluation of interviews and those made by the judges of that group based upon the live observation of teaching performance. The data used to test that hypothesis are contained in Table 13. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was computed from those data in order to determine the amount of association which existed. A coefficient of .663 was obtained. Table G of Ferguson<sup>11</sup> was used to evaluate the significance of the obtained rs. It was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, Hypothesis 10 was accepted. A considerable disparity existed between the interview and observation suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 1.

---

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

TABLE 13

RESULTS OF SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT ANALYZING THE ASSOCIATION WHICH EXISTED BETWEEN INTERVIEW AND OBSERVATION SUITABILITY ORDER ASSIGNMENTS MADE TO TEACHER CANDIDATES BY JUDGES OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUP 1

Teacher Candidate	Interview Rank	Observation Rank	d	d <sup>2</sup>
A	1	1	0	0
B	2	2	0	0
C	3	5	-2	4
D	4.5	6	1.5	2.25
E	4.5	3	-1.5	2.25
F	6	4	+2	4

$$\sum d^2 = 12.50 \quad r_s = .663 \quad P > .05$$

#### Hypothesis 11

The eleventh hypothesis stated that statistically significant association would not exist between the suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 1 based upon the evaluation of interviews and the final suitability order assignments made by the judges of that group after considering both the interviews and classroom observations. The data used to test that hypothesis are contained in Table 14. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was computed from those data in order to determine the amount of association which existed. A coefficient of .663 was obtained. Table G of Ferguson<sup>12</sup> was used

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

TABLE 14

RESULTS OF SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT ANALYZING THE ASSOCIATION WHICH EXISTED BETWEEN THE INTERVIEW AND FINAL SUITABILITY ORDER ASSIGNMENTS MADE TO TEACHER CANDIDATES BY THE JUDGES OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUP 1

Teacher Candidate	Interview Rank	Final Rank	d	d <sup>2</sup>
A	1	1	0	0
B	2	2	0	0
C	3	5	-2	4
D	4.5	6	+1.5	2.25
E	4.5	3	-1.5	2.25
F	6	4	+2	4

$$\sum d^2 = 12.50 \quad r_s = .663 \quad P > .05$$

to evaluate the significance of the obtained  $r_s$ . It was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, Hypothesis 11 was accepted. There was no significant association between interview and final rank order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 1.

### Hypothesis 12

The twelfth hypothesis stated that statistically significant association would exist between the suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 1 based upon the live observation of teaching performance and the final rank order assignments made by the judges of that group after considering both inter-

views and live classroom observations. The data used to test that hypothesis are contained in Table 15. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was computed from those data in order to determine the amount of association which existed. Perfect positive correlation existed between the observation and final suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 1. Therefore, Hypothesis 12 was accepted.

TABLE 15

RESULTS OF SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT ANALYZING THE ASSOCIATION WHICH EXISTED BETWEEN THE OBSERVATION AND FINAL SUITABILITY ORDER ASSIGNMENT MADE TO TEACHER CANDIDATES BY THE JUDGES OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUP 1

Teacher Candidate	observation Rank	Final Rank	d	d <sup>2</sup>
A	1	1	0	0
B	2	2	0	0
C	5	5	0	0
D	6	6	0	0
E	3	3	0	0
F	4	4	0	0

$$\sum d^2 = 0 \quad r_s = 1.000 \quad P < .01$$

### Hypothesis 13

The thirteenth hypothesis stated that statistically significant association would not exist between the suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges

of Experimental Group 2 based upon the evaluation of interviews and those made by the judges of that group based upon the observation of video-taped recordings of mini-teaching units. The data used to test that hypothesis are contained in Table 16. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was computed from those data in order to determine the amount of

TABLE 16

RESULTS OF SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT ANALYZING THE ASSOCIATION WHICH EXISTED BETWEEN INTERVIEW AND OBSERVATION SUITABILITY ORDER ASSIGNMENTS MADE TO TEACHER CANDIDATES BY THE JUDGES OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUP 2

Teacher Candidate	Interview Rank	Observation Rank	d	d <sup>2</sup>
A	1	1	0	0
B	2	2	0	0
C	3	3	0	0
D	4	4	0	0
E	5	5	0	0
F	6	6	0	0

$$\sum d^2 = 0 \quad r_s = 1.000 \quad P < .01$$

association which existed. A perfect positive coefficient was computed. Therefore, Hypothesis 13 was rejected. Although there were some internal shifts in consensus reported by individual judges within Experimental Group 2, the average consensus of the group remained unchanged.

Hypothesis 14

The fourteenth hypothesis stated that statistically significant association would not exist between the suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 2 based upon the evaluation of interviews and the final suitability order assignments made by the judges of that group after considering both interviews and classroom observations made via video-tape. The data used to test that hypothesis are contained in Table 17. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was computed from those data in order to

TABLE 17

RESULTS OF SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT ANALYZING THE ASSOCIATION WHICH EXISTED BETWEEN THE INTERVIEW AND FINAL SUITABILITY ORDER ASSIGNMENTS MADE TO TEACHER CANDIDATES BY THE JUDGES OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUP 2

Teacher Candidate	Interview Rank	Final Rank	d	d <sup>2</sup>
A	1	1	0	0
B	2	2	0	0
C	3	3	0	0
D	4	4	0	0
E	5	5	0	0
F	6	6	0	0

$$\sum d^2 = 0 \quad r_s = 1.000 \quad P < .01$$

determine the amount of association which existed. Perfect positive correlation was obtained. Therefore, Hypothesis 14



was rejected. Although there were some internal shifts in consensus reported by individual judges in Experimental Group 2, the average group consensus remained unchanged. Identical average rank order assignments were reported for both interview and final suitability order judgments.

#### Hypothesis 15

The fifteenth hypothesis stated that statistically significant association would exist between the suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 2 based upon the observation of video-taped recordings of mini-teaching units and the final suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of that group after considering both interviews and classroom observations. The data used to test that hypothesis are contained in Table 18. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was computed from those data in order to determine the amount of association which existed. Perfect positive correlation was obtained. Therefore, Hypothesis 15 was accepted. Although there were some internal shifts in consensus reported by individual judges of Experimental Group 2, the average group consensus remained unchanged. Identical average rank order assignments were reported for both observation and final suitability order judgments.

TABLE 18

RESULTS OF SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT ANALYZING THE ASSOCIATION WHICH EXISTED BETWEEN THE OBSERVATION AND FINAL SUITABILITY ORDER ASSIGNMENTS MADE TO TEACHER CANDIDATES BY THE JUDGES OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUP 2

Teacher Candidate	Observation Rank	Final Rank	d	d <sup>2</sup>
A	1	1	0	0
B	2	2	0	0
C	3	3	0	0
D	4	4	0	0
E	5	5	0	0
F	6	6	0	0

$$\sum d^2 = 0 \quad r_s = 1.000 \quad P < .01$$

#### Summary

The raw data which were obtained during the study and the results of the statistical tests to which they were subjected have been presented in this chapter. The data were used to test fifteen hypotheses concerned with the relationship which existed between teacher suitability decisions made by judges who observed classroom teaching performance of candidates (both live and via video-tape) and those made by judges who did not. A summary of findings, the conclusions which were drawn, and the recommendations which they supported are contained in Chapter V.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Introduction and Summary

The need for the study was established by pointing out the haphazard methods and procedures used by most large public school systems in the United States to select teachers. Also cited was the failure of researchers to determine exactly what constituted good teaching and to identify effective techniques for the prediction of future teaching success.

It was mentioned frequently in the literature that school personnel administrators should observe the teaching performance of candidates prior to making final selection decisions. Most writers believed that poor teachers hired by school systems which did not observe the performance of candidates as a part of teacher selection could have been identified and eliminated from consideration through the use of that procedure.

Despite the widespread support for the use of classroom observations in teacher selection, there appeared to be

little research data available to support that practice. Studies could not be located which suggested that the observation of teaching performance significantly affected selection decisions made by school personnel administrators.

#### Problem Restated

The problem of this study was to determine whether or not the live observation of teaching or observations made via video-tape would significantly affect final teacher selection decisions made by school personnel administrators.

#### Methodology

The twenty-six judges who participated in this study were required to rank six teacher candidates in the order of their suitability for employment as high school American history teachers. Twenty of the judges were doctoral students in educational administration at the University of Oklahoma; all were members of a class being offered in school personnel administration. The majority of them were experienced school administrators and had experience in personnel selection (see Table 1). Three of the judges were professors of educational administration at the University of Oklahoma. The remaining three were practicing school personnel administrators, each responsible for the selection of teachers in his school system.

The judges were randomly divided into three groups, each of which consisted of several doctoral students, one professor of education, and one practicing school personnel administrator. Each group used a different method to evaluate and rank six teacher candidates in the order of their suitability for employment. The Control Group used traditional teacher selection methods alone (an interview and an examination of the completed application form and other credentials) to assess teacher candidates. Experimental Group 1, in addition to using traditional teacher selection methods, made live observations of the teaching performance of candidates. Experimental Group 2, in addition to using traditional teacher selection methods, viewed video-taped recordings of the teaching performances which Experimental Group 1 had observed live.

Special instruments were used to guide the judges in the systematic observation and evaluation of candidates. Suitability order judgments were reported on forms specifically designed for that purpose.

### Findings

Kendall's coefficient of concordance and Spearman's rank correlation coefficient were used to test the 15 hypotheses developed to investigate the problem in this study.

Each hypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance.

The findings which were obtained are summarized below:

1. The three groups of judges, after observing interviews only, were in agreement at the .01 level as to the order of suitability of teacher candidates for employment.

2. The agreement which existed among individual judges of each of the three groups as to the final order of suitability of teacher candidates for employment was significant at the .01 level.

3. Agreement among individual judges as to final order of suitability of teacher candidates for employment was stronger among the judges of Experimental Groups 1 and 2 than among the judges of the Control Group.

4. A considerable amount of agreement existed between student and professional judges as to the final order of suitability of teacher candidates for employment. The student and professional judges of Experimental Groups 1 and 2 were in agreement at the .01 level of significance. Agreement between those two categories of judges in the Control Group approached significance at the .05 level.

5. Significant agreement existed among groups as to the final order of suitability of teacher candidates for employment. The average rank order assignments made by each

of the three groups, when considered collectively, were found to be significant at the .01 level.

6. Agreement was strongest between the Control Group and Experimental Group 2 as to the final order of suitability of teacher candidates for employment. Neither of those groups was in significant agreement with Experimental Group 1. The high level of agreement which existed between the Control Group and Experimental Group 2 was sufficient to reflect significant agreement among all three groups when tests for among groups agreement were conducted.

7. The live observation of teaching performance had a significant effect upon the final suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 1.

8. Observations of teaching performance made via video-tape had no significant effect upon final suitability order assignments made to teacher candidates by the judges of Experimental Group 2.

9. The live observation of teaching performance had a greater effect upon final teacher suitability order decisions than did interviews.

10. Interviews had a greater effect upon final teacher suitability order decisions than did the observation of teaching performance made via video-tape.

In addition to the above findings, it was also noted that perfect agreement existed among groups as to the first and second best suited candidates for employment.

### Conclusions

The findings of this study support the following conclusions:

1. It appears that the live observation of teaching performance can have a significant effect upon teacher selection decisions made by school personnel administrators.
2. Video-taped recordings of teaching performance do not appear to be a feasible substitute for live classroom observation in teacher selection.
3. The live observation of teaching performance may be of more assistance to school personnel administrators in establishing priorities for employment than in identifying outstanding candidates.
4. It may be that reliability among independent judges in teacher selection can be increased through the use of either live classroom observation or observations made by video-tape as a supplement to traditional teacher selection methods.

### Recommendations

The following recommendations are made:



1. That the study be repeated using a randomly selected group of practicing school personnel administrators as judges and a matched group of regular classroom teachers as teacher candidates.

2. That the study be expanded to include sex, race, age of teacher candidates and judges, formal education, and grade point average of candidates as variables.

3. That a longitudinal study be conducted in order to determine whether or not live classroom observation enables school personnel administrators to make better predictions of future teaching success than does the selection interview.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Beach, Dale S. Personnel: The Management of People at Work. 2nd ed. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1970.
- Benson, Charles S. The Economics of Education. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.
- Black, James Menzies. How to Get Results From Interviewing. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.
- Chruden, Herbert J., and Sherman, Arthur W., Jr. Personnel Management. 3rd ed. Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Company, 1968.
- Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.
- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.
- Hall, R. M., and Vincent, A. M. "Staff Selection and Appointment." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Edited by C. W. Harris. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1960, pp. 1375-77.
- Hariton, Theodore. Interview: The Executive's Guide to Selecting the Right Personnel. New York: Hastings House Publishers, 1970.
- Hays, William L. Statistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1966.
- Hollingworth, H. L. Judging Human Character. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1928.

- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Lang, Carroll L. Teacher Recruitment--Problems, Promises, and Proven Methods. Englewood Cliffs, New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
- Lewis, Ervin Eugene. Personnel Problems of the Teaching Staff. New York: The Century Company, 1925.
- McMurray, Robert N. Tested Techniques in Personnel Selection. Chicago: Dartnell Corporation, 1955.
- Moore, Harold E., and Walters, Newell B. Personnel Administration in Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1966.
- Reeder, Ward G. The Fundamentals of Public School Administration. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1951.
- Ryans, David G. "Predictions of Teacher Effectiveness." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Edited by C. W. Harris. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1960, pp. 1486-91.
- Siegel, Sidney. Non-Parametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.
- Van Zwoll, James A. School Personnel Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Division of the Meredith Publishing Company, 1964.

#### Yearbooks

- American Association of School Administrators. Staff Relations in School Administration. Thirty-third yearbook. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1955.
- Broudy, Harry S. "The Continuing Search for Criteria." Changing Dimensions in Teacher Education. Yearbook of the American Association for Teacher Education. Washington, D. C., 1967.

Periodicals

- Allen, Dwight W., and Wagschall, Peter. "A New Look in Credentialing." Clearing House, 44 (November, 1969).
- American Association of Examiners of Educational Personnel. Principles and Procedures of Teacher Selection. Cincinnati: Tri-State Offset Company, 1952.
- Bolster, B. I., and Springbett, B. M. "The Reaction of Interviewers to Favorable and Unfavorable Information." Journal of Applied Psychology, 45 (April, 1961), pp. 97-103.
- Branin, E. R. "Procedure for Interviewing Prospective School Teachers." American School Board Journal, 151 (July, 1965), p. 46.
- Carey, R. D. "How to Select and Place Teachers." American School Board Journal, 139 (December, 1959), pp. 17-18.
- Carlo, J. "Teacher Selection." National Association of Secondary School Principal's Bulletin, 43 (May, 1958), pp. 183-88.
- Chichester, J. B. "Who is a Good Teacher? Factors in Teacher Selection." Phi. Delta Kappan, 37 (May, 1956), pp. 245-47.
- Corey, S. M. "The Interview in Teacher Selection." Journal of Educational Research, 26 (March, 1933), pp. 525-31.
- Downs, Calvin W. "Perceptions of the Selection Interview." Personnel Administrator, 32 (May-June, 1969), pp. 8-23.
- Driver, R. S. "Research in the Interview." Office Management Series, No. 102. American Management Association, 1944, pp. 20-31.
- Durflinger, G. W. "Recruitment and Selection of Prospective Elementary and Secondary School Teachers." Review of Educational Research, 33 (October, 1963), pp. 355-57.

- Fitzgerald, Paul. "Recruitment of Teachers." Personnel Journal, 49 (April, 1970), pp. 312-14.
- Flinker, L. "Teacher Recruitment in New York City: Archaic and Costly." Clearing House, 44 (April, 1970), pp. 483-87.
- Ghiselli, Edwin E. "The Validity of a Personnel Interview." Personnel Psychology, 19 (Winter, 1966), pp. 389-94.
- Gilbert, Harry B. "Needed Research in the Area of Teacher Selection." Teacher Selection Methods. New York: New York City Board of Education, 1967.
- Graves, J. W., and Hixon, L. B. "What to Ask in Teacher Interviews." Nation's Schools, 77 (March, 1966), pp. 83-85.
- Green, G. S., "Modern Methods in the Selection of Teachers." American School Board Journal, 140 (May, 1960), pp. 13-16.
- Harmon, M., and Simon, S. B. "Choosing Staff: Some Outrageous Proposals." National Elementary Principal, 44 (May, 1965), p. 30.
- Johnson, James A., and Radebaugh, Byron F. "Excellent Teachers: What Makes Them Outstanding?" Clearing House, 44 (November, 1969), pp. 152-56.
- Karlik, D. J. "How One School Interviews Candidates." Michigan Education Journal, 44 (February, 1947), pp. 27-28+.
- Koerner, T. F. "Interviewing: Ask the Right Questions." Clearing House, 44 (October, 1969), pp. 102-4.
- Lennon, L. J. "How Do We Select Teachers at the Local School Level?" Journal of Teacher Education, 9 (May, 1958), pp. 51-53.
- McIntyre, Kenneth E. "How to Select Teachers." National Education Association Journal, 47 (April, 1958), pp. 250-51.
- McIntyre, Kenneth E. "How to Select Teachers." National

Education Association Journal, 47 (April, 1958), pp. 250-51.

Mayfield, E. C. "The Selection Interview - A Re-evaluation of Published Research." Personnel Psychology, 17 (Autumn, 1964), pp. 239-60.

-----, and Carlson, R. E. "Selection Interview Decisions: First Results From a Long-Term Research Project." Personnel Psychology, 19 (Spring, 1960), pp. 41-55.

Mayfield, Harold. "Employee Selection: How Much Does Personality Count?" Supervisory Management, 11 (March, 1966), pp. 22-26.

Merritt, Daniel L. "Attitude Congruency and Selection of Teacher Candidates." Administrator's Notebook, 19 (February, 1971), pp. 30-31.

Miller, J. W., and Rowe, Patricia M. "Influence of Favorable and Unfavorable Information Upon Assessment Decisions." Journal of Applied Psychology, 51 (October, 1967), pp. 432-35.

Mintzer, C. W. "Plan for the Selection of New Staff Members." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 41 (May, 1957), pp. 46-47.

Moffitt, F. J. "Good Teachers are Hard to Judge by Their Packaging." National's Schools, 81 (January, 1968), p. 14.

Moore, Harold E. The Administration of Public School Personnel. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1966.

Ordinia, A., Jr. "Why Interview?" Personnel Journal, 47 (June, 1968), pp. 430-32.

Pyron, H. Charles. "The Use and Misuse of Employment References in Hiring." Management of Personnel Quarterly, 9 (Summer, 1970), pp. 15-22.

Redefer, F. L. "Recruiting and Selecting Teachers." American School Board Journal, 145 (May, 1962), pp. 7-8.

- Redfern, G. B. "Teacher Selection." Education Leader, 23 (April, 1966), pp. 560-63.
- Rowe, Patricia. "Personnel Interviewers: Differences in Selection." The Canadian Journal of Psychology, 17 (March, 1970), pp. 19-46.
- Schwab, Donald P. "Why Interview? A Critique." Personnel Journal, 48 (February, 1969).
- , and Heneman, Herbert G., III. "Relationship Between Interview Structure and Interviewer Reliability in an Employment Situation." Journal of Applied Psychology, 53 (June, 1969), pp. 214-17.
- Snow, A. J. "An Experiment in the Validity of Judging Human Ability." Journal of Applied Psychology, 8 ( 1924), pp. 339-46.
- Springbett, B. M. "Factors Affecting Decision-Making in the Employment Interview." Canadian Journal of Psychology, 12 (March, 1958), pp. 13-22.
- "Teacher Selection: How to Weed Out the Duds." School Management, 11 (February, 1967), pp. 34-37.
- Urich, L., and Trumbo, D. "The Selection Interview Since 1949." Psychological Bulletin, 63 (February, 1965), pp. 100-16.
- Wagner, R. F. "The Employment Interview: A Critical Summary." Personnel Psychology, 2 (Spring, 1949), pp. 17-46.
- Wentworth, P. "How to Improve Employment Interviews." Personnel Journal, 32 (June, 1953), pp. 46-49.
- Wright, Orman R., Jr. "Summary of Research on the Selection Interview Since 1964." Personnel Psychology, 22 (Winter, 1969), pp. 391-411.
- Yevish, Irvin A. "The Observation Fallacy." The Education Digest, 33 (April, 1968), p. 51.
- Zatz, D. I. "Teachers Help Interview Prospective Teachers." Today's Education, 59 (February, 1970), p. 47.

Unpublished Materials

- Alderton, Harold L. "Selection of Teachers." Unpublished seminar study, University of Maryland, June, 1958. Cited by James A. Van Zwoll, School Personnel Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Division of the Meredith Publishing Company, 1964.
- Delaney, Eleanor Cecelia. "Teacher Selection and Evaluation: With Special Attention to the Validity of the Personnel Interview and the National Teacher Examinations." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1954.
- Gaugham, Girard Paul. "An Analysis of the Content of Preliminary Teacher Selection Interviews." Unpublished dissertation, Rutgers University, 1967.
- Gilbert, Harry B., et al. "Teacher Selection Policies and Procedures in the United States." Unpublished study conducted by the New York City Board of Education, 1966.
- Hodes, Lance N. "The Development of an Instrument to Aid in the Selection of Effective Teachers." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, the Pennsylvania State University, 1968.
- Johnson, Kermit Kent. "An Investigation of Employment Techniques with Special Reference to the Selection of College Graduates by Business and Industry." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Bradley University, 1956.
- Keeler, Harold J. "Predicting Teacher Effectiveness of the Graduates of the State University of New York Teachers Colleges." Unpublished Dissertation, Cornell University, 1956.
- Rudisill, Mervin D. "A Study of Practices and Procedures Used by Public Schools in Pennsylvania to Recruit and Employ Teachers." Unpublished dissertation, Temple University, 1966.
- Shultz, H. Charles. "A Study of Recruitment and Selection of School Teachers in Pennsylvania." Unpublished dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1964.



Steinbeck, Roy S. "A Study of Some Differences in Background, Attitudes, Experience, and Professional Preparation of Selected Elementary School Teachers With Contrasting Local Success Records." Unpublished dissertation, Indiana University, 1954.

UNIVERSITY PLACEMENT SERVICE

Credentials of \_\_\_\_\_

Recommended for \_\_\_\_\_

IMPORTANT: The credentials attached are strictly confidential. They are sent to prospective employers with the understanding that they will in no cases be shown to the person to whom they refer. Those papers are sent at the request of the prospective employer or at the request of the applicant. In the latter case, the university assumes no responsibility for the applicant's fitness for the particular position unless a letter of recommendation accompanies the papers.

Please feel free to retain the credentials as long as you have use for them. When you are through with them, return them to the placement service.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Director)

UNIVERSITY TRANSCRIPT

NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
MAJOR \_\_\_\_\_ MINOR \_\_\_\_\_

<u>DEPT. CODE</u>	<u>COURSE NO.</u>	<u>COURSE TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>	<u>GRADE</u>
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:

Education Professions Division

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Norman, Oklahoma

CO-OPERATING TEACHER'S REPORT ON STUDENT TEACHER

Name of Student Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 Teaching Area or Subject(s) \_\_\_\_\_  
 School \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature of Co-Operating Teacher \_\_\_\_\_

This is your official evaluation of the student teacher.  
 Your evaluation becomes a permanent part of the student's  
 record.

Elements Essential to Teaching Competence (Check each item in one column only)	Out- Standing	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Inade- quate for Teaching
Appeared in appropriate dress					
Talked in tones, rates & volumes appropriated to the classroom					
Displayed emotional stability and self-control					
Practiced appropriate oral and written communications					
Reacted receptively and construc- tively to criticisms					
Demonstrated comprehension of subject matters					
Assumed responsibility with reliability					
Planned thoroughly, resourcefully and creatively					
Organized the routines of classroom and school					
Skilled in providing & managing learning activities					
Developed pupil behaviors supportive of learning					
Maintained a professional relationship in attitudes and ethics					
Recognized pupils' capabilities, needs and behaviors					
SUMMARY EVALUATION: In my judgment this student will become a teacher who is (check in one column only)					

Explanatory Comments (this phase of evaluation may prove to be the most valuable)

Observable strengths of this student teacher:

Qualities or characteristics of this student teacher requiring improvement:

Use the reverse side for any additional comments.

Return the evaluation report to the College of Education at least three days before end of the student teacher period.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

TO:

You have been referred to the Teacher Placement Office of the University of Oklahoma as one who is familiar with the qualifications of \_\_\_\_\_, who has listed the following employment preferences: \_\_\_\_\_

Would you please (1) check the characteristics listed below as nearly as they represent your opinion of the applicant, and (2) write a brief statement concerning the applicant which might assist a prospective employer in considering the applicant. Statements are for the use of the Teacher Placement Office, and are not available to the applicant.

(Please use an "X" to indicate your opinion.)

Characteristics	Superior	Very Good	Good	Average	Poor
Intellectual Endowment					
Appearance					
Judgment and Common Sense					
Co-Operativeness					
Initiative					
Integrity					
Qualifications for Preferred Employment					

My acquaintance with this person has been as:

Employer\_\_\_\_\_, Supervisor\_\_\_\_\_; Teacher: High School\_\_\_\_\_,  
College\_\_\_\_\_, Friend\_\_\_\_\_, Co-worker\_\_\_\_\_.

General Statement:\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

CONFIDENTIAL RATINGS BASED ON APPLICANT'S PERSONALITY

\_\_\_\_\_ has been rated on the following traits by a number of different individuals independently. The scale provides for ratings from superior, the highest, to poor, the lowest. The number above each column refers to the rating made by the individual with the corresponding number at the bottom of the page. Additional significant statements are given below concerning this applicant.

TRAIT	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ability to Ex-press Self	:	:	:	:	:	:
Cooperation	:	:	:	:	:	:
Use of English	:	:	:	:	:	:
Judgment	:	:	:	:	:	:
Initiative	:	:	:	:	:	:
Appearance	:	:	:	:	:	:
Sense of Duty	:	:	:	:	:	:
Speaking Voice	:	:	:	:	:	:
Disposition	:	:	:	:	:	:
Intelligence	:	:	:	:	:	:
Dependability	:	:	:	:	:	:
Worth as a Teacher	:	:	:	:	:	:
Additional Statements, if any:						

NAME	POSITION	DATE
1	:	:
2	:	:
3	:	:
4	:	:
5	:	:
6	:	:



TEACHER APPLICATION FORM

1. Date \_\_\_\_\_

Mr.  
2. Mrs.  
Miss \_\_\_\_\_  
Last Name First Name Middle Name

I. PERSONAL

3. Place of Birth \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_

4. Date of Birth \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Marital Status \_\_\_\_\_

6. Name of Spouse \_\_\_\_\_ Address \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Telephone \_\_\_\_\_

7. Your Present Address \_\_\_\_\_ Phone \_\_\_\_\_

8. Height \_\_\_\_\_ Weight \_\_\_\_\_ Sex \_\_\_\_\_

9. Condition of Health \_\_\_\_\_

10. Physical Defects, if any \_\_\_\_\_

11. Number & Ages of Children, if any \_\_\_\_\_

12. Other Dependents \_\_\_\_\_

II. POSITION DESIRED

1. Designate the school assignments you are prepared to teach in order of preference.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_

2. List the activities with children, youth, or adults which you are prepared to direct \_\_\_\_\_

3. List any other information which may be deemed valuable, such as honors, publications, positions of trust, membership in professional organizations, etc. \_\_\_\_\_

4. Kind of Oklahoma Certificate Held \_\_\_\_\_

5. Are you a member of the Oklahoma State Teachers' Association? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Are you a member of the N.E.A.? \_\_\_\_\_
7. Other professional organizations \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

8. PROFESSIONAL REFERENCE

NAME	POSITION AT PRESENT	ADDRESS
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

9. EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

School	Name of School	Dates Attended	Major	Minor	Degree
High	:	:	:	:	:
School	:	:	:	:	:
Under-	:	:	:	:	:
Graduate:	:	:	:	:	:
Work	:	:	:	:	:
Graduate:	:	:	:	:	:
Work	:	:	:	:	:

10. Teaching Experience

Name of School	Location	Assign-ment	Began	ended	Name of Principal
:	:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:	:

TRAVEL EXPERIENCE

Place or Country Visited	Length of Stay	Year	Reason for Visit
:		:	:
:		:	:
:		:	:
:		:	:
:		:	:
:		:	:
:		:	:
:		:	:
:		:	:
:		:	:

EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE OTHER THAN TEACHING  
(Including Military)

Type of Work	Location	Dates	Name of Employer	Address
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:

Signature of Applicant \_\_\_\_\_

## CHECKLIST OF QUESTIONS

- I. Interviewer introduces herself to candidate.
- II. Interviewer guides questions.
  1. Ask the candidate to discuss briefly her philosophy of education.
  2.
    - a. What do you consider to be some of the major problems facing the secondary schools today?
    - b. How can we best solve those problems?
  3.
    - a. What are some of the current curricula trends in history?
    - b. How do you feel about the trends in education that have eliminated the classics, memorization of poems, watered-down homework, etc.?
  4. What curricula approach will you use if you are employed by our system?
  5. What are your views on teaching religion in the public schools?
  6. You may very well be assigned to an integrated classroom if you are hired. How would you feel teaching a class which contained children from several ethnic groups?
  7. What activities have you sponsored or participated in in your community and/or campus?
  8. Do you feel a teacher should sponsor certain activities such as: newspaper advisor, hobby club, etc., without extra compensation.
  9. What projects or activities did you have during your student teaching or previous position that you feel were worthwhile and challenging to your class?
  10. Why did you decide on teaching as a career.

11. How do you feel about teaching sex education in the public schools?
  12. What was your grade in student teaching? Do you feel that your grade was a true evaluation of your work?
  13. What types of employment have you been involved in during the summer months?
  14. Do you feel every teacher should go back to college once in a while to keep abreast of things that are happening in your area or to refresh your thinking?
  15. What professional journals do you subscribe to?
- III. Interview coordinator will terminate the interview after giving the candidate an opportunity to ask questions of the selection team.

TEACHER INTERVIEW RECORD SHEET

NAME OF TEACHER CANDIDATE \_\_\_\_\_ SEX \_\_\_\_\_

MAJOR \_\_\_\_\_ UNDERGRADUATE GRADE POINT AVE \_\_\_\_\_

NR. GRADUATE CREDIT HOURS \_\_\_\_\_ GRAD DEGREE \_\_\_\_\_

GRAD GPA \_\_\_\_\_

OBSERVATIONS	(Circle Response)				
	O	AA	A	BA	P *
1. Personal appearance.....	5	4	3	2	1
2. Ability to communicate effectively orally.....	5	4	3	2	1
3. Voice quality.....	5	4	3	2	1
4. Grammar.....	5	4	3	2	1
5. Poise and self-confidence....	5	4	3	2	1
6. Philosophy of education.....	5	4	3	2	1
7. Attitude toward teaching.....	5	4	3	2	1
8. Interest in children/youth...	5	4	3	2	1
9. Extent of democratic outlook.	5	4	3	2	1
10. Extent of cultural background	5	4	3	2	1
11. Extent of interests outside teaching.....	5	4	3	2	1
12. Extent of community contacts.	5	4	3	2	1
13. Knowledge of current affairs.	5	4	3	2	1
14. Knowledge of subject matter area.....	5	4	3	2	1
15. Ability to think logically...	5	4	3	2	1
16. Estimate of ability to relate to students.....	5	4	3	2	1
17. Estimate of ability to relate to parents.....	5	4	3	2	1
18. Estimate of ability to relate to supervisors.....	5	4	3	2	1
19. Willingness to accept additional responsibilities.....	5	4	3	2	1
20. Emotional stability.....	5	4	3	2	1
21. Potential for professional growth.....	5	4	3	2	1

\* LEGEND

O = Outstanding      AA = Above Average      A = Average  
 BA= Below Average      P = Poor

COMMENTS

	<u>O</u>	<u>AA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>BA</u>	<u>P *</u>
I. Comments about the interviewer:					
1. Poise and confidence.....	5	4	3	2	1
2. Voice clarity.....	5	4	3	2	1
3. Skill with which interview was conducted.....	5	4	3	2	1
4. Rapport of interviewer with teacher candidate.....	5	4	3	2	1
5. Other (Specify):					

II. Comments about the teacher candidate. Please specify any additional observations or comments you may have.

RANKING ASSIGNED:    NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_ INTERVIEW NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_  
INTERVIEWER \_\_\_\_\_ TEACHER SELECTION TEAM \_\_\_\_\_

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION GUIDE

NAME OF TEACHER CANDIDATE \_\_\_\_\_

TOPIC TAUGHT \_\_\_\_\_ OBSERVATION NR \_\_\_\_\_

OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_ TEACHER SELECTION TEAM \_\_\_\_\_

OBSERVATIONS	O	AA	A	BA	P *
1. Personal appearance.....	5	4	3	2	1
2. Voice quality.....	5	4	3	2	1
3. Grammar.....	5	4	3	2	1
4. Poise and self-confidence.....	5	4	3	2	1
5. Enthusiasm.....	5	4	3	2	1
6. Ability to plan and organize...	5	4	3	2	1
7. Clarity of the lesson.....	5	4	3	2	1
8. Body posture.....	5	4	3	2	1
9. Use of gestures.....	5	4	3	2	1
10. Extent to which observer's interest aroused.....	5	4	3	2	1
11. Extent to which observer's interest maintained.....	5	4	3	2	1
12. How good was the central idea of the lesson?.....	5	4	3	2	1
13. How well was the lesson intro- duced?.....	5	4	3	2	1
14. How well did the teacher candi- date transition from one phase of the lesson to another?.....	5	4	3	2	1
15. Propriety of the audio-visual aids used.....	5	4	3	2	1
16. Visual quality of audio-visual aids.....	5	4	3	2	1
17. How effectively were audio- visual aids integrated with verbal materials?.....	5	4	3	2	1
18. The extent to which audio- visual aids enhanced the lesson.....	5	4	3	2	1
19. How effectively was the lesson concluded?.....	5	4	3	2	1
20. Ability to plan and organize...	5	4	3	2	1

\* LEGEND

O = Outstanding

AA = Above Average

A = Average

BA = Below Average

P = Poor



COMMENTS

RANKING ASSIGNED \_\_\_\_\_

TEACHER SELECTION CONSOLIDATION SHEET

NAME OF ADMINISTRATOR \_\_\_\_\_ GROUP \_\_\_\_\_

I RANK THE SIX TEACHER CANDIDATES INTERVIEWED AND  
OBSERVED BY ME AS FOLLOWS:

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_
6. \_\_\_\_\_