



1976

Teacher selection : administrative views toward screening beginning high school physical education teachers

Dennis Richard Nugent
University of the Pacific

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nugent, Dennis Richard. (1976). *Teacher selection : administrative views toward screening beginning high school physical education teachers*. University of the Pacific, Thesis.
https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/1914

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgibney@pacific.edu.

TEACHER SELECTION: ADMINISTRATIVE VIEWS
TOWARD SCREENING BEGINNING HIGH SCHOOL
PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate Faculty of the
University of the Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Dennis Richard Nugent
December, 1976

This thesis, written and submitted by

is approved for recommendation to the Committee
on Graduate Studies, University of the Pacific.

Department Chairman or Dean:

Cedric W. Dempsey

Thesis Committee:

Evelyn L. Spring

Chairman

J. Connor Sutton

S. Thomas Stubbs

Dated *December 7, 1976*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Dr. Evelyn Spring, who gave a great deal of time from her busy schedule to offer help and guidance in the completion of this paper.

And also, to my wife, Linda, a special thanks for her frank and helpful criticism, her patience, her proofreading, and her typing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	
1. ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY	1
The Purpose of the Study	2
THE PROBLEM	2
Statement of the Problem	2
Importance of the Study	3
SCOPE AND DELIMITATIONS	4
Scope of the Study	4
Delimitation of the Study	5
BASIC ASSUMPTIONS AND HYPOTHESES	5
Assumptions	5
Statement of Hypotheses	6
Deduced Consequences	7
DEFINITION OF TERMS	11
SUMMARY	12
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	13
LITERATURE ON EVALUATION CRITERIA IN TEACHER SELECTION	13
Early Literature on Teacher Selection	13
Importance of Pre-Interview Assessment in Teacher Selection	15
Importance of Interview on Teacher Selection	16

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter	Page
Personal Qualities and Professional Qualifications	17
RELATED RESEARCH	19
Research on Effectiveness of the Interview in the Selection of Teachers	22
Characteristics of Interviewers.	23
Trends in Teacher Selection.	24
SUMMARY.	25
3. METHOD OF RESEARCH AND PROCEDURES.	26
METHOD OF RESEARCH	26
PROCEDURES	26
Basic Procedures	27
Sources of Data	27
Development of the Instrument	27
Pre-Tests for Validity and Reliability	28
Validity	28
Reliability	29
The Data	30
SUMMARY	32
4. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	33
THE RESPONDENTS	33
OVERVIEW OF DATA	34
OVERALL RESPONDENT VIEWS AND COMPARISON OF RESPONDENTS' VIEWPOINTS	36
ANALYSIS OF DATA	48

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter	Page
STUDY FINDINGS	61
SUMMARY	65
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	66
SUMMARY	66
CONCLUSIONS	68
RECOMMENDATIONS	70
BIBLIOGRAPHY	71
APPENDIXES	77
APPENDIX A. SUBJECTS FOR PRE-TEST AND SURVEY SAMPLE	77
APPENDIX B. LETTERS AND QUESTIONNAIRE	87
APPENDIX C. DATA, RESPONSES, AND MINOR TABLES	94

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Tally of High-Low Ranks on the Importance of the Pre-Interview Items	38
2. Tally of High-Low Ranks on the Importance of First Impression Items	40
3. Tally of High-Low Ranks on the Importance of Personal Qualities Items	42
4. Tally of High-Low Ranks on the Importance of Professional Qualifications Items	45
5. Comparison of Emphasis Placed on Personal Qualities and Professional Qualifications. Tested by Chi-Square	51
6. Comparison of Emphasis Placed on the Pre-Interview and Interview Assessment of Applicants' Professional Qualifications. Tested by Chi-Square	52
7. Comparison of Median Test Results for Importance on Interview Assessment of Professional Qualifications. Tested by Chi-Square.	54
8. Comparison of Importance Placed on Applicants' Coaching Potential and/or Experience. Tested by Chi-Square	56
9. Comparison of Importance Placed on Applicants' Additional Work Experience with Youth. Tested by Chi-Square	57
10. Comparison of Importance Placed on Applicants' Professional Flexibility. Tested by Chi-Square	59
11. Comparison of Importance Placed on Applicants' Teaching Strengths and Weaknesses. Tested by Chi-Square	60

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
12. Chi-Square Test Results for Each of the Null Hypotheses	62
13. Frequency of Questionnaire Responses	95
14. Mean Responses and Ranks of the Two Respondent Groups	99

Chapter 1

ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY

Yantis and Carey, in the Journal of College Placement, noted that some educators believed that, because of the large supply of teachers seeking employment, recruiting would become easier. Many employing officers, however, felt that because of the large supply of qualified prospective teachers the selection process has become more demanding. The major point made by the authors was that there is a need to determine important evaluation criteria for teacher selection (44:75).

In a study of five hundred seven Michigan public school districts, school administrators were asked to rank various evaluation criteria as to their importance in the selection of teachers. "The personal interview was considered to be the most important evaluation criterion when selecting a first year teacher" (44:76). Because of the importance that can be attached to an interview in the selection of a teacher, ". . . one of the most significant events in any teacher's life is the interview for his first position" (31:56). It appeared to the researcher that the first interview could be a very successful experience, or it could be quite disappointing. Regardless of the outcome, Drake noted that a prospective teacher might develop some anxiety and concern as that first interview approaches (28:48). The researcher believed such

anxiety might be relieved if the candidate had some insight into what to expect in regard to the importance placed on personal qualities and qualifications.

The odds against being invited to an interview for a possible teaching position would appear to be great today, in light of the aforementioned burgeoning supply of teaching applicants. And, no matter how important authorities assert the interview to be, it was noted that applicants must first pass preliminary evaluation of their written application materials. While the wording may vary, nearly all job announcements include a statement such as: "Applications will be preliminarily evaluated and invitations for interviews will be extended to the highest ranking candidates" (48:1).

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to give a prospective teacher some insight into evaluation criteria an employer might consider important in assessing personal qualities and professional qualifications.

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

The study problem posed for solution was to determine the viewpoints held by Superintendents or Personnel Directors, and Principals, in selected California counties, toward the screening process for selecting beginning high school Physical Education teachers; and, subsequently, to compare the viewpoints of the two respondent groups.

Importance of the Study

Funk asserted that since the hiring of a teacher is a big investment for a school district, the screening procedure may be one of the most important factors in staff selection (31:12). And, according to Yantis, the screening of teachers has become a very important responsibility of administrators because many qualified candidates apply for each vacant position. Also, it is their job to select the candidate best suited for the district (44:76).

It appeared that the screening process could be logically divided into the pre-interview assessment of a candidate and the interview itself. Hardaway asserted that the pre-interview of a candidate carries a great deal of weight in the screening process because this is where a school district can "weed out all the duds" (32:96). Despite this, preliminary research indicated that a particular Superintendent of a school district, Personnel Director, or Principal may differ from another in the qualities they desire in a prospective teacher.

If a candidate were to survive the initial screening process of the pre-interview assessment, he or she would likely be asked to interview with the district. Interviews have been used almost universally as part of teacher selection (23:50). Many facts found in the literature supported the idea that interviews are one of the most important factors in the hiring process because they are useful in revealing some of the applicants' personal qualities. According to Dunmire,

it is necessary to determine if the applicant has certain traits and personality, because the hiring of a teacher is not only a big financial investment for a school district, but also an important factor for consideration in staff morale (29:53). Relatedly, he noted that the staff should be considered in teacher selection because they have to work with new personnel (29:53).

The review of literature revealed apparent differences pertinent to the selection process of teachers. This indicated to the investigator that it would be meaningful to determine what traits and qualifications are important in the screening process of a beginning teacher in a specific locale. And further, how various administrative groups therein would rate the pre-interview and the various aspects of the interview itself.

SCOPE AND DELIMITATIONS

Scope of the Study

The data for this study were obtained through a questionnaire instrument mailed to Superintendents or Personnel Directors, and selected Principals in the following ten counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Joaquin, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma. All of the Superintendents or Personnel Directors, as well as a 25 percent sample of the high school Principals within the aforementioned counties, were selected from the California Public Schools Directory (4). The total number

included in the study was one hundred twenty. Subjects were subsequently divided into two respondent groups; seventy-five Superintendents or Personnel Directors, and forty-five Principals (List of subjects in Appendix A).

Data consisted of forced rankings on personal qualities and professional qualifications within and among major question sections (See questionnaire in Appendix B).

Delimitations of the Study

The study was not concerned with:

1. responses from private high schools.
2. the specific type of screening process which respondents used in teacher selection.
3. the financial status of any particular district or school.
4. the size of any particular district or school.
5. the degree of specialized training or the competence of the Superintendents or Personnel Directors, and Principals in regards to screening candidates.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

Assumptions

The following basic assumptions were made before conducting the survey:

1. An adequate percentage of subjects would return the questionnaire.

2. The subjects' responses to the questionnaire items would be honest.
3. The subjects would understand the items included on the questionnaire.
4. The subjects would complete the questionnaire fully and properly.
5. The questionnaire would yield data essential for answering the study problem.
6. The researcher would be able to properly analyze and interpret the data.

Statement of Hypotheses

Based on the review of literature, studying results from research done in a preliminary study (47:26), and thorough analysis of the problem, the investigator developed a number of pertinent hypotheses. Because of the various types of data and the many considerations to the study problem, a total of seven hypotheses were formulated. The first two hypotheses were concerned with the overall respondent viewpoints. Subsequent hypotheses were focused on potential differences between respondent groups.

H₁. Respondents would place significantly greater importance on professional qualifications of applicants than on personal qualities.

H₂. Respondents would place significantly greater importance on the interview assessment of applicants' professional qualifications than on the pre-interview assessment.

H₃. Principals would place significantly greater importance on the interview assessment of applicants' professional qualifications than would the Superintendents or Personnel Directors.

H₄. Principals would place significantly greater importance on applicants' coaching potential and/or experience than would the Superintendents or Personnel Directors.

H₅. Superintendents or Personnel Directors would place significantly greater importance on applicants' additional work experience with youth than would Principals.

H₆. Principals would be significantly more concerned with the professional flexibility of applicants than Superintendents or Personnel Directors.

H₇. Superintendents or Personnel Directors would place significantly greater importance on teaching strengths and weaknesses of applicants than would Principals.

Deduced Consequences

Deductions leading to the development of individual hypotheses were primarily based on findings revealed through the review of literature. The numbering below corresponds to that of the previously stated hypotheses.

1. The majority of the literature stressed professional qualifications of candidates as the single most important factor to consider in screening teacher applicants. Since initial screening is almost entirely based on perusal

of application data, it was deduced that, while subsequently important, personal qualities generally would not be viewed by hiring agents as being as important as professional qualifications.

2. While much literature could be found that discussed the importance of the pre-interview assessment in teaching applicants, as well as the ineffectiveness of the interview as the primary method of staff selection, much more literature was found which stated that the interview was probably the single most important factor in teacher selection. It seemed apparent that even if much emphasis was placed on the pre-interview assessment of candidates, and all applicants were presumably equal on paper, the interview would be the determining factor in the selection of a candidate. Based on these ideas, it was deduced that the respondents would place greater importance on the interview assessment of applicants' professional qualifications than on the pre-interview assessment.

3. Due to the sheer volume of teaching applications school districts were reportedly receiving, it seemed apparent that initial screening of these applicants would be done by the Superintendents or Personnel Directors before any were asked to interview. Based upon the rationale just developed, it was deduced that while Superintendents or Personnel Directors would be more involved with the pre-interview assessment of applicants, the Principals would be more involved with interviewing the "qualified" applicants. And thus the Principals

would place greater importance on the interview assessment of professional qualifications than would the other respondent group.

4. Because of the fact that Principals are involved so much in building management and generally are concerned about the programs within their schools, and because of the prevalent emphasis on winning in athletics and the prestige to school which accompanies winning, it was deduced that Principals would place greater importance on the coaching potential and/or experience of teaching applicants than would the Superintendents or Personnel Directors.

5. Based on the rationale developed earlier (See number 3), it seemed apparent that Superintendents or Personnel Directors would probably look at the general suitability of an applicant, while a Principal would look for someone that is going to fit into the present staff in terms of philosophy, personality, and specific area of interest. During the pre-interview assessment of an applicant, it could be determined if he or she had any additional work experience with youth. This would be an apparent positive factor in the initial screening of a candidate. If the applicant, after the initial process, appeared to be "qualified," he or she would most likely be invited to interview. Because of their specific concerns for the school and its programs, Principals would likely neither discount the importance of an applicant's additional work experience with youth, nor place much emphasis on it. Because of the aforementioned reasons, it was deduced

that Superintendents or Personnel Directors would place greater importance on the applicants' additional work experience with youth than would the Principals.

6. It seemed apparent that Principals must manage their individual schools, and in doing so must handle such problems as: teacher cut backs; teaching period allotments; tight district finances; and staffing for clubs, sports, and other extra-curricular activities. Principals must deal with these concerns constantly. When they do have a chance to interview a prospective teacher they might want to know if an applicant can fill various positions within a school's program. Based on these ideas, it was deduced that Principals would be more concerned with the professional flexibility of applicants than Superintendents or Personnel Directors.

7. To assess an applicant's teaching strengths and weaknesses when he or she is a beginning teacher is probably difficult and only based on a few criteria. One such criterion would be evaluation of the applicants' student teaching experience. Another might be responses to questions asked in the screening process pertinent to the applicant's own assessment of his or her teaching strengths and/or weaknesses. This type of philosophical question would generally be found in the Superintendent's or Personnel Director's initial screening of candidates to determine if they are qualified for a particular position. If the applicant seemed to be qualified, further screening would likely be done by the Principal. Based on the ideas just discussed, and because the Principals

assumably are more concerned with specific qualities of a candidate, it was deduced that the Superintendents or Personnel Directors would place greater importance on teaching strengths and/or weaknesses of applicants than would Principals.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Pertinent terms were defined as applied to this study to enhance reader understanding.

Screening process. Screening process is the occurrence of events which take place in teacher selection including the pre-interview assessment of a prospective teacher and the interview itself.

Pre-interview assessment. Pre-interview assessment is the initial screening of a prospective teacher via persual of written application and/or resume, and, at times, checking out references, placement file, or others.

Interview process. Interview process is the occurrence of events during an interview--the attitudes and questions which are considered and asked from the time a prospective teacher enters the room to the time he leaves. This would include such things as the first impression candidates made upon the interviewer, the candidates' personal qualities, and the candidates' professional qualifications.

Prospective teacher. Prospective teacher is an applicant or candidate for a teaching position. To qualify,

all the professional education requirements for the secondary teaching credential must be completed or in progress, and the applicant or candidate must be eligible to work the up and coming academic year.

Interviewer. An interviewer is the person, whether it be the Superintendent, Personnel Director, or Principal of a school district, in charge of screening, questioning, and/or evaluating prospective teachers.

Consistency. Consistency is uniformity or similarity in the various aspects of the screening process.

SUMMARY

This introductory chapter contained statements of the study purpose and problem. Also included were statements of importance, scope, delimitations, assumptions, hypotheses, deduced consequences, and definitions.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Jobs for young people in many professions are scarce (33:6). The teaching profession is no exception in this day and age of a tight job market. Although school systems may vary as to employment practices (8:341), the review of literature revealed a number of general considerations universally utilized in teacher selection. The findings of specifically related research were presented following the review of other resources.

LITERATURE ON EVALUATION CRITERIA IN TEACHER SELECTION

The screening process in teacher selection has been a responsibility which administrators have had to deal with as long as children have been attending public schools (7:4). Because of the importance placed upon this responsibility, it has been suggested that a systematic method or procedure be followed in order to improve the teacher selection process (7:3).

Early Literature on Teacher Selection

One of the earliest studies of the problem of teacher selection was made by Ballou in 1915 (3). This study was

followed in 1928 by a survey of the National Education Association (38). These contributions dealt, primarily, with the responsibility of the Superintendents for the selection of teachers and with the eligibility of candidates in terms of age, training requirements, teaching experience, health, and moral character.

In 1938 Coulbourn did a research study on teacher selection procedures in large city schools. He, through an extensive review of literature, constructed a list of criteria for establishing standards for teacher selection. The following criteria seemed to be of major importance in the screening process of teachers:

1. Every effort should be made by those responsible for the selection of teachers to obtain complete and reliable evidence concerning the qualifications of each applicant.

2. A program of teacher selection should include the use of an application blank to be filled out by all candidates.

3. Every candidate's credentials should include information from competent persons who are best acquainted with him and his work.

4. Provision should be made in every program of teacher selection for a personal interview, where possible, with every qualified candidate (7:18).

These criteria have been accepted by many school districts and authorities as proper steps to be considered in teacher selection.

Importance of Pre-Interview
Assessment in Teacher Selection

Morris asserted that the initial screening of a candidate is very important because it is impractical to interview every candidate for a teaching position (37:15). Further research suggested that the pre-interview assessment of a candidate could be the most important evaluation criterion because interviews were often "non predictive" of teaching success (25:504). Hickey, agreeing with the latter, stated that unless the interview of candidates could be unbiased and "consistent," the predictions made could be meaningless (23:505).

Finley felt that an interview might not effectively evaluate a candidate's qualifications for teaching, but might be more concerned with an applicant's attractiveness, poise, and dress (30:96). Carlson (26:461) did a study on written information versus the influence of appearance. He came to the conclusion that the written material weighed about 40 percent in the evaluation of a candidate, while appearance weighed only 5 percent. He also suggested that many times the interview could be ineffective because the interviewers looked for negative information from first impressions such as appearance, etc.

Although some authorities ascertained that the interview of candidates might be ineffective if done improperly, they also stressed the importance of having some

direction in the interview and selecting the best qualified candidates to interview (29, 30, 31, and others).

Importance of Interview on Teacher Selection

Almost everyone engages in interviewing of some kind (17:7), whether seeking employment, psychological help, or medical assistance. There are many different types of interviews and, according to Garrett ". . . the method of conducting an interview will be influenced to a considerable extent by the purpose of that interview" (9:17).

School systems may vary as to employment practices, but "rarely is the interview omitted" (8:341). It was suggested that one of the best means of securing information concerning a teaching candidate is through the personal interview, and there are few instances when teachers should be employed without having an interview (7:22). The purpose of the interview in teacher selection is to determine if the applicant meets the needs of the school district (31:12).

One school district may not be looking for the same type of candidate as another school district, but they usually seem to be concerned with the same characteristics of a candidate (29:53). According to the American Association of Examiners and Administrators of Educational Personnel:

The purposes of the interview are to appraise personality traits, explore range of interests, discover command of English, and note any other characteristics of importance for the position sought. Care should be taken to hold the interview to its purposes and not to trespass on other areas which are more effectively measured by other techniques. (1:1)

For the purposes of this study, characteristics of a teaching candidate were classified in two broad categories; the personal qualities, and the professional qualifications.

Personal Qualities and
Professional Qualifications

Many authorities have listed the individual characteristics within these categories and discussed the importance of them. This was evidenced by Brannon when he stated that "the personal interview holds the potential to yield a different dimension of the applicant's characteristics" (25:166). He later said that

. . . proper probing can reveal some of the candidate's basic feelings about education and life. . . . In addition, the interviewer has the opportunity to observe such important characteristics as poise, enunciation, phrasing, posture, facial expressions, manner of dress, cleanliness, and mannerisms. (25:167)

Further evidence listing the important characteristics of a candidate was found in a monograph on the "Principles and Procedures of Teacher Selection." It stated that the interview is best used to obtain estimates of certain personal and social characteristics and to a limited extent, the potentialities for professional growth and the general physical fitness of the applicant (1:97). Orth believed that the interview can be the basic criterion of employment, even though other factors must be considered when screening the applicants (40:19). He based this belief on preliminary research which indicated that personality may be the key ingredient to successful participation in a teaching situation (40:20).

Dunmire and Quigley made an evaluation rating chart for interviewers to which they assigned values of importance. Included on this chart were many characteristics important in teacher selection. They were (1) general appearance, (2) personal communication, (3) organizational ability, (4) personality (drive, tact), (5) experience, (6) educational background, (7) oral and written expression, (8) background in planning, and (9) community participation (29:53).

Finley had definite ideas about his interview procedure and the screening process, and how important it was in determining if candidates were qualified. It was his aim to determine and challenge the strong points of a candidate, and also to determine and attack his or her weak points (30:98). He felt that this was a good method for assessing a candidate's personality, opinions, and feelings.

Dunmire, Hontz, Yantis, and many of the other authorities whose literature was reviewed, discussed the personal qualities and professional qualifications important in teacher selection (29:53; 12:39; 44:76). Many of them did this by either compiling a list of questions an interviewer should ask or by listing characteristics an interviewer should rate in teacher selection. Among items listed by two or more authorities were (1) teaching strengths and weaknesses, (2) professional stability (or plans for moving out of area), (3) professional flexibility--willingness to work in variety of situations, (4) extracurricular interests, (5) why teaching, (6) extra work related to teaching, (7) teaching philosophy,

(8) study plans, (9) student teaching experience and/or impressions, and (10) areas of interest in teaching.

Hontz summed up the apparent mixture of characteristics and various lists compiled by the authorities when he said "as each interview is a unique expression of the interests of the participants, it is impossible to predict the exact course which a particular interview will take" (12:39). He went on to say, however, that "certain topics are common to most interviews" (12:39).

Another characteristic thought to be of importance in teacher selection was the applicant's past performance (student teaching). According to McKenna, "the best prediction of how an employee will perform in the future is from his past. One way to determine past performance is through the interview" (36:8). He also stated that 20 percent or more of the variance in future performance can be predicted on the basis of the interview alone (36:8).

RELATED RESEARCH

A review of literature on teacher selection methods indicated that although teacher selection policies and procedures have attracted much attention over the years, not much research was evident on the viewpoint of Superintendents, Personnel Directors, or Principals in the teacher selection screening process, especially comparing the viewpoints of the different respondents.

Coulbourn did a study in 1938 (mentioned earlier in this chapter) that dealt with the selection of teachers in large school systems. While he did not compare groups that did teacher selection, he did list many of the qualities or traits rated high by administrators. Among them were (1) personal appearance, (2) personal manner, (3) professional attitude, (4) use of English, (5) evidence of culture, (6) recreational activities, (7) voice, (8) dress, (9) professional growth, and (10) physical appearance (7:72).

Research done by the American Association of Examiners and Administrators of Educational Personnel, also dealing with principles and procedures in teacher selection, did not distinguish any differences in individual viewpoints among interviewers (1:20). Still another study was conducted nineteen years ago by the National Education Association. This study primarily dealt with the entire area of personnel administration. The teacher selection process was only partially treated and nothing noteworthy about consistency in viewpoint was discussed (15:2).

Gilbert, Bogen, and Lang, in a cooperative research project, discussed teacher selection policies and procedures in large public schools. They did not provide data pertinent to the different interviewers' viewpoints, but they did offer a concise list of the five most likely characteristics to be rated by interviewers. There were (1) personal appearance, (2) speech, (3) attitudes toward work, (4) interest in children and/or youth, and (5) philosophy of education (10:43).

One similar type of research paper, which supported the importance or value placed on the interview in teacher selection, was found in reviewing the literature. In 1972 Yantis and Carey surveyed five hundred seven Michigan public school administrators. They were asked to rank various evaluation criteria as to importance in the screening process of a first year teacher. On a basis of ranks one to seven, the following results were given:

<u>Items</u>	<u>Mean Response</u>
1. Personal interview	1.61
2. Student teaching	1.94
3. Past employer references	3.94
4. Academic evaluation letter	4.43
5. Academic grade point average	4.61
6. Extracurricular activities	5.36
7. Character references	5.70 (44:76)

Another survey done concerning the screening process in general, which could apply to teaching, was entitled "How Do Employers Value the Interview." In this article Drake had employers force rank many items pertinent to evaluation criteria of job applicants (28:48). The results showed that 78 percent of the respondents felt the function of the interview was the preliminary screening of candidates. Among other information of interest was the statement that the most important "personal" quality was "self-expression." "General appearance" outweighed the "famous hand shake," and the "general impression" of the interviewer overrode evaluation based on "course work" and "resumes" (28:49).

A sizeable number of articles offered suggestions regarding what should be done in the field of interview

method for teacher selection, but offered no empirical data about consistency in viewpoint of the administrators selecting teachers. This apparent inconsistency in the screening method, particularly the interview, was expressed by a number of researchers. Garrett emphasized this idea in the following statement:

Probably everyone starting to interview wishes there were a list of rules he could follow, but unfortunately it is impossible to enumerate a complete list of infallible rules for all interviewing or even for any particular kind. Interviewing takes place between human beings who are much too individualized to be reduced to a formula. (9:7)

Research on Effectiveness of the Interview in the Selection of Teachers

A number of researchers have questioned the effectiveness of the employment interview as the primary or a major component in the selection process (35:141). Landy and Bates also felt, however, that even though interviews might not be valid, "there is a general feeling among researchers in that area, that there is something going on in the interview that is systemic" (35:141).

The results of other research on the ineffectiveness of the interview were found in an article by Robinson (41:39). He summarized the research that was done on the selection interview since 1964. He used that point in time as a baseline because of two articles which appeared in separate journals during that year. These articles summarized the research back to 1949. The two articles in 1964, along with Robinson's work, independently reference over one hundred fifty

different articles and books in the field. The majority of research discussed casted serious doubts on the effectiveness of traditional interviews. Robinson suggested that "a blind faith persists in the efficiency and, too often, the validity of the selection interview" (41:8). He further evidenced this idea as follows:

The interview is the most widely used yet least understood method of personnel management. Virtually every organization utilizes the interview. . . . However, in spite of its wide usage, the interview is probably the least efficient technique in personnel management today. (41:40)

While much research seemed to negate the effectiveness of the interview in the selection process, other research could be found that suggested what effects the interview might have on teacher selection decisions. Bolton and Hickey did a study which attempted to determine the actual value of an interview in teacher selection. They concluded that it was of considerable value if administered properly, and measured the necessary information desired (23:503).

Characteristics of Interviewers

Research was done on the characteristics of interviewers, but nothing could be found comparing individual interviewers' viewpoints in teacher selection. However, some related literature gave suggestions as to why differences might exist in the viewpoint of the interviewers. Steinkamp did research on some of the characteristics of effective interviewers. His study focused on interviewer personality traits as they relate to interviewing effectiveness. He

wrote: "The effective interviewer displays less social dependence, and does not need to receive as much sympathy and affection" (42:480). He stressed the idea that positive self-confidence, the ability to control the interview situation, and to view people objectively are very important characteristics of an effective interviewer (42:480).

The interviewer's personality or personal characteristics are important factors in the selection process because "the assessment one makes can easily be biased by prejudices" (18:3). An individual in charge of screening might have certain preferences which could rightly or wrongly bias his or her judgment in teacher selection. According to Shouksmith, "such biases lead to unreliability in the interview" (18:3). He also wrote that the way to make teacher selection, particularly interviews, more reliable is through the control of these biases. In his words:

The importance of excluding or controlling a bias in assessments emerges. The competent interviewer is one who knows his own biases and whose interview technique is such that it excludes bias as much as possible from the assessment. (18:6)

Trends in Teacher Selection

The trend that the screening process and interviews seemed to be taking was toward a very individual nature. There was a great deal of literature supporting the idea that inconsistency in viewpoint existed in the interview process. According to Shouksmith:

There is no such thing as the interview, but there are many interviews. Each has its own method and characteristics. Even with one type of interview there is by no means only one method. (18:8)

According to Maier, the needs of the school direct the prejudices of the interviewer in teachers interviewed and selected. "It goes without saying that interviewers may differ in skill, but it is also possible that two skilled interviewers may practice quite different selection methods" (14:2).

SUMMARY

From all the literature reviewed, even though many items were deemed important, no clear and concise pattern in the screening process could be distinguished, pertinent to overall viewpoint of Superintendents or Personnel Directors, and Principals.

Although the methods of screening candidates may have differed because of the type of position open, there seemed to be certain criteria of evaluation common to teacher selection.

The importance of the pre-interview assessment and the interview in teacher selection supported the need for the study problem. The related research discussed the problem and, in discussing the trends of teacher selection, questions about consistency in viewpoint in teacher selection appeared.

Chapter 3

METHOD OF RESEARCH AND PROCEDURES

The method of research and procedures for gathering and analyzing the data were selected for their usefulness in this type of study.

METHOD OF RESEARCH

The descriptive-survey method, using a questionnaire instrument, was used for this study because it was deemed to be the best way of collecting the desired information for answering the study problem. According to Good and Scates:

Descriptive-survey studies are research when they create or ascertain: (1) new categories that are revealing, or of more far-reaching significance; (2) concepts that afford a more basic grasp of the factors which enter into the results or which represent results more certainly; (3) methods of detecting and identifying a factor, and measuring it (qualifying it), valuable for analysis and description; (4) certain relationships (occasionally correlation or causal) that obtain, either for practical or scientific interest or value; and (5) the structure of relationships--of the mechanism relating them, why and how certain factors cause certain results. (11:557)

26

PROCEDURES

In order to conduct the study, the researcher had to apply the following procedures to guide the collection, treatment, and analysis of the data.

Basic Procedures

A review was made of the pertinent literature which included books, journals, professional publications, periodicals, and miscellaneous unpublished materials. An orientation to the study was done which discussed the purpose, importance, scope, and delimitations of the study. Basic assumptions, hypotheses, deduced consequences, and a definition of terms were also formulated. An alphabetized and consecutively numbered bibliography and appendixes were prepared.

Sources of Data

The data were collected from the responses of selected school Superintendents or Personnel Directors, and Principals within selected counties. The viewpoints of these two respondent groups were collected by the administration of a questionnaire. A total of one hundred twenty subjects were selected for the study, comprising two respondent groups. One respondent group consisted of seventy-five public school Superintendents or Personnel Directors, representing the total population of ten selected counties in California. The other respondent group consisted of forty-five, or a 25 percent random sample, of high school Principals in the same counties (See Appendix A).

Development of the Instrument

In order to conduct the investigation, the author had to construct a questionnaire. The contents of the

questionnaire were basically identified through a review of literature. However, content and format stemmed from suggestions provided by a group of experts who helped with the development of the instrument. Major segments of the questionnaire dealt with ranking numerous candidate qualities and qualifications in the following broad categories of (1) the pre-interview assessment of a prospective teacher, (2) the first impression a prospective teacher makes upon an interviewer, (3) the personal qualities of a prospective teacher, (4) the professional qualifications of a prospective teacher, and (5) the overall importance of each of these question areas in the screening process.

Pre-Tests for Validity and Reliability

Pre-tests were conducted to establish validity and, subsequently, for reliability. The subjects for pre-tests were selected because of location. The area from which the subjects were selected included communities in San Joaquin and Stanislaus counties. The list of subjects included Superintendents, Personnel Directors, and high school Principals within various school districts throughout the two counties (A list of the subjects can be found in Appendix A).

Validity. The pre-test for validity was administered to ten subjects, all of whom responded. These subjects were

selected on the basis of their expertise in hiring, and included Superintendents, Personnel Directors, and high school Principals. A cover letter accompanied the questionnaire in which the study and the need for expert assistance were explained (See Appendix B). In the instructions, the respondents were asked to add or delete items, and to constructively comment on all or any part of the questionnaire. Follow-up phone calls were made to assure full return of the questionnaires.

After analyzing the results of the pre-test, the questionnaire was revised and refined. In its final form, the questionnaire was divided into three major parts, the second of which had three sub-sections. The first two parts required force ranking various items pertinent to importance in assessing the characteristics of a prospective Physical Education teacher. The third part of the questionnaire required assigning a percentage rating to each of the preceding parts, and sections thereof, pertinent to their overall importance in the screening process.

The questionnaire, as revised, was found to be valid by the same panel of experts (See Appendix A). Subsequently it was tested for reliability.

Reliability. The pre-test for reliability was administered to ten subjects, with a ten day interval between the first and second administrations (See Appendix B for copies of cover letters). Eight of the ten subjects completed the pre-test. The results of the subjects' first

responses were correlated with their responses on a re-test. Correlations for the five inclusive categories on a test/re-test ranged between .786 and .829, determined, in consultation with an advisor, to be sufficiently high for carrying out the study.

The Data

In order to obtain the data for the study, the survey was conducted with administration of the final questionnaire. The questionnaires, along with a cover letter explaining the study, were mailed with self-addressed stamped envelopes to the one hundred twenty subjects. Follow-up letters and questionnaires were mailed to subjects who did not respond within two weeks.

After the questionnaires were returned, the responses were compiled and the data analyzed. The following steps were taken to present, analyze, and discuss the data:

1. The number of respondents, and a breakdown within each respondent group were given.
2. The two sets of respondent data were first tabulated and mean responses, or simple percentages, were computed where appropriate.
3. An overview of the data was given which discussed the structure of the questionnaire and method of tallying the high or low responses to the various sections or items on the questionnaire.
4. Assessment of overall respondent views was done

by analyzing the responses and the emphasis of importance placed on various items. A tally of high or low responses was used to develop a method of statistical analysis. Further assessment of overall viewpoint was done by calculating the respondents' mean ranks on the various questionnaire items.

5. Comparison of viewpoints between respondent groups was done by two methods. The first method was a comparison of the respondents' mean ranks to the various items, while the second method was a comparison of tallies of the high or low responses placed on the importance of the items. Using the latter method, the responses were statistically tested for significant differences.

6. To statistically analyze the data concerning the overall respondent views, and to compare viewpoints of the two respondent groups, seven null hypotheses were formulated.

7. To test the significance of differences among the respondents with respect to their views on the importance of various questionnaire sections, and to test the null hypotheses, Chi-Square (x^2) was used at the .05 level of significance. The latter was selected due to its strength in testing for significance of difference (20:20).

8. In order to statistically analyze the significance of differences between the respondent groups pertinent to the emphasis of importance placed on various questionnaire items and to test the null hypotheses, Chi-Square (x^2) was again used at the .05 level of significance, with the one exception of H_{03} . The latter was tested by the Median Test (20:21).

9. Tables, which were either included within the text or placed in the appendixes, were made to enhance reader understanding and present the data in a more graphic form.

10. The findings were consolidated into one section of the study to support generalizations and conclusions.

11. A summary, conclusions, and recommendations for further research studies in the area were presented in a separate study chapter.

Additional procedures which applied to the preparation and presentation of the thesis were done in accordance with the University of the Pacific's "Instructions for the Preparation and Presentation of Theses and Dissertations," and Campbell's and Ballou's thesis writing manual (6).

SUMMARY

In discussing the method of research and procedures, the basic organization of the investigation was given. The justification for utilizing the descriptive-survey method was presented, as well as the procedures for collecting, presenting, and analyzing the data.

Chapter 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

After administering the questionnaire, sending numerous follow-up questionnaires, and receiving a substantial number of responses, the investigator compiled and analyzed the data. The data were helpful in determining the viewpoint toward the screening process for selecting beginning high school Physical Education teachers in selected counties in California; and, more specifically, in determining to what extent, if any, consistency existed in viewpoint among and/or between Superintendents or Personnel Directors, and Principals, in assessing the personal qualities and professional qualifications of a prospective teacher.

THE RESPONDENTS

Questionnaires were sent to seventy-five Superintendents or Personnel Directors, and forty-five Principals. Of the one hundred twenty subjects included in the study, a total of one hundred six, or 88 percent of the subjects responded. The breakdown of responses was as follows:

	<u>Supts. or Per. Dirs.</u>	<u>Principals</u>	<u>Total</u>
Completed the questionnaire	60	40	100
Returned; improperly completed	0	2	2
Returned; not complete	4	0	4
Did not respond	<u>11</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>14</u>
Total	75	45	120

The respondents who completed the questionnaire properly consisted of 89 percent, or forty Principals, and 80 percent, or sixty Superintendents or Personnel Directors. A total of 83 percent of the subjects surveyed returned questionnaires which were used in presenting the data (A complete summary of questionnaire responses was included in Appendix C).

OVERVIEW OF DATA

The three-part questionnaire contained a variety of types of data (See Appendix B). Part I, "Pre-Interview," contained eight items respondents were asked to rank in importance. The items in this section related to professional qualifications of applicants. Part II, "The Interview," contained three sections (A-C), each of which had a list of items to be ranked by importance. Section A contained four items, while both Sections B and C contained seven items. Sections A and B were concerned with personal qualities of applicants. Section C consisted of professional qualifications. Part III of the questionnaire, "Overall Rating of Candidate," consisted of four categories, each paralleling the previous questionnaire sections. The data

for this last part of the questionnaire consisted of percentage ratings of the importance of the previous questionnaire parts and sections.

Tallies of high-low responses to these various questionnaire sections, by the one hundred respondents, were placed in Tables and either interspersed throughout the subsequent discussion, or, in some cases, placed in the Appendixes. Assessment of overall respondent views was based on a simple majority (51) of responses pertinent to the importance of various sub items. A high-low importance concept, based on simple majority, was utilized in analyzing the data. For example, in a section containing eight items, the ranks of one to four were considered high, while ranks five to eight were considered low. This procedure was followed for sections with an even number of items. In the two sections with seven items, the ranks of one to three were high and five to seven were low. The rank of four was considered neutral. In tests for significance of difference, the neutral rankings were equally divided between high and low categories. The overall viewpoints of the one hundred respondents were assessed in accordance with the high-low method just presented. Further assessment of the overall viewpoints of the one hundred respondents was done by determining the mean responses to each of the questionnaire items. These were listed in their order of importance.

Comparisons in the viewpoints of the two sub-groups-- sixty Superintendents or Personnel Directors and forty Principals--were additionally determined by application of Chi-Square (χ^2), the test selected to determine the significance of differences between groups.

OVERALL RESPONDENT VIEWS AND
COMPARISON OF RESPONDENTS' VIEWPOINTS

With respect to the items contained in Part I (Pre-Interview), there was a simple majority agreement of respondents. Five of the eight items were ranked high (a, c, e, f, and g). The remaining three items (b, d, and h) ranked low. These high-low items were listed below, along with the number of respondents so ranking them.

<u>High Importance</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Low Importance</u>	<u>No.</u>
Student teaching evaluation	90	Participation in intercollegiate athletics	94
References	76	Extracurricular activities	79
Major area of interest in P.E./coaching	74	Additional work with youth	67
Coaching potential	54		
Scholastic record	52		

While there were simple majority views noted among respondents, two interesting observations were made from the data (See Table 1). First, responses were not always consistently high or low. For example, for item f, "scholastic record," respondents were nearly divided in the assessment of importance (52 high; 48 low), indicating inconsistency in viewpoint within respondent groups. Second, while item a, "coaching potential and/or experience," received a simple

majority high ranking (54), less than a majority (27) of Superintendents/Personnel Directors ranked this item high. Their views toward its importance were fairly well split. The significance of these differences were analyzed elsewhere in the chapter.

Further assessment of the "overall viewpoint" of respondents pertinent to the pre-interview screening of applicants was done by determining the mean responses to the questionnaire items in Part I. The following were the mean responses of ranks one to eight from both respondent groups:

1. Student teaching evaluation	2.39
2. References	3.12
3. Major area of interest	3.32
4. Coaching potential and/or experience	4.21
5. Scholastic record	4.78
6. Additional work experience with youth	5.33
7. Extracurricular activities	5.88
8. Participation in intercollegiate athletics	6.67

The above list of mean responses agreed with the items ranked either high or low which was listed earlier in this chapter. The two lists gave the researcher a fairly clear picture of the viewpoint of the respondents pertinent to the pre-interview assessment of applicants.

In comparing mean responses of each of the respondent groups, the Superintendents or Personnel Directors, and the Principals agreed on almost all the items. Exceptions were "additional work experience with youth" and "extracurricular activities." The mean rank responses of

Table 1

Tally of High-Low Ranks on the Importance
of the Pre-Interview Items

Importance of Ranks	Position	Number of subjects and percentage of ranks on questionnaire items (N = 100)								
		Items	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h
High 1 to 4	Supts. or Pers. Dir.	No.	(27)	(11)	(43)	(5)	(46)	(32)	(55)	(25)
		Percent	.45	.18	.72	.08	.77	.53	.91	.42
	Principals	No.	(27)	(10)	(31)	(1)	(29)	(20)	(35)	(8)
		Percent	.68	.25	.76	.03	.73	.50	.86	.20
	Total	No. and Percent	54	21	74	06	76	52	90	33
	Low 5 to 8	Supts. or Pers. Dir.	No.	(33)	(49)	(17)	(55)	(14)	(28)	(5)
Percent			.55	.82	.28	.92	.23	.47	.09	.58
Principals		No.	(13)	(30)	(9)	(39)	(10)	(20)	(5)	(32)
		Percent	.32	.75	.24	.97	.27	.50	.14	.80
Total		No. and Percent	46	79	26	94	24	48	10	67

- a. Coaching potential and/or experience.
- b. Extracurricular activities and/or leisure pursuits.
- c. Major area of interest within P.E. and/or athletics.
- d. Participation in Intercollegiate Athletics.
- e. References (personal and employers).
- f. Scholastic record.
- g. Student teaching evaluation.
- h. Additional work experience with youth.

the Principals for "extracurricular activities" was 5.7, above "additional work experience with youth" ranked at 5.75 (See Table 14, Appendix C for mean responses of the two respondent groups).

The items in Part II, Section A, focussed on four aspects of "first impressions." Only item c, "physical appearance," received a majority high ranking (72). Item a, "punctuality," was ranked of low importance by sixty-five respondents. "Social grace" and "mannerisms" (b and d) each received a majority low ranking and were very close (with 53 and 52 respectively). The researcher's attention was drawn to the latter items, however. For, while the Principals did rank them low, the Superintendents or Personnel Directors were split on their assessment of importance (50:50). As a group, they were not consistent in viewpoint (See Table 2).

The mean response of ranks was also calculated for Part II, Section A. The results were helpful in further assessment of respondent viewpoint concerning the "first impression" an applicant makes upon an interviewer. The ranks were as follows:

1. Physical appearance	1.96
2. Mannerisms (body language)	2.52
3. Social grace	2.61
4. Punctuality	2.87

The means gave some indication to viewpoint, but because of their closeness and the range of ranks, it seemed apparent that inconsistency existed in viewpoint among the respondents (See Table 13, Appendix C for frequency of

Table 2

Tally of High-Low Ranks on the Importance
of First Impression Items

Importance of Ranks	Position	Number of subjects and percentage of ranks on items (N = 100)				
		Items	a	b	c	d
High 1 or 2	Supts. or Pers. Dir.	No.	(19)	(30)	(43)	(30)
		Percent	.37	.50	.72	.50
	Principals	No.	(16)	(17)	(29)	(18)
		Percent	.40	.43	.73	.45
	Total	No. and Percent	35	47	72	48
	Low 3 or 4	Supts. or Pers. Dir.	No.	(41)	(30)	(17)
Percent			.63	.50	.28	.50
Principals		No.	(24)	(23)	(11)	(22)
		Percent	.60	.57	.27	.55
Total		No. and Percent	65	53	28	52

- a. Punctuality.
 b. Social grace.
 c. Physical appearance (build, neatness, attractiveness).
 d. Mannerisms (body language).

responses). However, a comparison of the mean responses of the two respondent groups showed agreement in viewpoint, and the mean ranks of each group followed the same order as the above list (See Table 14, Appendix C).

The order of importance compiled from the tally of high-low ranks and the list of mean responses were in apparent agreement on the top and bottom ends, but were in disagreement concerning the importance of "mannerisms" and "social grace." But the difference seemed so slight that no further discussion was deemed necessary.

Part II, Section B, contained seven personal qualities. It was to be remembered here that the rank of four was considered neutral. Those items ranked as most important (e and f) and those ranked least important (b and c) follow, along with the number of respondents so ranking them.

<u>High Importance</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Low Importance</u>	<u>No.</u>
Interest and enthusiasm	74	Preparation for interview	75
Oral expression of ideas	51	Drive and ambition	59

The other three items were of apparent neutral importance in the views of the respondents because none of them received a majority of responses in either the high or the low range. Because of the range of high-low responses on the items, it seemed apparent that there was inconsistency of viewpoint within the two respondent groups with respect to "candidness" (49 high--34 low), "friendliness and sense of humor" (46 high--34 low) and "self-confidence" (41 high--43 low). These observations were overt in Table 3.

Table 3

Tally of High-Low Ranks on the Importance
of Personal Qualities Items

Importance of Ranks	Position	Number of subjects and percentages of ranks on questionnaire items (N = 100)							
		Items	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
High 1 to 3	Supts. or Pers. Dir.	No.	(30)	(16)	(12)	(28)	(42)	(30)	(27)
		Percent	.50	.27	.20	.47	.70	.50	.45
	Principals	No.	(19)	(14)	(6)	(18)	(32)	(21)	(14)
		Percent	.46	.35	.15	.45	.80	.53	.35
	Total	No. and Percent	49	30	18	46	74	51	41
	Low 5 to 7	Supts. or Pers. Dir.	No.	(21)	(36)	(44)	(21)	(12)	(18)
Percent			.35	.60	.73	.35	.20	.30	.40
Principals		No.	(13)	(23)	(31)	(13)	(4)	(12)	(19)
		Percent	.33	.58	.78	.33	.10	.30	.48
Total		No. and Percent	34	59	75	34	16	30	43
Neutral (4)		Total	No. and Percent	17	11	7	20	10	19

- a. Candidness.
- b. Drive and ambition.
- c. Evidence of preparation for interview.
- d. Friendliness and sense of humor.
- e. Interest and enthusiasm.
- f. Oral expression of ideas.
- g. Self-confidence.

The respondents' mean responses to "personal qualities" gave further insight into the viewpoint of the groups. However, a scattering of responses was also apparent, which, because of the wide range in rankings, seemed to indicate inconsistency within the groups (See Table 13, Appendix C).

These items were listed in the order of mean ranks:

1. Interest and enthusiasm	2.71
2. Candidness	3.44
3. Oral expression of ideas	3.56
4. Friendliness and sense of humor	3.82
5. Self-confidence	3.86
6. Drive and ambition	4.63
7. Evidence of preparation for interview	5.53

Inconsistency in viewpoint also seemed apparent between respondent groups as their mean responses were compared. The groups' mean responses agreed on the ranking of items a, b, c, and e. But they differed considerably on the importance of items d, f, and g. These inconsistencies seemed to exist because (1) the Superintendents or Personnel Directors ranked "oral expression of ideas" third at 3.5, while the Principals ranked it fourth at 3.65, (2) the Superintendents or Personnel Directors ranked "self-confidence" fourth at 3.58, while the Principals ranked it fifth at 4.28, and (3) the Superintendents or Personnel Directors ranked "friendliness and sense of humor" fifth at 3.97, while the Principals ranked it third at 3.60 (See Table 14, Appendix C).

Part II, Section C was comprised of seven professional qualifications. With the elimination of rank four responses (neutral), there still remained six of seven items receiving

simple majority response--three high and three low in importance. Items given majority high rankings were d, e, and g; those receiving majority low ranking were b, c, and f. Item a failed to gain a simple majority ranking in either direction (See Table 4). The ranked majority views and respondent numbers follow:

<u>High Importance</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Low Importance</u>	<u>No.</u>
Physical Education philosophy and/or experience	70	Coaching philosophy and/or experience	60
Teaching strengths and weaknesses	61	Reasons for going into teaching	55
Professional flexibility	51	Philosophy and/or experience with atypical students	53

The only neutral item, as determined with high-low respondent tallies, was "student counseling ability"(33-49). The fact that this item did not receive a simple majority ranking, either high or low, indicated mixed respondent feelings as to its importance. Of further interest, in the findings of this section, were the respondent viewpoints on "professional flexibility." It seemed apparent that the Principals placed greater importance on professional flexibility (63 percent high ranks) than the Superintendents or Personnel Directors (43 percent high ranks). Another questionnaire item of note was item g, "teaching strengths and weaknesses." Although a simple majority, or fifty-nine, ranked this as being of high importance, Principals were split on the issue. On the other hand, a large majority of Superintendents/Personnel Directors (72 percent) ranked this

Table 4

Tally of High-Low Ranks on the Importance of Professional Qualifications Items

Importance of Ranks	Position	Number of subjects and percentage of ranks on questionnaire items (N = 100)							
		Items	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
High 1 to 3	Supts. or Pers. Dir.	No.	(21)	(14)	(16)	(39)	(26)	(25)	(43)
		Percent	.35	.23	.27	.65	.43	.42	.72
	Principals	No.	(12)	(15)	(11)	(31)	(25)	(9)	(18)
		Percent	.30	.36	.28	.78	.63	.23	.45
	Total	No. and Percent	33	29	27	70	51	34	61
	Low 5 to 7	Supts. or Pers. Dir.	No.	(28)	(41)	(32)	(12)	(23)	(30)
Percent			.47	.68	.53	.20	.38	.50	.18
Principals		No.	(21)	(19)	(21)	(5)	(10)	(25)	(18)
		Percent	.53	.46	.53	.13	.25	.63	.45
Total		No. and Percent	49	60	53	17	33	55	29
Neutral (4)		Total	No. and Percent	18	11	20	13	16	11

- a. Ability to provide student counseling.
- b. Coaching philosophy and/or experience.
- c. Philosophy and/or experience with respect to atypical students.
- d. Physical Education philosophy and/or experience.
- e. Professional flexibility.
- f. Reasons for going into teaching.
- g. Teaching strengths and weaknesses.

item as being high in importance. The significance of the differences on these two items is presented later in the chapter.

The mean ranks of the respondents in this section showed some very interesting results. The overall ranks and their means were as follows:

1. Physical Education philosophy and/or experience	2.59
2. Teaching strengths and weaknesses	3.21
3. Professional flexibility	3.69
4. Ability to provide student counseling	4.43
5. Philosophy and/or experience with respect to atypical students	4.55
6. Reasons for going into teaching	4.67
7. Coaching philosophy and/or experience	4.69

While the overall viewpoint of the respondents, as determined by the mean ranks, appeared to agree with the list of high ranked and low ranked items, the real inconsistencies appeared when the means of the two respondent groups were compared. It seemed that the overall viewpoint of the respondents could not be determined accurately from the mean responses because the groups differed on many of the items (See Table 14, Appendix C). Of the seven items included in Section C, the respondent groups differed on five of them. The biggest differences between the groups came in the following items:

1. The Principals ranked "coaching philosophy" fourth at 4.18, while the Superintendents or Personnel Directors ranked it seventh at 5.05.

2. The Principals ranked "Physical Education philosophy and/or experience" first at 2.2, while the Superintendents or Personnel Directors ranked it second at 3.03.

3. The Principals ranked "professional flexibility" second at 3.35, while the Superintendents or Personnel Directors ranked it third at 3.92.

4. The Superintendents or Personnel Directors ranked "reasons for going into teaching" fourth at 4.35, while the Principals ranked it seventh at 5.15.

5. The Superintendents or Personnel Directors ranked "teaching strengths and weaknesses" first at 2.7, while the Principals ranked it third at 3.98.

It seemed apparent by the scattering of responses, that there was inconsistency in viewpoint both among and between the groups in Section C of the questionnaire.

Part III of the questionnaire consisted of four sections, representing each of the previously discussed questionnaire sections. In this section percentage ranking of items was based on proportions of one hundred. The data for this section were analyzed in depth elsewhere in the chapter. Presented here were the highest and lowest percentage rates given by respondents, and the median percentage rankings for each.

<u>Area of Assessment</u>	<u>Highest Percentage</u>	<u>Lowest Percentage</u>	<u>Median Percentage</u>
Pre-Interview	70.0	2.0	15.2
First Impression	75.0	4.0	11.75
Personal Qualities	60.0	5.0	26.3
Professional Qualifications	75.0	10.0	29.0

Due to the wide range of respondent scores, the median was selected as the most valid measure of central tendency against which to assess respondent views.

The overview of data revealed some broad overall respondent agreement as to the importance of various applicant qualities and qualifications. At the same time, it revealed some inconsistency within and between groups. The latter were elaborated upon elsewhere in the chapter.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Seven null hypotheses were tested to provide the basis for answering the study problem. Chi-Square tests were applied to the data for six of the seven hypotheses. The exception was H_{03} , which was tested by the Median Test. The following null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance.

H_{01} . There is no significant difference between the emphasis respondents placed on professional qualifications of applicants and that placed on personal qualities.

H_{02} . There is no significant difference between the importance respondents placed on the pre-interview and the interview assessment of professional qualifications.

Ho₃. Respondent groups came from populations with the same median pertinent to views toward the interview assessment of applicants' professional qualifications.

Ho₄. There is no significant difference between respondent groups with respect to the importance placed on applicants' coaching potential and/or experience.

Ho₅. There is no significant difference between respondent groups with respect to the importance placed on applicants' additional work experience with youth.

Ho₆. There is no significant difference between respondent groups with respect to importance placed on applicants' professional flexibility.

Ho₇. There is no significant difference between respondent groups pertinent to the importance placed on applicants' teaching strengths and weaknesses.

The first two null hypotheses dealt with the overall viewpoint of the respondent groups.

Before testing the first null hypothesis, a tally of combined overall assessments and majority emphasis ratings (more than 50 percent) was done. In using Part III of the questionnaire for data, the emphasis placed on professional qualifications came from the combined percentage ratings of categories one and four, and the emphasis placed on personal qualities came from the combined percentage ratings of categories two and three (See Questionnaire Responses, Appendix C). To test Ho₁: there is no significant difference between the emphasis respondents placed on professional qualifications.

of applicants and that placed on personal qualities, Chi-Square (χ^2) with a 50:50 hypothesis was used at the .05 level of significance. The results showed forty-nine respondents favored professional qualifications, as against fifty-one favoring personal qualities (See Table 5). Since the obtained value of Chi-Square, .04, clearly fell short of the 3.84 table value required at the .05 level of significance with 1 df, the null hypothesis was accepted. There was no significant difference between emphasis placed on professional qualifications and personal qualities.

After the majority and tied percentage preferences to the pre-interview (Part III, Category 1) and interview assessment of professional qualifications (Category 4) were tallied, the second null hypothesis was tested (Refer to Table 6). Chi-Square with a 50:50 hypothesis was used to test H_0 : there is no significant difference between the importance respondents placed on the pre-interview and the interview assessment of professional qualifications. The results showed twelve respondents favoring the pre-interview assessment of professional qualifications, seventy-one favoring the interview, and seventeen rating them equally. In applying the Chi-Square test, one half of the tied ratings were added to each category (The results would have been the same if ties were removed).

Because the Chi-Square value of 50.94 considerably exceeded both the 3.84 table value at the .05 level of significance with 1 df, and the 6.64 table value at the .01

Table 5

Comparison of Emphasis Placed on Personal Qualities and Professional Qualifications. Tested by Chi-Square.

Frequencies: Occurred (expected), majority of emphasis placed on; (N=100)				
Professional Qualifications		Personal Qualities		Total
49	(50)	51	(50)	100

$\chi^2 = .04$ Null hypothesis accepted at the .05 level of significance.

Table 6

Comparison of Emphasis Placed on the Pre-Interview and Interview Assessment of Applicants' Professional Qualifications. Tested by Chi Square.

Frequencies: Occurred (expected), majority of emphasis placed on; (N=100)		
Pre-Interview	Interview	Total
20.5 (50)	77.5 (50)	100

$\chi^2 = 50.94$ Null hypothesis rejected
at the .05 level of significance.

level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected. In light of the significant difference revealed, it was apparent that the interview assessment of professional qualifications was favored by the respondents over the pre-interview.

The last five null hypotheses were concerned with a comparison of the respondent groups' viewpoints pertinent to the screening process of a beginning high school Physical Education teacher.

The third null hypothesis: respondent groups came from populations with the same median pertinent to views toward the interview assessment of applicants' professional qualifications, was tested by the Median Test and Chi-Square with a 50:50 hypothesis. Because of the wide range of percentage responses for the fourth category of Part III (A high of 75 percent and a low of 10 percent) the Median Test seemed to be the best method for statistical analysis.

With the overall median for category four determined at 29 percent, the number of respondents within each group whose responses fell above or below this median was tallied and tested for significance of differences utilizing the Chi-Square technique (See Table 7).

Since the 8.8 calculated value of Chi-Square exceeded the table values at both the .05 (3.84) and .01 (6.64) levels of significance, with 1 df, the H_0 was rejected. The two groups did not come from populations with the same median, pertinent to the interview assessment of an applicant's professional qualifications. It appeared that Principals

Table 7

A Comparison of Median Test Results for
Importance on Interview Assessment
of Professional Qualifications.
Tested by Chi-Square.

Position	Frequencies: Occurred (expected) (N = 100)		
	Above Md.	Below Md.	Total
Superintendents or Personnel Dir.	36 (30)	24 (30)	60
Principals	28 (20)	12 (20)	40
Total	64	36	100

$x^2 = 8.8$ Null hypothesis rejected at the .05 level
of significance.

placed a greater emphasis on this aspect of selection than did the Superintendents or Personnel Directors.

The last four null hypotheses were concerned with comparing subjects' high-low responses to various questionnaire items. In each instance Chi-Square was then used to test for significance of differences between the groups.

The data from respondent groups pertinent to "coaching potential and/or experience" were found in the responses to questionnaire Part I, Item a. The high-low responses to the items were tallied to analyze the fourth null hypothesis: there is no significant difference between respondent groups with respect to the importance placed on applicants' coaching potential and/or experience. To test this hypothesis, Chi-Square was applied to the data and the significance of difference was determined at the .05 level (See Table 8).

Because the value of Chi-Square in the test was 4.89 which exceeded the table value of 3.84 at the .05 level of significance with 1 df, the H_04 was rejected. And therefore, it seemed apparent that Principals appeared to place more emphasis on coaching potential and/or experience than the Superintendents or Personnel Directors.

The data from Part I, Item h, provided the basis for testing H_05 : there is no significant difference between respondent groups with respect to the importance placed on applicants' additional work experience with youth. The results of this Chi-Square test were placed in Table 9.

Table 8

Comparison of Importance Placed on Applicants'
Coaching Potential and/or Experience.
Tested by Chi-Square.

Position	Frequencies: Occurred (expected) (N=100)		Total
	High Response	Low Response	
Superintendents or Personnel Directors	27 (32.4)	33 (27.6)	60
Principals	27 (21.6)	13 (18.4)	40
Total	54	46	100

$\chi^2 = 4.89$ Null hypothesis rejected at the .05 level of
significance.

Table 9

Comparison of Importance Placed on
 Applicant's Additional Work
 Experience with Youth.
 Tested by Chi-Square.

Position	Frequencies: Occurred (expected) (N = 100)		Total
	High Response	Low Response	
Superintendents or Personnel Dir.	25 (19.8)	35 (40.2)	60
Principals	8 (13.2)	32 (26.8)	40
Total	33	67	100

$\chi^2 = 5.10$ Null hypothesis rejected at the .05 level of
 significance.

The null hypothesis was rejected because the 5.10 computed value of Chi-Square exceeded the table value of 3.84 at the .05 level of significance with 1 df. It appeared that Superintendents or Personnel Directors placed somewhat greater emphasis on additional work experience with youth than did the Principals.

Data gathered from Part II, Section C, Item g, were used to test the sixth null hypothesis: there is no significant difference between respondent groups with respect to importance placed on applicants' professional flexibility. Again Chi-Square, at the .05 level of significance, was applied (See Table 10).

The calculated value of Chi-Square, 2.78, fell short of the table value of 3.84 at the .05 level of significance with 1 df. While H_06 was accepted, it was noted that the value of Chi-Square was significant at the .10 level of significance (.10 table value of 2.71). This appeared to indicate a leaning of the Principals toward placing a higher emphasis on applicants' professional flexibility than did the Superintendents/Personnel Directors respondent group.

The seventh and final null hypothesis was that: there is no significant difference between respondent groups pertinent to importance placed on applicants' teaching strengths and weaknesses. The data were gathered from Part II, Section C, Item g. Results of the Chi-Square test at the .05 level of significance were placed in Table 11.

Table 10

Comparison of Importance Placed on
Applicant's Professional Flexi-
bility. Tested by Chi-Square.

Position	Frequencies: Occurred (expected)		(N = 100)		Total
	High Response	Low Response			
Superintendents or Personnel Dir.	32 (36)	28 (24)			60
Principals	28 (24)	12 (16)			40
Total	60	40			100

$x^2 = 2.78$ Null hypothesis accepted at the .05 level of
significance.

Table 11

Comparison of Importance Placed on
 Applicant's Teaching Strengths
 and Weaknesses. Tested
 by Chi-Square.

Position	Frequencies: Occurred (expected)		Occurred (N = 100)		Total
	High Response		Low Response		
Superintendents or Personnel Dir.	46	(39.6)	14	(20.4)	60
Principals	20	(26.4)	20	(13.6)	40
Total	66		34		100

$\chi^2 = 7.57$ Null hypothesis rejected at the .05 level of
 significance.

Since the value of Chi-Square, computed at 7.56, exceeded the table value using 1 df at the .05 level of significance (3.84), the H_0 was rejected. The value of Chi-Square also exceeded the table value (6.64) at the .01 level of significance. Therefore, it appeared that the Superintendents or Personnel Directors placed considerably more emphasis on applicants' teaching strengths and weaknesses than did the Principals.

In order to enhance reader understanding, the Chi-Square test results for each of the null hypotheses were included in Table 12.

STUDY FINDINGS

In summarizing the findings of the study, it seemed that the respondent groups showed much diversity in the emphasis placed on the questionnaire items. The findings concerning the overall majority viewpoint of respondents follow.

1. The data revealed that respondents either decisively supported or negated the importance of some applicant qualities and qualifications, and marginally supported other items as being important. A summary of these respondent views can be divided into four areas. (a) Decisively important qualities and qualifications were student teaching evaluation, references, major area of interest in Physical Education/coaching, Physical Education philosophy and/or experience, teaching strengths and weaknesses.

Table 12
Chi-Square Test Results for Each
of the Null Hypotheses

Hypothesis	Chi-Square Value	Table Value at .05 Level	Accepted or Rejected
Ho ₁	.04	3.84	Accepted
Ho ₂	50.94	3.84	Rejected
Ho ₃	8.8	3.84	Rejected
Ho ₄	4.89	3.84	Rejected
Ho ₅	5.1	3.84	Rejected
Ho ₆	2.78	3.84	Accepted
Ho ₇	7.57	3.84	Rejected

physical appearance of applicants, and interest and enthusiasm. (b) Decisively unimportant qualities and qualifications were participation in intercollegiate athletics, extracurricular activities and additional work with youth, coaching philosophy and/or experience, reasons for going into teaching, philosophy and/or experience with respect to atypical students, punctuality, preparation for interview, and drive and ambition. (c) Somewhat important qualities and qualifications were coaching potential, scholastic record, professional flexibility, and oral expression of ideas. (d) Neutral response items were social grace and mannerisms, candidness, ability to provide student counseling, self-confidence, and friendliness and sense of humor.

2. No significant difference was found between the emphasis respondents placed on the importance of applicants' personal qualities and the emphasis placed on professional qualifications.

3. Respondents placed significantly greater emphasis on the importance of the interview than they did on the pre-interview assessment of applicants' qualifications. This finding was supported at both the .05 and the .01 levels of significance.

With the overall majority views of respondents established, data were further analyzed to determine the significance of differences between respondent group views. Findings from the analysis of data, tested at the .05 level of significance, were the following:

1. Respondents did not come from populations with the same median, pertinent to their views toward the interview assessment of applicants' professional qualifications. Principals were found to place significantly greater emphasis on this aspect of selection than the Superintendents or the Personnel Directors. This finding was supported at the .01 as well as the .05 level of significance.

2. Principals placed significantly more importance on applicants' coaching potential and/or experience than did the Superintendents or Personnel Directors.

3. Superintendents or Personnel Directors placed significantly greater emphasis on applicants' additional work experience with youth than the Principals.

4. While there was no significant difference between groups with respect to the importance placed on applicants' professional flexibility, a trend was noted at the .10 level of significance which indicated that Principals tended to find this more important than Superintendents or Personnel Directors.

5. Superintendents and Personnel Directors placed significantly greater importance on applicants' teaching strengths and weaknesses than the Principals. This finding was supported at the .01 as well as the .05 level of significance.

SUMMARY

In presenting the data the subjects once again were described along with the number of respondents. An overview of the analysis of data was also included, as well as a discussion of the overall views of the respondents and the findings from tests applied to seven null hypotheses at the .05 level of significance. The analysis of data was necessary to help determine the study findings summarized in the preceding section.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section of the study deals with the presentation of a summary, conclusions, and the researcher's recommendations for further studies in the area of the screening process of beginning high school Physical Education teachers.

SUMMARY

The purpose of the study was to give a prospective teacher some insight into evaluation criteria an employer might consider important in assessing personal qualities and professional qualifications. To fulfill the purpose of the study, the investigator had to answer the study problem which was to determine the viewpoints held by Superintendents or Personnel Directors, and Principals, in selected California counties, toward the screening process for selecting beginning high school Physical Education teachers; and, subsequently, to compare the viewpoints of the two respondent groups.

The importance of the study was supported by a review of literature. The latter included discussions of the viewpoint of authorities pertinent to teacher selection, the interview, and the screening process in general. These were

helpful to the investigator in constructing the study questionnaire. Much of the literature reviewed dealt with guidelines, lists of questions, and the importance of various criteria in teacher selection. Other areas discussed were the possible ineffectiveness of the interview in teacher selection because of the inconsistencies, the biases, and the lack of pre-arranged direction or structure given to many interviews.

The subjects from which the data for the study were gathered included the Superintendents or Personnel Directors, and a 25 percent random sample of the Principals from the public high schools within ten selected bay area counties in California. The study was not concerned with such things as: the type of screening process used; the degree of specialized training of the interviewer; or, the size or financial status of the districts included in the study. In order to give strength to the study, it was assumed that: a significant number of subjects would respond; the responses would be honest; the questionnaires would be understood; the subjects would complete the questionnaire properly; the questionnaire would yield the data essential for answering the study problem; and, the researcher would be able to properly analyze and interpret the data. To answer the study problem, a total of seven study hypotheses were formulated, two of which dealt with the overall respondent viewpoints, and the remaining five with potential differences between respondent groups.

Key and special terms pertinent to reader understanding were defined.

The descriptive-survey method of research was chosen because it was believed to be the best method for designing the study in order to answer the study problem. A questionnaire was constructed by the investigator after reviewing the literature and consulting various authorities in the field. This instrument was used to gather the data which would elicit respondent viewpoints. Other basic procedures used to construct, test, and administer the questionnaire were included in Chapter 3 of the study.

Once the data were gathered, they were tallied and tables were constructed to present the findings more graphically. Discussion of the overview of the data, and the overall respondent views were included to support the study findings. The statistical test applied on the data was Chi-Square (χ^2) using a .05 level of significance to either accept or reject the null hypotheses. The data were presented and analyzed by the investigator, after which a summary of the study findings was compiled. The list of subjects, letters of correspondence, the questionnaire, and data of minor significance to the study were placed in the appendixes.

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions pertinent to criteria for screening beginning high school Physical Education teacher applicants

were based on the findings resulting from analysis of the study data. The conclusions were limited to the populations of Superintendents or Personnel Directors, and public high school Principals in the ten California counties from which sample respondent groups were drawn.

It was concluded that:

1. Both personal qualities and professional qualifications of applicants are important in the assessment of potential teachers, particularly; student teaching evaluation, references, major area of interest in Physical Education/coaching, Physical Education philosophy and/or experience, teaching strengths and weaknesses, physical appearance of applicants, and interest and enthusiasm.
2. The personal interview is favored over the pre-interview assessment of applicants' professional qualifications, particularly among Principals.
3. While Superintendents and Personnel Directors are more concerned with applicants' teaching strengths and weaknesses and additional work experience with youth, Principals are more concerned with coaching potential and/or experience, and, to some degree, the professional flexibility of applicants.
4. Five of the seven study hypotheses are tenable. The first and sixth are untenable.
5. The purpose of the study is fulfilled.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Having demonstrated that five of seven study hypotheses seemed to be supported, the investigator felt that the study problem was seemingly answered. The following recommendations were made by the researcher to give further suggestions to subsequent studies of this nature that might be undertaken:

1. Consideration might be given to reconstruction of the questionnaire so that it would look at the size and financial status of the school districts.
2. Provide for responses to items that do not apply in individual cases.
3. To determine the amount of screening done, establish a personal inventory to accompany the questionnaire which would assess the specialized training and experience of the subjects.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

1. American Association of Examiners and Administrators of Educational Personnel. Principles and Procedures of Teacher Selection. Ohio: Tri-State Offset, 1951.
2. Backstrom, Charles H., and Gerald D. Hursh. Survey Research. Chicago: Northwestern University Press, 1963.
3. Ballou, Frank W. Appointment of Teachers in Cities. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1915.
4. California Public Schools Directory. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1974.
5. Callahan, Sterling G. Successful Teaching in Secondary Schools. Illinois: Scott Forsman, 1966.
6. Campbell, William, and Stephen Ballou. Form and Style. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
7. Coulbourn, John. Selection of Teachers in Large City School Systems. New York: Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1938.
8. Eye, Glenn G., and Willard R. Lane. The New Teacher Comes to School. New York: Harper Brothers, 1956.
9. Garrett, Annette. Interviewing: Its Principles and Methods. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1951.
10. Gilbert, Henry, and others. Teacher Selection Policies and Procedures in Large Public School Systems in the United States. New York: Hunter College, 1966.
11. Good, Carter V., and Douglas E. Scates. Methods of Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.
12. Hontz, Glenn. Finding the Right Teaching Position. Ohio: Charles Merrill Books, 1965.
13. Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.
14. Maier, Norman. The Appraisal Interview. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

15. National Education Association, Research Division. Teacher Personnel Practices, Urban School Districts. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1956.
16. Richardson, Stephen, and David Klein. Interviewing: Its Forms and Functions. New York: Basic Books, 1965.
17. Selltitz, Claire, and others. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
18. Shouksmith, George. Assessment Through Interviewing. New York: Pergamon Press, 1968.
19. Siegel, Sidney. Non Parametric Statistics for Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw Hill, 1956.
20. Spence, Janet T., and others. Elementary Statistics. New York: Meredith Corporation, 1968.

B. PERIODICALS

21. Austin, David L. "The Case of Donald A.--To Hire or Not to Hire," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 50:5-8, January, 1972.
22. Barton, L. D. "How to Size Up a Man in 16 Minutes," School Management, 10:94-95, December, 1966.
23. Bolton, D. L., and M. E. Hickey. "Effects of Interviews on Teacher Selection Decisions," Journal of Applied Psychology, 53:501-5, December, 1969.
24. Branin, E. R. "Procedure for Interviewing Prospective Teachers," The American School Board Journal, 151:44-48, July, 1965.
25. Brannon, C. John. "Development in Interview Procedure for Teachers," Clearing House, 49:166-67, December, 1975.
26. Carlson, R. E. "Selection Interview Decisions: The Relative Influence of Appearance and Factual Written Information on Interview's Final Rating," Journal of Applied Psychology, 51:459-65, December, 1967.
27. Dipboye, Robert L., and others. "Relative Importance of Applicant Sex, Attractiveness and Scholastic Standing in Evaluation of Job Applicant Resumes," Journal of Applied Psychology, 60:39-43, May, 1974.

28. Drake, L. R., and others. "How Do Employers Value the Interview?" Journal of College Placement, 32:48, February, 1972.
29. Dunmire, E. E., and P. J. Quigley. "Getting the Right Man for the Job," Nation's Schools, 85:52-53, June, 1970.
30. Finley, J. D. "Teacher Selection: How to Weed Out the Duds," School Management, 12-16, December, 1964.
31. Funk, H. D. "A Prospective Teacher's First Interview: Does the School District Meet His Requirements," School and Community, 56:11, March, 1970.
32. Hardaway, C. W. "Teacher Selection: How to Weed Out the Duds--Part II," School Management, 11:95-98, February, 1967.
33. Horowitz, Romaine. "How to Sell Yourself or . . . Why It Doesn't Pay to Hold Hands at a Job Interview," Senior Scholastic, 45:28, April, 1974.
34. Koerner, T. F. "Interviewing: Ask the Right Questions," Clearing House, 44:102-4, October, 1969.
35. Landy, Frank J., and Frederick Bates. "Another Look at Contrast Effects in the Employment Interview," Journal of Applied Psychology, 58:141-44, 1973.
36. McKenna, B. H. "How to Interview Teachers," American School Board Journal, 15:8-9, June, 1968.
37. Morris, John L. "The Interview: Guidelines for Making It a More Effective Hiring Device," The Clearing House, 46:29-32, September, 1971.
38. National Education Association, Research Division. "Practices Affecting Teacher Personnel," Research Bulletin, 4:47-50, September, 1928.
39. Nelken, Dan. "The Job Interview: Rating Applicants," Senior Scholastic, 45:36-37, May, 1974.
40. Orth, Lee. "The Interview--Is It Fair?" School and Community, 20:19, May, 1974.
41. Robinson, Stephen L. "The Group Interview," Journal of College Placement, 32:39-41, February-March, 1972.
42. Steinkamp, S. W. "Some Characteristics of Effective Interviewers," Journal of Applied Psychology, 50:486-88, December, 1966.

43. Valenzi, Enzo, and I. R. Andrews. "Individual Differences in the Decision Process of Employment Interviewers," Journal of Applied Psychology, 58:49-53, January, 1973.
44. Yantis, J. T., and M. Carey. "Improving Teacher Selection," Journal of College Placement, 32:75-77, December, 1971-January, 1972.

C. OTHER SOURCES

45. Board of Education, St. Helena Unified School District. A paper on "Procedures for the Employment of Certified Personnel." Date of adoption--August, 1974.
46. Kennedy, Joyce L. "Careers--What's New in Hiring Methods," The Sacramento Union. August 1, 1976.
47. Nugent, Dennis. A research paper entitled "A Study on the Interview Process Pertinent to the Selection of High School Physical Education Teachers," for University of the Pacific, Stockton, June, 1971.
48. San Juan Unified School District. A paper on "Employment Opportunities," Bulletin #20, June, 1976.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SUBJECTS FOR PRETESTS
AND SURVEY SAMPLE

1. Subjects for validity testing
2. Subjects for reliability testing
3. Subjects for study survey

SUBJECTS FOR VALIDITY TESTING

1. Ernest Azevedo, Personnel Director
Modesto City Schools
Modesto, California
2. Robert Colton, Principal
Beyer High School
Modesto, California
3. Donald Goldstein, Principal
Turlock High School
Turlock, California
4. Dale Harter, Superintendent
Turlock Joint Union High School District
Turlock, California
5. Roger Irvine, Superintendent
Oakdale Joint Union High School District
Oakdale, California
6. Eugene Maxwell, Superintendent
Patterson Joint Unified School District
Patterson, California
7. Eugene Mould, Principal
Modesto High School
Modesto, California
8. Max Norwood, Principal
Ceres High School
Ceres, California
9. Robert Scherer, Principal
Oakdale High School
Oakdale, California
10. Neal Wade, Superintendent
Stanislaus County Schools
Modesto, California

SUBJECTS FOR RELIABILITY TESTING

1. Gary Brophy, Principal
East Union High School
Manteca, California
2. Donald Champlin, Principal
Downey High School
Modesto, California
3. Floyd Dale, Principal
Lodi High School
Lodi, California
4. Collins Haan, Principal
Stagg High School
Stockton, California
5. John Hawkins, Principal
Escalon High School
Escalon, California
6. Thomas Houston, Principal
Franklin High School
Stockton, California
7. Charles Leech, Principal
Linden High School
Linden, California
8. Henry Meyer, Director of Physical Education
Modesto City Schools
Modesto, California
9. Harry Owens, Principal
Edison High School
Stockton, California
10. Robert Taylor, Principal
Grace Davis High School
Modesto, California

THE SUBJECTS

A. SUPERINTENDENTS
OR PERSONNEL DIRECTORSAlameda County

Alameda Co. Supt. of School Office	*Superintendent
Alameda City Unified	Personnel Director
Albany City Unified	Superintendent
Amador Valley Joint Union	Personnel Director
Berkeley Unified	*Personnel Director
Castro Valley Unified	*Personnel Director
Emery Unified	Superintendent
Fremont Unified	Personnel Director
Hayward Unified	Personnel Director
Livermore Valley Joint Unified	Personnel Director
Newark Unified	Superintendent
New Haven Unified	Superintendent
Oakland City Unified	Personnel Director
Piedmont City Unified	Superintendent
San Leandro Unified	Personnel Director
San Lorenzo Unified	Personnel Director

Contra Costa County

Contra Costa Co. Supt. of School Office	Superintendent
Antioch Unified	Superintendent

John Swett Unified	Superintendent
Martinez Unified	Superintendent
Mount Diablo Unified	Personnel Director
Pittsburg Unified	Superintendent
Richmond Unified	Superintendent
San Ramon Valley Unified	Personnel Director

Marin County

Marin Co. Supt. of School Office	Superintendent
Novato Unified	Superintendent
San Rafael City High School District	Superintendent
Shoreline Unified	Superintendent
Tamalpais Union High Schoof District	Personnel Director

Napa County

Napa Co. Supt. of School Office	Superintendent
Calistoga Joint Unified	Superintendent
Napa Valley Unified	Personnel Director
St. Helena Unified	Superintendent

San Francisco County

San Francisco Co. Supt. of School Office	*Personnel Director
---	---------------------

San Joaquin County

San Joaquin Co. Supt. of School Office	Personnel Director
--	--------------------

Escalon Unified	Superintendent
Lincoln Unified	Personnel Director
Linden Unified	Superintendent
Lodi Unified	Personnel Director
Manteca Unified	Superintendent
Stockton City Unified	*Personnel Director

San Mateo County

San Mateo Co. Supt. of School Office	Personnel Director
Cabrillo Unified	Superintendent
Jefferson Union	*Personnel Director
La Honda-Pescadero Unified	Superintendent
San Mateo Union	Personnel Director
Sequoia Union	Personnel Director
South San Francisco Unified	*Personnel Director

Santa Clara County

Santa Clara Co. Supt. of School Office	Superintendent
Campbell Union	Personnel Director
Eastside Union	Personnel Director
Fremont Union	*Personnel Director
Gilroy Unified	*Superintendent
Los Gatos Joint Union	Superintendent
Milpitas Unified	Superintendent
Mt. View-Los Altos Union	Personnel Director
Morgan Hill Unified	*Superintendent
Palo Alto City Unified	Personnel Director

San Jose Unified	Personnel Director
Santa Clara Unified	Personnel Director

Solano County

Solano Co. Supt. of School Office	Superintendent
Benicia Unified	Superintendent
Dixon Unified	*Superintendent
Fairfield-Suisun Joint Unified	Personnel Director
Travis Unified	*Superintendent
Vacaville Unified	Personnel Director
Vallejo City Unified	Personnel Director

Sonoma County

Sonoma Co. Supt. of School Office	Personnel Director
Analy Union	*Superintendent
Cloverdale Unified	Superintendent
Healdsburg Union	Superintendent
Petaluma Joint Union	Superintendent
City of Santa Rosa	Personnel Director
Sonoma Valley Unified	*Superintendent
Geyserville Unified	*Personnel Director

*Questionnaires either not returned or incomplete

THE SUBJECTS

B. HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Alameda County

*Albany High School	Albany
Canyon High School	Castro Valley
American High School	Fremont
Irvington High School	Fremont
Tennyson High School	Hayward
Livermore High School	Livermore
*Castlemont Senior High School	Oakland
*Fremont Senior High School	Oakland
Piedmont Senior High School	Piedmont
Pacific High School	San Leandro

Contra Costa County

Liberty Union High School	Brentwood
San Ramon High School	Danville
Campolindo High School	Moraga
*Pleasant Hill High School	Pleasant Hill
Ellis High School	Richmond
Kennedy High School	Richmond

Marin County

Redwood High School

Larkspur

San Rafael High School

San Rafael

Napa County

Calistoga High School

Calistoga

Vintage High School

Napa

San Francisco County

Balboa High School

San Francisco

Lowell High School

San Francisco

Mission High School

San Francisco

San Joaquin County

Tokay High School

Lodi

Manteca High School

Manteca

Lincoln High School

Stockton

San Mateo County

Carlmont High School

Belmont

Oceana High School

Pacifica

Terra Nova High School

Pacifica

El Camino High School

South San Francisco

Santa Clara County

Los Gatos High School	Los Gatos
Live Oak High School	Morgan Hill
Awalt High School	Mt. View
*Mt. View High School	Mt. View
Branham High School	San Jose
Del Mar High School	San Jose
James Lick High School	San Jose
Oak Grove High School	San Jose
Silver Creek High School	San Jose
Wilcox High School	Santa Clara
Saratoga High School	Saratoga
Peterson High School	Sunnyvale
Sunnyvale High School	Sunnyvale

Solano County

Vanden High School	Travis Air Force Base
--------------------	-----------------------

Sonoma County

Analy High School	Sebastopol
-------------------	------------

*Questionnaires either not returned or incomplete

APPENDIX B

LETTERS AND QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Letters of correspondence
2. Questionnaire (final copy)

2709 Santiago Drive
Modesto, California 95351
July 18, 1974

I am presently a graduate student and Physical Educator pursuing a Master of Arts degree from University of the Pacific. I am doing research for a thesis to determine if there is consistency in the interview process pertinent to the selection of a first year high school Physical Education teacher. The study is concerned with both the assessment of a candidate's personal qualities and qualifications, and the types of questions asked by interviewers.

Because of your position of importance, and your knowledge and experience in the areas of interview and teacher selection, I request your assistance in determining if the following questionnaire is a valid instrument for the above mentioned study.

Because this is a pretest for validity, please complete the questionnaire and make any necessary comments regarding clarity, possible voids, additions, or deletions. I would like to have it returned by July 30, 1974.

Thank you very much for taking time out of your busy schedule to help me with this project.

Sincerely,

Dennis R. Nugent

2709 Santiago Drive
Modesto, California 95351
August 27, 1974

Thank you very much for your cooperation and participation in the first step of the questionnaire validity check for my Masters Thesis. Your comments and responses were all very helpful in the development of a more streamlined and concise instrument.

Enclosed is a copy of my revised questionnaire. I would appreciate it if you would complete the questionnaire one last time and make any suggestions you feel pertinent. As you respond to the questionnaire, please rank the importance of the various qualities and qualifications of a beginning Physical Education teaching candidate.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Dennis R. Nugent

2709 Santiago Drive
Modesto, California 95351
October 18, 1974

90

Your concern and experience in the teacher selection process prompts me to call on you for assistance with the research study I have undertaken.

Based on a review of literature and personal experience as an interviewee in recent years, it appears that the selection process is individualistic and influenced, somewhat, by situational factors. However, it has occurred to me that an analysis of administrators' views would yield certain consistencies in pre-assessing and interviewing potential teaching candidates, with respect to the importance placed on applicants' personal qualities and professional qualifications.

My particular study has been delimited to the pre-interview and interview process as it pertains to beginning Physical Education teachers. Depending upon the status of supply and demand at any given time, I believe the findings of this type of study would be useful for both teaching applicants and personnel officers.

Out of respect for your valuable time, the enclosed questionnaire instrument was developed for completion in approximately five minutes. The content and format are the result of input from a panel of experts.

Your prompt return of the completed questionnaire will be greatly appreciated. A self-addressed envelope has been included for your convenience. In return for your assistance, I will be glad to forward a copy of the study findings.

Sincerely,

Dennis R. Nugent
Physical Education teacher
and graduate student

Name _____

Position _____

Questionnaire

THE PRE-INTERVIEW AND INTERVIEW
PROCESS: ASSESSMENT OF BEGINNING
PHYSICAL EDUCATION CANDIDATES

Please answer all the items in the following three parts.

Part I. PRE-INTERVIEW

Directions: Please force rank the following items in order of importance (assigning #1 to the item of greatest importance, #2 to the item of second importance, etc.). It may be difficult to discriminate between some items, but for the success of the study it is necessary that you do not assign the same number to more than one item in each category.

Before the interview of a first year teaching candidate how do you rank the importance of the following eight items?

- ___ a. Coaching potential and/or experience
- ___ b. Extracurricular activities and/or leisure pursuits
- ___ c. Major area of interest within P.E./Athletics
- ___ d. Participation in intercollegiate Athletics
- ___ e. References (personal and employers)
- ___ f. Scholastic record
- ___ g. Student teaching evaluation
- ___ h. Additional work experience with youth

Part II. THE INTERVIEW

Directions: Please force rank the items within each of the three question areas (A, B, and C).

A. First Impressions (Rank from 1 to 4)

- ___ a. Punctuality
- ___ b. Social grace
- ___ c. Physical appearance (build, neatness, attractiveness)
- ___ d. Mannerisms (body language)

B. Personal Qualities (Rank from 1 to 7)

- ___ a. Candidness (honesty of responses)
- ___ b. Drive and ambition (has established goals for self)
- ___ c. Evidence of preparation for interview
- ___ d. Friendliness and sense of humor
- ___ e. Interest and enthusiasm
- ___ f. Oral expression of ideas (effectiveness of language)
- ___ g. Self-confidence

C. Professional Qualifications (Rank from 1 to 7)

- ___ a. Ability to provide student counseling (concerned with total needs of students)
- ___ b. Coaching philosophy and/or experience
- ___ c. Philosophy and/or experience with respect to atypical students
- ___ d. Physical Education philosophy and/or experience
- ___ e. Professional flexibility (indication or willingness to accept assignments in areas of minor interest)
- ___ f. Reasons for going into teaching
- ___ g. Teaching strengths and weaknesses

Part III. OVERALL RATING OF CANDIDATE

Directions: Please assign a percentage rating of overall importance to each of the four inclusive categories. The four assigned ratings should total one hundred percent.

- | | | |
|----|--|--------------|
| 1. | The pre-interview assessment of the candidate
(Refer to Part I) | _____ % |
| 2. | First impression of candidate (Refer to Part
II-A) | _____ % |
| 3. | Personal qualities (Refer to Part II-B) | _____ % |
| 4. | Professional qualifications (Refer to Part
II-C) | _____ % |
| | Total | <u>100</u> % |

Comments:

_____ Please send me a summary of the study.

APPENDIX C

DATA, RESPONSES,
AND MINOR TABLES

1. Table 13--Questionnaire Frequency
of Responses
2. Table 14--Comparison of Mean Ranks to
Questionnaire Items
3. Questionnaire Responses Print-Out

Table 13
 Frequency of Questionnaire Responses
 Part I: The Pre-Interview

Item	Subj.	Rank								Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
a	S	4	15	5	3	11	10	9	3	
	P	1	8	5	13	7	3	3	0	
	Total	5	23	10	16	18	13	12	3	100
b	S	0	1	5	5	9	16	11	13	
	P	0	3	4	3	6	6	11	7	
	Total	0	4	9	8	15	22	22	20	100
c	S	10	9	16	8	9	6	2	0	
	P	13	2	11	5	2	2	3	2	
	Total	23	11	27	13	11	8	5	2	100
d	S	0	1	2	2	10	5	12	28	
	P	0	1	0	0	6	13	5	15	
	Total	0	2	2	2	16	18	17	43	100
e	S	19	11	9	7	4	4	3	3	
	P	9	9	6	5	3	3	4	1	
	Total	28	20	15	12	7	7	7	4	100
f	S	1	6	10	15	7	7	8	6	
	P	2	5	7	6	3	5	4	8	
	Total	3	11	17	21	10	12	12	14	100
g	S	26	14	8	7	1	1	2	1	
	P	13	11	6	5	4	0	1	0	
	Total	39	25	14	12	5	1	3	1	100
h	S	2	6	5	12	8	9	12	6	
	P	1	1	2	4	9	8	8	7	
	Total	3	7	7	16	17	17	20	13	100

S = Superintendents or Personnel Directors
 P = Principals

Table 13 (continued)

Part IIa: First Impression

Item	Subject	Ranks				Total
		1	2	3	4	
a	S	9	10	17	24	
	P	8	8	9	15	
	Total	17	18	26	39	100
b	S	12	18	14	16	
	P	8	9	11	12	
	Total	20	27	25	28	
c	S	27	16	10	7	
	P	16	13	7	4	
	Total	43	29	17	11	100
d	S	13	17	18	12	
	P	7	11	14	8	
	Total	20	28	32	20	100

Table 13 (continued)

Part IIb: Personal Qualities

Item	Subject	Ranks							Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
a	S	10	12	8	9	11	6	4	100
	P	11	7	1	7	6	5	3	
	Total	22	19	9	16	17	11	7	
b	S	8	4	4	8	5	21	10	100
	P	0	9	5	3	8	8	7	
	Total	8	13	9	11	13	29	17	
c	S	2	7	3	4	6	9	29	100
	P	2	3	1	3	4	7	20	
	Total	4	10	4	7	10	16	49	
d	S	4	9	15	11	5	10	6	100
	P	5	6	7	9	8	5	0	
	Total	9	15	22	20	13	15	6	
e	S	18	12	12	6	5	3	4	100
	P	13	10	9	4	3	0	1	
	Total	31	22	21	10	8	3	5	
f	S	10	11	9	12	8	7	3	100
	P	7	3	11	7	4	4	4	
	Total	17	14	20	19	12	11	7	
g	S	12	5	10	9	19	3	2	100
	P	3	5	6	7	6	9	4	
	Total	15	10	16	16	25	12	6	

Table 13 (continued)

Part IIc: Professional Qualifications

Item	Subject	Ranks							Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
a	S	5	9	7	11	5	12	11	100
	P	3	6	3	7	6	7	8	
	Total	8	15	10	18	11	19	19	
b	S	4	3	7	5	13	10	18	100
	P	3	5	7	6	10	5	4	
	Total	7	8	14	11	23	15	22	
c	S	0	7	9	12	15	11	6	100
	P	1	4	6	8	8	8	5	
	Total	1	11	15	20	23	19	11	
d	S	18	15	6	9	5	6	1	100
	P	22	6	3	4	1	3	1	
	Total	40	21	9	13	6	9	2	
e	S	6	7	13	11	10	8	4	100
	P	4	9	12	5	6	2	2	
	Total	10	16	25	16	17	10	6	
f	S	8	9	8	5	6	8	16	100
	P	2	3	4	6	3	7	15	
	Total	10	12	12	11	9	15	31	
g	S	22	11	10	6	5	3	3	100
	P	5	7	6	4	6	8	4	
	Total	27	18	16	10	11	11	7	

Table 14
 Mean Responses and Ranks of
 the Two Respondent Groups

Part I: Pre-Interview

Item	Superintendents		Principals	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
a. Coaching potential and/or experience	4.42	4	3.9	4
b. Extracurricular activities and/or leisure pursuits	6.0	7	5.7	6
c. Major area of interest within P.E. and/or Athletics	3.38	3	3.23	3
d. Participation in Inter-collegiate Athletics	6.73	8	6.63	8
e. References (personal and employers)	3.08	2	3.18	2
f. Scholastic record	4.73	5	4.85	5
g. Student teaching evaluation	2.31	1	2.5	1
h. Additional work experience with youth	5.05	6	5.75	7

Table 14 (Continued)

Part II: The Interview

A. First Impressions

Item	Superintendents		Principals	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
a. Punctuality	2.93	4	2.76	4
b. Social grace	2.57	3	2.68	3
c. Physical appearance (build, neatness, attractiveness)	1.95	1	1.98	1
d. Mannerisms (body language)	2.48	2	2.58	2

B. Personal Qualities

Item	Superintendents		Principals	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
a. Candidness (honesty of responses)	3.43	2	3.45	2
b. Drive and ambition (has established goals for self)	4.68	6	4.55	6
c. Evidence of preparation for interview	5.47	7	5.63	7
d. Friendliness and sense of humor	3.97	5	3.6	3
e. Interest and enthusiasm	2.88	1	2.45	1
f. Oral expression of ideas (effective language)	3.50	3	3.66	4
g. Self-confidence	3.58	4	4.28	5

Table 14 (Continued)

C. Professional Qualifications

Item	Superintendents		Principals	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
a. Ability to provide student counseling (concerned with total needs of students)	4.38	5	4.5	5
b. Coaching philosophy and/or experience	5.05	7	4.15	4
c. Philosophy and/or experience with respect to atypical students	4.58	6	4.52	6
d. Physical Education philosophy and/or experience	3.03	2	2.2	1
e. Professional flexibility (indication of willingness to accept assignments in areas of minor interest)	3.92	3	3.35	2
f. Reasons for going into teaching	4.35	4	5.15	7
g. Teaching strengths and weaknesses	2.7	1	3.98	3

Questionnaire Responses
Print-Out

SURJECT POS.	ITEMS	PART I								SECT A				PART II SECT B							SECT C							PART III PERCENTAGE			
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G				
1	S	2	6	1	8	4	7	3	5	1	4	2	3	2	3	6	4	5	7	1	3	7	4	1	5	6	2	30	20	20	30
2	S	6	4	3	5	7	8	1	2	4	2	3	1	3	6	7	4	2	5	1	4	6	3	2	5	7	1	5	15	25	55
3	S	6	7	3	8	2	4	1	5	3	4	1	2	4	3	6	7	2	5	1	3	7	6	2	5	4	1	50	10	25	15
4	S	3	8	2	4	5	7	1	6	3	4	1	2	3	7	6	4	1	2	5	6	3	5	2	4	7	1	30	10	20	40
5	S	5	8	1	6	4	3	2	7	1	4	2	3	6	4	2	7	1	3	5	6	5	4	1	3	7	2	10	10	30	50
6	S	6	7	3	8	4	5	1	2	1	3	4	2	5	4	7	1	6	2	3	4	6	3	2	7	1	5	35	15	25	25
7	S	8	4	6	7	2	5	1	3	1	4	3	2	1	6	5	7	3	4	2	4	7	5	1	2	6	3	50	10	20	20
8	S	2	4	5	8	6	7	3	1	4	3	1	2	4	6	5	3	7	2	1	2	7	4	3	5	6	1	10	20	40	30
9	S	3	4	6	7	1	8	2	5	1	3	4	2	5	2	7	6	4	1	3	5	7	3	6	1	4	2	5	75	5	15
10	S	2	8	1	5	7	4	6	3	2	3	1	4	1	6	4	5	7	2	3	6	2	5	1	4	7	3	25	25	25	25
11	S	2	8	4	6	7	3	1	5	4	2	3	1	7	4	1	3	6	2	5	4	3	6	5	7	1	2	10	10	40	40
12	S	3	5	2	8	1	6	4	7	4	1	2	3	3	1	5	6	7	2	4	6	3	7	2	4	5	1	15	10	25	50
13	S	2	6	3	5	1	4	8	7	4	1	2	3	3	2	7	6	4	5	1	2	4	3	5	6	7	1	15	10	25	50
14	S	2	5	4	6	1	8	3	7	2	4	1	3	1	7	2	3	4	5	6	6	1	3	2	4	7	5	25	25	25	25
15	S	5	8	1	7	3	6	2	4	1	4	2	3	2	6	7	3	1	4	5	1	7	3	4	2	6	5	20	15	40	25
16	S	6	7	1	8	2	3	4	5	3	2	4	1	1	4	7	3	2	6	5	7	5	2	1	6	4	3	20	5	25	50
17	S	7	6	2	8	3	5	1	4	1	2	4	3	1	7	5	3	2	4	6	2	7	4	6	3	1	5	15	20	40	25
18	S	1	8	6	7	2	5	3	4	3	2	1	4	5	6	7	2	1	3	4	6	5	7	4	3	1	2	15	10	50	25
19	S	5	7	6	8	1	3	2	4	1	2	3	4	2	6	7	5	4	1	3	4	5	2	3	1	6	7	10	60	15	15
20	S	2	6	3	5	1	8	7	4	3	2	1	4	3	5	7	6	1	4	2	6	3	7	4	2	5	1	25	10	35	30
21	S	7	8	3	5	2	4	1	6	4	3	1	2	2	6	7	4	1	3	5	7	5	3	6	4	2	1	3	7	30	60
22	S	2	7	6	8	3	6	4	5	4	2	3	1	5	6	7	4	1	2	3	1	2	6	4	3	7	5	15	25	40	20
23	S	2	5	7	8	3	6	4	1	4	3	1	2	4	6	7	2	1	3	5	3	7	2	6	4	5	1	20	40	20	20
24	S	2	6	1	7	5	4	3	8	4	2	1	3	1	4	7	6	5	2	3	3	4	5	1	6	7	2	10	10	40	40
25	S	5	7	1	6	4	2	3	8	4	2	1	5	2	6	7	3	1	4	5	7	6	4	1	5	3	2	15	20	35	30
26	S	1	6	5	2	8	3	4	7	4	3	1	2	7	6	5	3	1	2	4	6	2	5	1	4	7	3	2	8	50	40
27	S	7	5	3	8	2	4	1	6	3	2	1	4	4	7	2	3	1	6	5	1	6	4	5	3	2	7	20	25	30	25
28	S	2	8	5	7	3	4	1	6	3	2	1	4	1	5	7	2	3	6	4	2	5	5	4	3	7	1	40	15	20	25
29	S	4	8	3	5	2	6	1	7	3	4	2	1	7	1	3	6	2	4	5	3	4	5	1	6	7	2	35	10	20	35
30	S	8	5	4	6	3	7	1	2	2	1	3	4	2	6	7	5	3	1	4	6	5	4	2	7	1	3	20	20	30	30
31	S	5	6	2	8	4	7	1	3	2	4	3	1	5	4	7	6	2	1	3	6	7	2	4	5	1	3	15	15	30	40
32	S	3	4	5	6	1	7	2	8	3	2	4	1	5	6	7	3	2	4	1	7	6	5	4	2	3	1	50	20	20	10
33	S	5	6	3	8	1	7	2	4	2	3	1	4	5	7	3	2	1	6	4	2	7	6	5	1	3	4	15	25	30	30
34	S	2	7	3	8	1	5	4	6	4	1	3	2	3	6	7	4	2	1	5	7	2	5	3	6	4	1	16	10	30	50
35	S	5	6	3	7	2	8	1	4	3	1	2	4	6	5	7	2	1	4	3	2	6	7	5	4	3	1	10	40	30	20
36	S	5	7	3	8	2	4	1	6	4	2	1	3	4	6	7	3	2	5	1	5	3	4	2	6	7	1	10	10	30	50
37	S	7	3	4	8	5	2	1	6	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	7	5	7	6	1	4	2	3	20	25	25	30
38	S	6	7	4	8	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	5	6	7	4	1	2	3	6	7	4	1	5	2	3	20	10	40	30
39	S	2	3	4	8	6	1	7	5	4	2	1	3	2	7	6	5	3	1	4	7	5	6	1	4	2	3	10	10	40	40
40	S	3	7	4	5	6	2	1	8	2	4	1	3	3	4	6	2	7	1	5	7	1	6	2	3	5	4	10	10	20	60
41	S	7	6	1	8	5	3	2	4	2	1	4	3	2	6	7	1	5	3	4	3	5	2	1	4	7	6	15	20	30	35
42	S	2	6	1	5	8	4	3	7	4	2	1	3	6	7	4	3	1	2	5	7	4	5	3	1	6	2	10	50	20	20
43	S	6	7	5	8	1	4	2	3	3	4	1	2	5	7	6	1	4	3	2	4	7	3	2	6	5	1	10	10	40	40
44	S	4	6	2	8	1	5	3	7	3	2	1	4	4	1	2	7	3	5	6	5	6	4	2	3	7	1	5	10	35	50
45	S	6	8	1	5	2	3	4	7	3	1	2	4	4	6	7	2	1	3	5	4	5	6	2	3	7	1	50	10	20	20
46	S	5	6	4	7	2	3	1	8	4	2	3	1	4	3	5	2	1	6	7	2	5	6	4	7	3	1	10	25	25	40
47	S	4	7	5	8	1	6	2	3	4	3	2	1	2	1	7	4	3	6	5	4	3	7	1	5	6	2	10	10	40	40
48	S	5	6	3	8	1	4	2	7	4	3	1	2	5	6	7	3	2	4	1	7	6	5	1	3	2	4	40	20	40	20
49	S	6	5	7	8	3	2	1	4	3	4	2	1	2	1	6	7	3	4	5	4	6	5	7	3	2	1	30	20	20	30
50	S	5	6	2	7	3	4	1	8	1	3	4	2	1	6	7	4	5	2	3	4	7	2	1	6	3	5	25	25	25	25
51	S	6	5	2	4	8	3	1	7	4	1	2	3	2	5	7	6	3	4	1	3	5	7	1	6	2	4	10	10	30	50
52	S	7	5	6	8	1	3	2	4	4	1	3	2	7	1	6	4	3	5	2	7	4	5	6	3	2	1	10	10	40	40

SUBJECT	POS.	ITEMS	PART I								SECT A				PART II SECT B							SECT C							PART III PERCENTAGE			
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G				
53	S	1	8	2	3	6	7	5	4	4	3	1	2	5	1	2	6	3	7	4	1	3	4	2	5	7	6	20	10	40	30	
54	S	7	6	3	3	8	1	5	2	2	4	1	3	6	1	2	7	4	3	5	1	7	5	4	2	6	3	20	10	20	50	
55	S	2	8	3	5	4	6	1	7	4	1	3	2	6	4	7	3	2	5	1	2	6	3	4	5	1	7	50	10	25	15	
56	S	7	3	5	8	4	6	1	2	3	4	2	1	1	7	4	2	3	6	5	2	7	5	6	1	3	4	20	30	30	20	
57	S	7	5	3	8	1	4	2	6	4	1	2	3	4	5	7	6	3	1	2	5	7	6	2	3	4	1	5	20	15	60	
58	S	8	3	6	7	1	4	2	5	2	4	1	3	6	7	1	3	2	4	5	6	7	5	3	2	1	4	50	20	15	15	
59	S	6	8	5	7	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	5	6	2	4	1	7	3	4	5	6	3	2	7	1	10	15	50	25	
60	S	2	3	5	7	1	8	4	6	3	2	1	4	3	2	6	4	5	3	1	7	1	4	2	3	5	6	10	15	25	50	
61	P	7	8	1	6	3	4	2	5	3	4	2	1	2	5	6	4	3	7	1	5	3	4	1	7	6	2	25	10	35	30	
62	P	4	6	2	5	1	8	3	7	2	4	3	1	2	6	7	5	1	4	3	6	2	5	1	3	4	7	10	50	20	20	
63	P	1	8	3	7	6	5	4	2	1	2	4	3	2	5	3	6	4	1	7	1	5	3	4	2	6	7	15	30	30	25	
64	P	5	7	4	8	2	3	1	6	1	4	2	3	1	7	6	4	3	2	5	7	5	6	2	3	4	1	40	15	5	40	
65	P	3	7	2	6	4	8	1	5	4	2	1	3	6	5	7	4	3	1	2	7	4	6	1	5	2	3	20	20	40	20	
66	P	4	8	1	6	3	5	2	7	1	3	2	4	6	2	7	5	1	3	4	4	5	3	1	7	6	2	15	15	30	40	
67	P	2	6	1	6	7	4	3	5	2	4	3	1	4	2	7	5	1	6	3	6	5	4	2	3	7	1	25	20	25	30	
68	P	5	7	1	6	2	3	4	8	2	3	1	4	7	2	5	6	1	4	3	6	5	4	1	3	7	2	20	20	30	30	
69	P	4	7	1	5	3	6	2	8	4	3	2	1	5	2	7	4	1	3	6	5	3	6	1	4	7	2	5	5	30	60	
70	P	2	5	6	7	1	3	4	8	4	1	3	2	4	3	6	5	2	7	1	6	3	4	1	5	7	2	20	30	30	20	
71	P	4	6	3	5	2	7	1	8	4	3	1	2	5	2	7	4	3	1	6	7	5	4	1	2	3	6	20	50	20	10	
72	P	2	3	1	6	4	8	5	7	4	2	1	3	2	4	7	1	3	6	5	3	2	5	4	1	7	6	13	12	50	25	
73	P	5	6	4	7	3	2	1	8	2	3	4	1	1	5	4	3	2	7	6	2	4	5	3	6	1	7	70	10	10	10	
74	P	4	3	7	8	1	6	2	5	2	3	1	4	4	6	5	2	3	1	7	5	7	4	6	1	2	3	10	20	30	40	
75	P	4	7	3	8	2	5	1	6	3	4	1	2	1	7	6	5	3	4	2	1	6	7	2	3	5	4	15	10	50	25	
76	P	3	8	4	7	1	2	5	6	4	3	2	1	6	7	2	1	5	4	3	7	2	3	1	5	6	4	10	20	30	40	
77	P	2	5	1	6	3	8	4	7	3	1	2	4	3	7	6	2	5	1	4	7	4	5	1	2	6	3	20	10	30	40	
78	P	4	7	5	6	2	3	1	8	3	1	2	4	7	2	6	5	1	3	4	6	7	4	1	5	2	3	5	5	60	30	
79	P	5	7	3	2	4	8	1	6	4	2	1	3	2	6	7	1	4	5	3	1	6	4	5	3	7	2	25	25	25	25	
80	P	6	5	7	8	1	4	2	3	3	1	2	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	7	5	6	4	2	3	1	15	15	35	35	
81	P	5	4	3	8	6	1	2	7	2	4	1	3	2	4	7	5	1	3	6	4	1	7	2	3	6	5	10	20	40	30	
82	P	2	4	1	5	6	8	3	7	1	4	2	3	2	6	7	4	1	3	2	5	4	2	1	3	7	6	25	25	25	25	
83	P	6	2	5	8	7	4	3	1	3	4	1	2	6	5	1	3	2	4	7	2	7	3	6	1	4	5	20	20	30	30	
84	P	2	7	1	6	5	8	3	4	2	4	3	1	1	4	2	5	3	7	6	4	3	1	7	2	5	6	10	10	30	50	
85	P	4	8	3	7	1	2	5	6	2	4	1	3	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	4	6	1	2	7	3	30	10	20	40	
86	P	4	5	3	6	2	7	1	8	4	3	2	1	6	5	1	2	7	3	4	3	4	5	1	2	7	6	35	15	15	35	
87	P	7	2	3	8	1	4	5	6	4	2	1	3	1	3	7	4	2	5	6	4	7	2	1	3	6	5	15	10	25	50	
88	P	7	3	1	6	5	8	2	4	4	3	1	2	1	6	7	3	4	2	5	2	6	7	1	3	4	5	30	10	30	30	
89	P	4	5	7	8	2	3	1	6	3	4	1	2	4	6	7	5	2	1	3	7	5	2	6	4	3	1	10	15	25	50	
90	P	5	6	3	8	4	2	1	7	4	2	1	3	1	6	7	4	2	5	3	7	6	5	1	3	4	2	10	10	5	75	
91	P	3	7	8	5	4	1	2	6	1	4	2	3	1	7	2	6	4	3	5	6	2	7	1	4	5	3	20	10	20	50	
92	P	3	6	4	8	1	7	2	5	3	1	4	2	6	7	5	2	1	3	4	7	1	6	3	2	4	5	15	10	25	50	
93	P	3	4	8	6	1	7	2	5	4	1	2	3	5	2	7	4	1	6	3	6	3	7	2	5	1	4	50	15	15	20	
94	P	2	3	1	8	5	6	4	7	4	2	1	3	4	2	7	3	1	6	5	4	2	5	1	3	7	6	33	15	18	34	
95	P	6	7	4	8	1	3	2	5	4	1	3	2	1	2	5	6	3	4	7	4	5	3	2	6	7	1	20	10	10	60	
96	P	5	2	6	8	7	3	1	4	4	1	3	2	2	7	4	3	5	1	6	4	5	2	3	1	7	6	25	15	35	25	
97	P	4	7	3	8	2	6	1	5	1	3	4	2	1	5	7	3	2	4	6	2	3	6	1	5	7	4	30	10	30	30	
98	P	5	7	4	8	2	6	1	3	1	2	3	4	1	6	7	4	2	3	5	2	6	5	1	4	3	7	15	15	40	30	
99	P	2	8	1	5	3	6	7	4	1	4	2	3	4	3	7	2	1	5	6	5	1	3	4	2	7	6	20	20	30	30	
100	P	4	6	1	8	7	2	3	5	3	2	1	4	4	3	7	6	2	5	1	2	3	6	1	4	7	5	5	5	40	50	