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The problem with which this investigation is concerned is that of achieving reliability of administrative judgment in the selection of beginning teachers.

This study has a threefold purpose. The first is to determine the type and extent of investigation necessary to achieve reliability of judgment in the ratings of teacher applicants. The second is to investigate the feasibility of a Regional Education Service Center's providing personnel selection services to independent school districts. The final purpose is to develop recommendations relating to reliability in teacher selection.

Twenty-three beginning teacher applicants were investigated by personnel directors from four independent school districts and a three member team of administrators representing a Regional Education Service Center. Independent ratings of applicants were made at four intervals of the investigation procedure. The ratings were compared at each interval using Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance corrected for tied ranks (Wc) to determine the extent of agreement among personnel directors. Finally, the composite ratings of the personnel
directors were compared to the ratings of the selection team representing the Regional Education Service Center to determine the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient (rs) at different intervals of the investigation procedure.

There was a low level of agreement ($W_c = .49$) among personnel directors when they ranked applicants after an examination of the application form only. There was even less agreement ($W_c = .43$) after the second rating which was made at the conclusion of the personal interviews. When judges made their third ranking after an examination of reference forms, transcripts and college placement files, their extent of agreement was greater, as indicated by ($W_c = .57$). Still more agreement ($W_c = .59$) existed after the fourth ranking following a personal telephone conversation with the supervisors of student teaching.

The correlations between the ratings of the personnel directors and the selection team were all positive and ranged from .36 after the first rating to .64 for the final rating.

The data presented in this study resulted in the following conclusions:

1. Personnel directors tend to agree in their ratings of applicants at each point in the employment process; however, the extent of agreement is low.
2. The typical employment interview does not contribute to the reliability factor in the selection of beginning teachers.

3. Personnel directors' ratings of applicants are influenced by application forms, interviews, reference forms, college placement files, transcripts and the information they receive verbally from supervisors familiar with the applicant's student teaching experience.

4. A selection team representing a Regional Education Service Center will rate applicants in a manner positively correlated with the ratings of personnel directors.

5. Experienced school administrators will rate applicants in a similar manner regardless of their current position and job assignment.

6. The extent of investigation, rather than the investigator, is the important factor in achieving reliability of administrative judgment in teacher selection.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The current excess of certified teachers in the United States is well documented (7, pp. 50-59). The U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare has estimated that 2,053,000 new graduates will seek teaching positions in the five-year period from 1973 to 1978. An additional 300,000 teachers will seek to return to the teaching field. With only 40,000 new jobs available and only 998,000 vacancies created by teachers leaving the profession during this period, there may be more than a million surplus teachers actively seeking employment by 1978 (7, p. 50). Since this abundant supply is forecast to continue for several years, administrators responsible for selecting teachers must increase the reliability of their judgments with more thorough investigations of applicants.

Ironically, the oversupply of teachers may contribute to a tendency for personnel administrators to take short cuts in the decision-making process. Some personnel administrators are processing more than 2,000 applications each year. This volume creates such demands on the available time of personnel
administrators that it is reasonable to assume some dilution of the normal personnel investigative procedure.

School personnel administration is an expanding profession. Many school districts have created personnel departments. The increasing demand for accountability in all phases of school administration requires the most reliable teacher selection procedures. The selection process must become more professionalized.

The problem of establishing the reliability and validity of the interview has been investigated. Although its reliability and validity have been found generally low, the interview remains a universally accepted method of personnel selection. It has public approval as a tool for selection, and its objectivity has withstood legal challenges. Nevertheless, discrimination because of sex, age or race has recently received much attention.

In 1965, K. E. McIntyre found that a major weakness in school staff selection was a definite tendency to oversimplify the job and to substitute flashes of intuition for the difficult, analytical task of appraising abilities (2, pp. 45-46). H. F. Otto has reported that superintendents rely primarily on "the old eagle eyes" to select staff members (4, p. 29).

College supervisors of student teachers have reported to this investigator that only occasionally are they contacted
personally by personnel directors concerning their evaluation of an applicant for a teaching position. Furthermore, they are frequently amazed and puzzled when some of their weakest students are employed while the more outstanding students may not even be granted an interview.

A typical school district spends approximately ninety percent of its operational budget for salaries. A teacher is expected to remain with the district for several years. Even ten years' salary amounts to an investment of eighty to one hundred thousand dollars! Any district contemplating the purchase of equipment in this price range makes a thorough investigation of the product.

During a recent campaign, a successful candidate for the State Board of Education in Texas stated that he would support the board's policies and various agency regulations to improve teacher selection procedures. He emphasized that it was critical to attract and then to select the best teachers for our public schools.

Intermediate units such as the Regional Education Service Centers in Texas have in many instances demonstrated the ability to provide certain services to a group of local school districts effectively and economically. Currently, Regional Centers are extensively involved in data processing, in-service education, media libraries and consultant services. Personnel services are limited or non-existent. The potential for
expanding the scope of Regional Service Centers depends on finding additional areas where centralized administrative functions can be effectively implemented.

The annually increasing number of teacher applicants is creating an obvious need for school personnel administrators to professionalize their approach to teacher selection. The need to achieve reliability of judgment is a major concern in the selection process. Identifying the steps which lead to reliable selection will be helpful in improving procedures. According to McIntyre, "One does not, being of sound mind, satiate his appetite on beans at a smorgasbord" (3, p. 4).

The emphasis on accountability, along with public interest and awareness of the annual investment of public money for teacher salaries, requires that every effort be made to professionalize the teacher-selection process. As a part of this effort, this study seeks to analyze the impact of certain investigative procedures used by school administrators in the selection of teachers.

Purpose of Study

This study's purpose is to determine the type and extent of investigation necessary for school administrators to make reliable ratings of applicants for teaching positions.

A second purpose is to investigate the feasibility of a Regional Education Service Center's providing certain
personnel selection services to local districts within the region. If judgments made by an interview team from a regional center show a high correlation with those made by personnel directors, the possibility of expanding the scope of services offered by regional centers will be enhanced.

A third purpose is to develop proposals and recommendations for school administrators to consider as they search for more reliable and effective procedures for selecting teachers.

This study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. Will there be agreement among personnel directors in their ratings of teacher applicants based on an examination of a written application, as evidenced by a statistically significant coefficient of concordance value (.05) level?

2. Will there be greater agreement among personnel directors in their ratings of applicants based on an examination of a written application and a personal interview?

3. Will there be even greater agreement among personnel directors in their ratings of applicants based on examination of a written application, personal interview, examination of transcripts, college placement folders, letters of recommendation and rating forms?
4. Will there be even greater agreement among personnel directors in their rating of applicants based on an examination of a written application, a personal interview, examination of transcripts, college placement folders and personal telephone conversation with the applicant's supervisor of student teaching?

5. Will there be agreement, as evidenced by a statistically significant $r_s(.05$ level), between personnel directors and a teacher-selection team for a regional service center in their ratings of teacher applicants after an investigation which includes a written application, a personal interview, examination of transcripts, college placement folders, letters of recommendation, rating forms and personal telephone conversation with the applicant's supervisor of student teaching?

Procedure

Four experienced personnel administrators and one teacher-selection team from Region X Service Center independently conducted a complete examination and investigation of twenty-three teacher applicants. Each subject was an actual applicant for a teaching position in the school districts which the administrators represented.
The subject applicants were a group of senior student teachers assigned to a suburban school district during the spring semester of 1973 who indicated an active interest in employment near a large metropolitan area in the North Texas area.

Administrators representing four large school districts in the North Texas area and a teacher-selection team appointed by the Executive Director of a Regional Education Service Center conducted the investigation over a period of three weeks in May, 1973.

As a first step in the investigative procedure, each director and team independently rated the twenty-three subjects based on an examination of the applicant's completed standard application form. The rating procedure consisted of selecting the four best applicants and the four least desirable applicants and assigning them to groups one and five respectively. Of those remaining, the same procedure was repeated, with five assigned to groups two and four. Finally, the five remaining were placed in group three.

A second step involved an interview with each applicant by each administrator and team. Time and date of the interview and the data provided each administrator were controlled, and a common format for the interviews was used by the administrators. Applicants were interviewed independently
for twenty minutes by each administrator and the team within three consecutive days. A second rating was made in the same manner as the first rating.

Administrators and the team were provided additional identical data on each applicant following the interview period. This information consisted of the following written data: character references, college placement file, professional references, and college transcript. Applicants were again ranked in five groups. A fourth rating of the same type was made following personal telephone contact with the college supervisor of student teaching or the cooperating teacher. Inquiries concerning the applicant were conducted according to a predetermined format. For the fifth and final rating, personnel directors ranked the subjects from one to twenty-three, and the Regional Selection Team collectively ranked them on the same scale.

Limitations

This study was limited to an analysis of four investigation activities of personnel directors during the pre-employment process. It was also limited to ratings of student teachers from selected North Texas Universities in the Spring of 1973.
Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that the decisions of the judges and the actions of the applicants were the same in this controlled situation as they would have been in an uncontrolled pre-employment process. It was assumed that group dynamics in team interviews were typical of group dynamics that are generally operative.

Definition

The term "judges" refers to the interview team as well as to the four personnel directors involved in this study.

Analysis of Data

A statistical procedure, Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance (1, pp. 344-347), provided an estimate of the overall relationship between the multiple ratings. This technique is valuable in obtaining some sense of agreement among judges. It can be used to obtain a numerical estimate of the rank-order correlation.

A "W" value was obtained for each of the four ratings applied by the four personnel directors to the twenty-three applicants. The "W" value can only be positive and ranges in value from zero to one. In a case of maximum agreement, "W" = 1.0. For maximum disagreement, "W" = 0. A test was applied to the null hypothesis that the four personnel directors were independent in their ratings and that there
was no community of agreement among them. The obtained "W" was tested for significance at the .05 level using $X_r^2$. The rating procedure forced a number of tied ranks; therefore a formula for "W" which corrects for tied ranks was used (1, p. 364). The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient (5, pp. 82-84) was used to compute a relationship between the ratings of the regional team and the ratings of each personnel director, with the possible statistic obtained ranging in value from -1 to +1. The null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the rating of the selection team and the rating of the personnel directors was tested. The obtained statistic was tested for significance at the .05 level (6, p. 240).
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CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

This chapter presents a review of significant literature and research pertinent to teacher selection procedures. In this survey the material is grouped into three categories. First, the necessity for a professional approach to teacher selection is presented to help demonstrate the need for this study. Second, teacher-selection procedures are explored as a basis for the experiment reported in Chapter III. Finally, inter-rater and inter-observer reliability studies are reported to provide a basis for comparing the results reported in Chapter IV.

The Need for a Professional Approach to Teacher Selection

Research in the area of teacher-selection procedures is somewhat reminiscent of Mark Twain's observation that everybody talks about the weather while nobody does anything about it. In proposing research in teacher selection, Harry B. Gilbert prefaces his specific suggestions with the following basic assumptions:

1. **Interest in the area of teacher selection is minimal based upon the actual amount of research under way. However, a great deal of interest does exist among teacher personnel selectors and universities. The problem is to make patent what's latent.**
2. Professional teacher selection practices are rarely employed. In large systems they presume to be using selection techniques, screening is actually what is done. In smaller, affluent school districts, hunch rejections and global perusals, sometimes in actual observations, serve as selection techniques.

3. Since the field of teacher selection is a great big area up for grabs, it is desirable that research be encouraged in varieties of approaches, without too much specificity. It follows, of course, that wide dissemination of research be encouraged and that investigators be supported with the notion that hypotheses may be rejected as well as verified by experimental data. Regrettably this simple dictum, readily understood in university settings, seems to be a heretic notion in an age when innovations are publicized as successes before evaluation (8, p. 107).

Jay E. Greene argues for a more professional approach to teacher selection:

When school personnel administration was the part-time duty of a busy school administrator, the subjective unsystematic approach to staff selection was understandable. But as school personnel administration becomes a recognized profession—as it becomes the full time speciality of an administrator and his staff—in an ever-increasing number of communities, the selection of school staff will become more professionalized and systematic (10, p. 125).

K. E. McIntyre pleads for a more professional approach in the selection of teachers:

Although the several types of individual and group interviews can contribute much to the selection process, employers (including school administrators) tend to limit themselves to the individual interview and to assume too much for it. The research has consistently shown that ratings based on individual interviews bear little relationship with performances on the job, yet the typical employer is quite sure that the studies do not apply to him. Most of us do
not play the horses because we soon learn the inexorable laws of chance as they unfold at the finish line, but we continue to gamble on hunches in the employment of professional personnel simply because we do not take the trouble to check up on our self-imputed ability to pick winners (16, p. 17).

McIntyre suggests that school districts, which have relied on the individual interview, should try other approaches. He recommends a panel interview involving two or more interviewers and one applicant, predicting that a higher degree of reliability will be achieved through increasing the number of observers and interpreters (16, p. 17).

According to McIntyre, "The best time to solve a personnel problem is before the problem signs a contract" (16, p. 4).

James A. Van Zwoll, a respected authority in school personnel administration, states the problem this way:

Only through careful selection of personnel, particularly the teaching personnel, can the schools hope to retain—or regain—the confidence of the people. Careful selection can be productive of more effective school operation, reduction in or better use of supervision, and the possible release of funds—otherwise spent on ineffective services and the supervision they entail—for the improvement of instruction (23, p. 99).

Van Zwoll also argues that personnel selection in business or schools is an important and difficult task even when all known scientific selection devices and techniques are used. In public schools the problem is complicated by the lack of precise knowledge concerning just what constitutes a good teacher. The complexities of the task make a professional approach to teacher selection a vital goal (23, p. 96).
Written opinion in this field presents a strong case for making every effort to improve the reliability and validity of teacher selection practices. However, significant studies in this area are very limited and have had little impact on the actual field practices of public school officials. It is doubtful that any other single factor is as important in determining a school's effectiveness as is the quality of its teachers. Albert Huggett states, "Perhaps the biggest task faced by every superintendent is that of selection of good teachers" (12, p. 57). Harold Moore puts it another way: "All that follows in the educational program is dependent on what is fed into the staff" (17, p. 36).

Teacher Selection Procedures

According to Marvin Dunnette, methods such as interviewing, contacting references, studying application blanks and personal data sheets, and reviewing scholastic records are widely accepted and widely used; however, these procedures are rarely standardized and seldom offer valid conclusions. He explains further that the variety of information and knowledge obtained from applicant to applicant can result in "little more than vague impressions, subjective hunches, and intuitive feelings" (5, p. 65). Baily R. Gaydon, surveying Texas superintendents, concludes that they rely strongly on their personal judgment in selecting teachers (7, p. 40).
William B. Castetter acknowledges the fact that some administrative decisions must necessarily be made on a subjective basis. Regardless of their shortcomings, the best known instruments and techniques must be used. Recognizing the element of uncertainty in the use of these evaluation instruments, Castetter maintains that a structured method of selection is still preferable over selection on the basis of favoritism, religious or political affiliation, pressures from individuals or community power structures (3, p. 195).

Van Zwoll expresses a strong feeling that two basic needs underlie the problems in teacher selection. The needs lie in defining the characteristics of good teaching and developing a way of determining the degree to which the applicant measures up to these characteristics. Until these problems are resolved, Van Zwoll contends that school personnel will continue to be employed by the use of devices which are unreliable yet which at least offer some method of rating applicants (23, p. 107). Van Zwoll also reports that school systems have necessarily set up a number of bases on which to judge applicants in spite of the relative weakness in the reliability factor. Depending upon the applicant and the interviewer, these bases are sometimes used in their entirety in the selection process; however, more often they are only partially used as a supplementary device in the selection procedure. Van Zwoll emphasizes that the way in which a selection device is used is of more importance than the
device itself. He feels that for some time the judgment of
the professional men at the supervisory level will necessarily
have to be relied upon in the hiring of applicants (23, p. 107).
"Even with the highest refinement of selection procedures,
there is need to rely considerably upon the judgment of those
who have the responsibility for making the final recommenda-
tions" (23, p. 115).

J. R. Shannon and Marion Kittle have identified four
contributors to poor selection of teachers: recommendations by
teacher agencies, lack of careful investigation, pressure, and
pity. To state it bluntly, according to Shannon and Kittle,
"The fact simply is that no one knows how to select teachers
successfully" (21, p. 641).

Harold Stone and W. E. Kendall report that steps in
selection procedures vary among organizations and that differing
emphases may be placed on the steps employed:

One vital principle, however, is unvarying, and will
affect any process utilized. Significant improvement
in the selection process in an organization will depend
on the extent to which crucial factors for success can
be isolated and the reliability with which these factors
can be measured in applicants (22, p. 144).

A study by I. Van W. Raubenheimer and Joseph Tiffin points
out the need for thorough personnel selection procedures.
Their conclusions stress the idea that it is highly possible
to improve procedures for determining academic or job success
to a level "beyond the individuals for whom predictions are made" (19, p. 233). H. B. Gilbert and G. Lang call for investigation in teacher selection procedures. They state, "It becomes essential, therefore, to examine procedures in the selection of teachers, to make certain the techniques are reliable and valid, as well as understandable and acceptable to the community" (9, p. 1).

In recent years federal laws and federal agency guidelines have placed certain restrictions on employers with respect to their employment practices. According to Lawrence Lipsett, "Restrictions on testing may, indeed, have some constructive effect if they influence personnel workers to make full utilization of the techniques that have always been available--the application blank, the interview, and the personnel investigation" (14, p. 654). Harold Moore reports that too many employers of teachers have the opinion that they possess a "sixth sense" as related to interviewing prospective teachers (17, p. 43). This analysis agrees with most written opinion on the subject. David Ryans recommends the use of an interviewing committee to select personnel rather than the use of a single interviewer. He maintains that more reliable results can be obtained from a composite judgment than from an individual judgment. Assuming that the interviewers are equally competent, the reliability of the results can be expected to increase with the number of interviewers (20, p. 45). Ryans
also points out that certain traits or qualities may be judged more accurately than others. Conceit, vulgarity, mental balance and leadership are traits more likely to receive agreement among interviewers than unselfishness, integrity, cooperativeness, kindliness, and impulsiveness (20, p. 45). According to Ryans, the interview has been used to judge such a large number of traits in gathering information about an applicant that it has been placed in the category of a "catch-all." He feels that the traits judged are difficult to analyze and almost impossible to measure. He says, however, that, even with its notorious lack of reliability, the interview is still the most popular of all selection procedures (20, p. 45).

Dunnette suggests that the interview is an especially effective public relations device; however, he concludes that it is not really a reliable predictor of expected job behavior. He suggests further that a major fallacy in the personal interview is that individual interviewers operate differently and probably do not use the same method with each applicant (5, p. 65).

Reliability of Ratings

R. Morse and J. W. Hawthorne investigated the reliability of four board members' ratings of 394 applicants for the position of Fire Captain. The ratings, based on an oral examination, showed a reliability of .86. According to Morse and Hawthorne,
"These results have been verified on several occasions with reliabilities of from .85 to .95 being found, leading to that whatever it measures, the rating of personal qualifications measures something with a reliability comparable to written tests" (18, p. 15).

The reliability of oral examinations was the subject of a study by E. J. Barnes and S. L. Pressey. Six candidates for graduate degrees were examined by three different committees. The correlations of the ratings were computed between the first and second committee, second and third and first and third. An average correlation was determined to be .30 (2, pp. 719-732).

Robert Havighurst studied the reliability of rating scales used in analyzing interviews, hoping to determine whether one group of raters would give the same ratings on a particular interview as a different group of judges or raters. Twenty-one interviews were judged by six teams of judges. Using Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance, the inter-rater reliability was .70 for one type of interview and .71 for another type. Havighurst considers this a high correlation (11, pp. 1-10).

Theodore Abramson reports the results of a study to determine the reliability of observations of teachers' classroom behavior. The model provided for a team of observers
to visit a number of classroom teachers. Each teacher was observed only once by the team. An overall reliability coefficient of .37 was obtained (1, pp. 1-8).

The object of a study by Max Luft was to validate a technique for establishing inter-rater reliability by using videotapes of a typical classroom scene. Several observers, viewing the tape within a one-week period, responded to the Southwestern Cooperative Interaction Observation Schedule. Each observer's rating was compared to every other rating, yielding a mean correlation of .457 (15, p. 1).

Margaret Hubbard Jones, in a study of the reliability of a system for gathering data describing pupil-teacher classroom communication, reports the inter-observer agreement to be about seventy-five percent, with very little change over the course of the study (13, pp. 1-7). In Havighurst's study, a reliability coefficient of .70 using Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance (w) was considered high. A coefficient of .6 or below was considered low (11, p. 10).
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

This investigation involved the ratings of twenty-three teacher applicants by four personnel administrators and a selection team of three administrators representing a Regional Education Service Center. The purpose of this experiment was to determine the extent of agreement among the four judges at four different points in a typical selection procedure, and to determine whether a service center interview team would rate applicants in a manner similar to the personnel directors of independent school districts.

Selection of the Subjects

The subjects for this study were selected from the total group of eligible student teachers assigned to the Richardson Independent School District during the period of this investigation. Their eligibility as a subject was determined by whether they were actively interested in a teaching position in the school districts participating in the study. Although twenty-five student teachers met the criteria, only twenty-three were included, the remaining two having accepted teaching positions in other schools.
Selection of the Judges

Four full-time personnel administrators in adjacent school districts agreed to participate in this experiment. Each of the four possessed extensive experience in selecting teachers for employment. In addition, the executive director of a Regional Education Service Center assigned a team of three administrators to participate in the study. Each member of the team was an experienced school administrator employed by the regional center.

The Application

An application form was prepared which, when completed, would contain the composite data required on the application forms of all four school districts involved. Each of the subjects submitted a completed application form to the investigator. Copies of the form were made for each of the five judges and distributed to them on the first day of the experiment. Each judge examined the application forms and rated the applicants based on these forms. The first rating was completed and submitted on the third day of the experiment and prior to the interview phase.

For the first through the fourth ratings, each judge rated the applicants using a type of "Q" sort technique. The four highest ranking applicants were assigned to Group I, and the four lowest to Group V. Of those remaining, the five highest
were placed in Group II and the five lowest in Group IV. Finally, the five remaining were placed in Group III.

The Interview

On the third day of the experiment, eight subjects were interviewed by the five judges. All interviews were twenty minutes long, following a pre-determined format agreed upon by all judges. Prior to the interviews all subjects were reminded that their composite rating of all judges would be considered their "true" rating and the one on which job offers would be determined. Eight more interviews were conducted on the fourth day and the final seven on the fifth day. All interviews took place in the same location, each judge having a separate interview office. At the completion of the interview phase, each judge rated each applicant in the same manner as the first rating. Rating forms were submitted prior to the beginning of the next phase of the experiment.

The Reference Material

Rating forms were sent to each person whom the applicant had listed as a reference. Transcripts and college placement files were secured for each subject. Copies of this material were made available for each judge to examine. All of the reference material for each subject was distributed to the judges following the completion of the interview phase on the
fifth day of the experiment. Judges examined the material pertaining to the applicants during the sixth and seventh day. They then made a third rating based on their evaluation of the applicants at the end of the seventh day.

The Personal Telephone Inquiry

During the eighth through the eleventh day of the investigation, each judge made a personal telephone inquiry to the college supervisor of student teaching or the cooperating teacher who had supervised the subject. Judges made their usual inquiry concerning the applicant without any restrictions or special controls. Upon completion of this phase, each judge made a fourth rating in the same manner used for the previous ratings. Finally, a fifth rating was made which required each judge to rank the applicants from one to twenty-three. After the final rating forms were submitted, each judge and each applicant was informed that the control phase of the experiment was concluded and that job offers could now be extended.

Analysis of the Data

The data collected from the rating forms submitted by the personnel directors and the interview team was analyzed to answer the questions formulated for this study. The extent of agreement at each rating interval among the four
personnel directors was determined using Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance (W). The obtained W at each interval was then tested for significance at the .05 level of confidence using $X^2$. The difference between each pair of obtained W's was only observed as there was no appropriate statistical procedure available to apply a test of significant difference. A composite ranking for the four personnel directors was computed at each interval and compared to the ranks assigned by the service center selection team using the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient. The resulting correlation was tested for significance at the .05 level of confidence.
The purpose of this study was to determine the extent of agreement among a group of judges when independently conducting an investigation of applicants for teaching positions. An additional purpose was to determine the extent of agreement between personnel directors of independent school districts and a teacher-selection team from a Regional Education Service Center. To determine the extent of agreement among the personnel directors, Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance (W) corrected for tied ranks, was calculated for each of the first four ratings. The W value can only be positive and can range in value from zero to one. For maximum agreement, $W = 1.0$. For maximum disagreement, $W = 0$. Each obtained W was tested for significance at the .05 level using $X^2$.

Table I answers the first question formulated for this study: whether there will be agreement among personnel directors in their rating of teacher applicants based on an examination of a written application, as evidenced by a statistically significant coefficient of concordance value (.05) level. The ranks assigned to each of the twenty-three subjects by the personnel directors after examination of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Directors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School District A</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District B</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District C</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District D</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wc = .49 Significant at the .05 level
application forms is presented. \( W_c \) was calculated for this first rating:

\[
W_c = \sum_{m}^{n} \frac{(e x n')^2}{m} - \frac{(ex..)^2}{m n} \frac{m (n^3 - n)}{12} - ec
\]

The coefficient of concordance \( W_c \) was calculated to be .4932. It was tested and found to be significant at the .05 level using \( \chi^2 \).

\[
\chi^2 = m (n-1) W_c
\]

\( d.f. = n-1 \)

Table II shows the ranks assigned by the personnel directors after they had completed personal interviews with all twenty-three subjects. These data answer the second question of this study: whether there will be more agreement among personnel directors in their rating of teacher applicants based on an examination of a written application and a personal interview. The resulting coefficient of concordance was \( W_c = .4375 \). Using the \( \chi^2 \) test, the \( W_c \) was significant at the .05 level.

Table III shows the ranks assigned by the personnel directors after they had completed an examination of reference forms, transcripts, and college placement files for each of the twenty-three subjects. These data answer the third question of this study: whether there will be even greater agreement among personnel directors in their
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Directors</th>
<th>Teacher Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District A</td>
<td>7  12 17 17 21.5 17 17 7 17 12 2.5 17 21.5 7 12 21.5 2.5 17 2.5 7 12 21.5 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District B</td>
<td>17 21.5 7 21.5 17 12 2.5 12 2.5 7 17 17 7 21.5 21.5 12 12 7 2.5 2.5 17 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District C</td>
<td>21.5 21.5 7 12 17 7 17 2.5 2.5 12 7 21.5 17 2.5 12 17 21.5 12 2.5 12 7 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District D</td>
<td>12 12 21.5 21.5 17 21.5 2.5 2.5 7 17 17 2.5 17 21.5 17 7 2.5 7 2.5 12 12 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$W_c = .44$ Significant at the .05 level
### TABLE III

**THIRD RANKING OF TEACHER APPLICATIONS BY PERSONNEL DIRECTORS**

| Personnel Directors | Teacher Applicants | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 |
| School District A   |                   | 7 | 12| 12| 7 | 21.5| 12| 12| 7 | 17| 17| 2.5| 17| 17| 7 | 17| 21.5| 12| 21.5| 2.5| 2.5| 7 | 21.5| 2.5|
| School District B   |                   | 17| 21.5| 7 | 21.5| 21.5| 12| 25| 12 | 2.5| 7 | 12| 17| 7 | 7 | 17| 21.5| 12| 12 | 2.5| 7 | 2.5| 17| 12|
| School District C   |                   | 31.5| 17| 12| 7 | 21.5| 12| 17| 2.5| 2.5| 12| 7 | 17| 17| 7 | 17| 21.5| 21.5| 12| 2.5| 7 | 2.5| 7 | 12|
| School District D   |                   | 7 | 17| 12| 17 | 21.5| 12| 21.5| 2.5| 2.5| 7 | 17| 21.5| 7 | 37| 21.5| 17| 12| 7 | 2.5| 2.5| 7 | 12| 12|

\[ W_c = .57 \text{ Significant at the .05 level} \]
rating of teacher applicants based on an examination of a written application, a personal interview, examination of transcripts, college placement folders, letters of recommendation and rating forms. \( W_c \) was equal to .57406. Significance at the .05 level was determined using \( \chi^2 \).

Table IV displays the data required to answer question four: whether there will be even greater agreement among personnel directors in their rating of teacher applicants based on an examination of a written application, a personal interview, examination of transcripts, college placement folders and personal telephone conversation with the applicant's college supervisor of student teaching. Ranks were assigned by personnel directors after they had each made a personal telephone inquiry concerning each of the twenty-three subjects. The supervisors of student teaching were those questioned by the personnel directors. For this fourth rating, \( W_c = .5876 \), which was also significant at the .05 level.

On the final rating of the teacher applicants shown in Table V, the personnel directors assigned ranks which varied eight points or more for sixteen of the twenty-three subjects. None of the subjects was assigned the same rank by all four personnel directors. In two cases the variation was only one point.

Table VI illustrates the change in ratings assigned to the subjects by the Region Center Selection Team at five rating intervals.
TABLE IV
FOURTH RANKING OF TEACHER APPLICANTS BY PERSONNEL DIRECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Directors</th>
<th>Teacher Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District A</td>
<td>7 12 21.5 7 21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District B</td>
<td>17 21.5 7 21.5 21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District C</td>
<td>21.5 17 12 7 21.5 12 17 7 2.5 12 17 21.5 17 2.5 17 17 21.5 12 3.5 7 2.5 7 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District D</td>
<td>12 12 12 21.5 21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wc = .59 Significant at the .05 level
# Table V

Fifth Ranking of Teacher Applicants by Personnel Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Directors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School District A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District C</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District D</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VI
RANKING OF TEACHER APPLICANTS AT FIVE RATING INTERVALS BY
REGION SERVICE CENTER SELECTION TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Interval</th>
<th>Teacher Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables VII through X compare the personnel directors' composite rankings of the teacher applicants with the Regional Service Center's ranking at each of the five rating intervals of the investigation procedure. The comparison of the personnel directors' composite ranking with the team ranking was made using Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient (rs).

An rs of + .3574 was obtained for the first ranking, as indicated in Table VII. Five of the twenty-three applicants were assigned ranks which varied as much as eight points.

The correlation for the second ranking, demonstrated by Table VIII, was + .5259. The ranks assigned varied as much as eight points for six of the teacher applicants after this second rating.

Only four of the teacher applicants were assigned ranks which varied as much as eight points for the third rating. The correlation, as shown in Table IX, was + .6315.

An rs of + .6857 was obtained from the data in Table X. Three of the compared ranks varied eight points or more.

When the composite rank for each subject, as determined by the personnel directors' ratings, was compared to the rank assigned by the interview team, there was a variation of eight or more points for twelve of the twenty-three applicants at some point in the investigation procedure.
TABLE VII
COMPOSITE FIRST RANKING OF TEACHER APPLICANTS BY PERSONNEL DIRECTORS
AND FIRST RANKING OF REGION SERVICE CENTER SELECTION TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Teacher Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Directors</td>
<td>14.5 12 19.5 19.5 14.5 12 2.5 5 17 9 10 6 21 11 2.5 7.5 17 1 7.5 22 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Team</td>
<td>14.5 17 2.5 17 21.5 12 17 7 12 12 7 21.5 2.5 17 7 2.5 2.5 21.5 17 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rs = + .35 Not significant at .05 level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Teacher Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Directors</td>
<td>16.5 19 9.5 19 22.5 15 13 2.5 4 7 11 21 13 5.5 19 22.5 9.5 15 1 2.5 5.5 16.5 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Team</td>
<td>17 21.5 7 21.5 21.5 7 2.5 17 7 17 17 21.5 12 12 17 12 12 2.5 25 2.5 12 7 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rs = .53 Significant at .05 level
TABLE IX
COMPOSITE THIRD RANKING OF TEACHER APPLICANTS BY PERSONNEL DIRECTORS
AND THIRD RANKING OF REGION SERVICE CENTER SELECTION TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Teacher Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Directors</td>
<td>14 19 8 14 23 11.5 16 4 5 9 10 20.5 11.5 6 20.5 22 17.5 14 1 2.5 2.5 17.5 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Team</td>
<td>21.5 17 2.5 12 21.5 7 7 12 7 12 13 21.5 12 7 17 21.5 17 2.5 2.5 2.5 17 17 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rs = .65 Significant at .05 level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Teacher Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Directors</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Team</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rs = .69 Significant at .05 level
Table XI answers question five of this study: whether there will be agreement, as evidenced by a statistically significant rs (.05 level), between personnel directors and a teacher-selection team for a Regional Service Center in their rating of teacher applicants after an investigation which includes a written application, a personal interview, examination of transcripts, college placement folders, letters of recommendation, rating forms and personal telephone conversation with the applicant's college supervisor of student teaching. For this fifth ranking each personnel director and the interview team assigned a rank of one to twenty-three for each subject. A composite rank was determined for the four personnel directors and was compared to the final rank of the interview team. Using the Spearman Rank Correlation procedure, rs was calculated to be + .6435.

Tables XII through XV illustrate the four consecutive ranks assigned to each of the twenty-three subjects by each personnel director. These tables reveal changes in ratings by each personnel director after each step in the investigation procedure. One of the personnel directors (Table XIII) assigned the same rank at each interval to six of the teacher applicants. Another director (Table XV) assigned the same rank to only three of the teacher applicants at each rating interval. Table XIV shows that two of the subjects were consistently ranked by a personnel director. From the data in Table XII, it can be observed that none of the applicants was assigned an identical rank by the personnel director at each
### TABLE XI

**COMPOSITE FINAL RANKING OF TEACHER APPLICANTS BY PERSONNEL DIRECTORS AND FINAL RANKING OF REGION SERVICE CENTER SELECTION TEAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Teacher Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Directors</td>
<td>15.5 18 12 17 23 10 12 4 3 7 12 21 9 8 19 22 20 15.5 1 2 5 12 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Team</td>
<td>20 19 3 11 22 7 23 14 6 9 10 18 13 8 12 21 17 4 2 1 15 16 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rs = +.64 Significant at .05 level
TABLE XII
RATINGS ASSIGNED TO TEACHER APPLICANTS BY SCHOOL DISTRICT "A"
at four rating intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Interval</th>
<th>Teacher Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XIII
RATINGS ASSIGNED TO TEACHER APPLICANTS BY SCHOOL DISTRICT "B"
AT FOUR RATING INTERVALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Interval</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XIV
RATINGS ASSIGNED TO TEACHER APPLICANTS BY SCHOOL DISTRICT "C"
AT FOUR RATING INTERVALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Interval</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE XV**

RATINGS ASSIGNED TO TEACHER APPLICANTS BY SCHOOL DISTRICT "D"
AT FOUR RATING INTERVALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Interval</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fourth</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Summary

The problem of this study was to analyze the inter-rater reliability of the ratings assigned to prospective teachers by a group of school administrators. The analysis was limited to ratings of beginning teachers who had recently completed student teaching in a public school. The purposes of the study were (1) to determine the type and extent of investigation necessary to make reliable ratings of applicants for teaching positions, (2) to investigate the feasibility of a Regional Education Service Center's providing certain personnel selection services to local school districts, and (3) to develop proposals and recommendations for school administrators concerning reliability of teacher-selection procedures.

The following questions were formulated for this study:

1. Will there be agreement among personnel directors in their rating of teacher applicants based on an examination of a written application, as evidenced by a statistically significant coefficient of concordance value, (.05) level?
2. Will there be more agreement among personnel directors in their rating of teacher applicants based on an examination of a written application and a personal interview?

3. Will there be even greater agreement among personnel directors in their rating of teacher applicants based on an examination of a written application, a personal interview, examination of transcripts, college placement folders, letters of recommendation and rating forms?

4. Will there be even greater agreement among personnel directors in their rating of teacher applicants based on an examination of a written application, a personal interview, examination of transcripts, college placement folders, letters of recommendation, rating forms and a personal telephone conversation with the applicant's college supervisor of student teaching?

5. Will there be agreement, as evidenced by a statistically significant $r_s (.05$ level), between personnel directors and a teacher-selection team from a regional service center in their rating of teacher applicants after an investigation which includes a written application, a personal interview, examination of transcripts, college
placement folders, letters of recommendation, rating forms and personal telephone conversations with the applicant's college supervisor of student teaching?

The related literature was subdivided into three sections: the need for a professional approach to teacher selection, teacher selection procedures, and reliability of ratings.

To answer the questions formulated for this study, four personnel directors and an interview team conducted a complete examination and investigation of each of twenty-three teacher applicants. Applicants were rated by ranking at four different intervals of the investigation in May, 1973. Each subject was an applicant for a teaching position in all the schools participating in the study. Rankings of the subjects were made after (1) examination of the application, (2) the personal interview, (3) examination of reference forms, transcripts and college placement files, and (4) personal telephone contact with the applicant's supervisor of student teaching.

In the analysis of data, Chapter IV presents tables to report the rank assigned to each subject by each judge. The following statistical procedures were used to answer the questions posed in this study: (1) Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance, and (2) Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient,
Findings

1. There was agreement among personnel directors, as evidenced by a significant $W_c (0.49)$ at the .05 level of confidence, when they independently ranked applicants after examination of an application form.

2. There was less agreement among personnel directors when they ranked applicants a second time ($W_c = 0.44$) after completing a personal interview.

3. There was greater agreement ($W_c = 0.57$) among judges when they ranked applicants a third time after examination of reference forms, college placement files and transcripts.

4. There was a higher degree of agreement among judges ($W_c = 0.59$) when they ranked applicants a fourth time after a personal telephone conversation with the supervisors of student teaching.

5. There was a positive correlation ($r_s = 0.3574$) between the first rating of the personnel directors and the selection team.

6. There was a positive correlation ($r_s = 0.5259$) between the second rating of the personnel directors and the selection team.
7. There was a positive correlation ($r_s = .6315$) between the third rating of the personnel directors and the selection team.

8. There was a positive correlation ($r_s = .6857$) between the fourth rating of the personnel directors and the selection team.

9. There was a positive correlation ($r_s = .64$) between the final rating of the personnel directors and the final rating of the selection team from the Regional Education Service Center.

Conclusions

In regard to reliability of judgment in the selection of teachers, the following conclusions are drawn from the literature:

a. The reliability of the interview as a selection tool is low.

b. Predictions are that reliability of teacher selection can be increased through the use of improved techniques.

c. There is general agreement that the reliability of teacher selection procedures can and should be improved; however, very little has been done to achieve this goal.
d. The subjective personal judgment of professional school administrators has been, and will continue to be for some time, the primary basis for teacher selection.

e. Two advancements are essential for significant improvement in teacher selection procedures: the ability to identify the characteristics of good teachers and a reliable means of measuring these characteristics.

f. Far too many employers of teachers have an erroneous opinion that they possess a "sixth sense" as related to their own inherent ability to select teachers.

g. Reliability studies relating to teacher selection have been generally limited to the interview.

In regard to the inter-rater reliability of ratings assigned by personnel directors to applicants for teaching positions, the following conclusions are drawn from the data obtained:

a. Personnel directors tend to agree in their ratings of applicants at each point in the employment process; however, the extent of agreement is low.
b. The typical employment interview does not contribute to the reliability factor in the selection of beginning teachers.

c. Personnel directors' ratings of applicants are influenced by application forms, interviews, reference forms, college placement files, transcripts and the information they receive verbally from supervisors familiar with the applicant's student teaching experience.

In regard to the feasibility of a Regional Education Service Center performing certain personnel selection services for a local school district, the following conclusions are drawn from the data obtained:

a. A selection team representing a Regional Education Service Center will rate applicants in a manner positively correlated with the ratings of personnel directors.

b. Ratings of a selection team will have a low correlation with personnel directors ratings after examination of application forms only, but the correlation will be successively higher after each additional phase of the investigation procedure is completed.

c. School personnel with administrative experience will rate applicants in a similar manner regardless of their current position and job assignment.
d. The extent of investigation, rather than the investigator, is the important factor in achieving reliability of administrative agreement in teacher selection.

Implications

In regard to reliability of judgment in the selection of teachers, certain implications are as follows:

a. School officials with the responsibility for selecting teachers for employment should conduct a thorough examination of every qualified applicant, to include (1) an examination of the application form, (2) a personal interview, (3) examination and evaluation of rating forms, transcripts, and placement files, and (4) personal telephone inquiries with professionals who know the applicant.

b. Employing officials should be aware of the limitations of the interview as a tool for making reliable decisions concerning applicants for teaching positions.

c. Personnel directors should use every appropriate and available resource to gather information concerning an applicant. The reliability of judgment will be improved as the employing official collects and evaluates additional information.
d. Personnel directors should involve others in the teacher-selection process. Special consideration should be given to establishing interview teams to reduce the impact of personal bias and to improve reliability in selection.

e. Telephone inquiries of those familiar with the applicant's abilities will contribute to more reliable selection of teachers.

f. Personnel directors should work toward establishing effective communication between the personnel office and teacher educators in order to secure the most accurate information available.

g. School districts should provide sufficient staff and funds for the personnel office to assure that each applicant can be investigated thoroughly before employment decisions are made.

h. Personnel directors should systematically attempt to validate their selection procedures by comparing their pre-employment evaluation of applicants with the teaching performance of those selected for employment.

i. Personnel directors should devote a large portion of their time on college campuses to conferences with teacher educators rather than exclusively to
interviews with applicants, thus acquiring additional first-hand information on applicants and prospective applicants.

j. Teacher educators should make every effort to follow the teaching careers of students in an effort to improve their ability to predict teaching success.

In regard to the feasibility of a Regional Education Service Center providing certain personnel selection services to local school districts, certain implications are as follows:

a. A region selection team could be especially helpful to local districts in identifying the top 10% of the applicants for teaching positions.

b. Local districts will accept as being valid for their own use application forms, personal data, transcripts, college placement files and completed reference forms which have been collected and processed by a service center.

c. Experienced school administrators not employed full time by the school district can be very helpful to local districts in staff selection. The effectiveness of outside administrators is enhanced by their immunity from possible political pressures and their resulting objectivity in certain decisions.
Recommendations for Future Research

Based upon this study of reliability in the selection of teachers, the following recommendations for future research are made:

a. It is recommended that this study be replicated using experienced teachers as subjects.

b. It is recommended that this study be replicated using three-member selection teams from each school district.

c. Studies should be conducted to determine the reliability of other selection procedures.

d. The subjects of this study should be followed for the next several years, and those who teach should be the subjects of a study to determine whether their performance or success in teaching is related to their rating as applicants by personnel directors.

e. A study should be conducted to determine more cooperatively effective and efficient methods of collecting and analyzing data on persons applying at a number of school districts.

f. The reliability of judgment as it relates to a number of applicants for a particular position should be examined through a study involving a personnel director, supervisor, principal, and department or grade-level chairman.
You have been selected as one of twenty-five student teachers to participate in the research study described to you during your initial orientation session at the Central Administration Building.

Enclosed is an application form which you are to complete and return in the enclosed envelope by April 20. This one application will be the only one necessary for Richardson, Garland, Carrollton-Farmers Branch and Plano. Upon receipt of your application, we will send for your college placement file and contact the references which you have listed.

Interviews will be scheduled for you with the personnel directors of the four participating districts and the interview team from Region X Education Service Center. All your interviews will be scheduled at the Richardson Administration Building on the same day. Your cooperating teacher and your principal will approve your absence for the interviews.

For research validity, it is important that you do not contact any administrators from Richardson, Garland, Plano or Carrollton-Farmers Branch until the date of the interviews. You are, of course, free to make any contacts or applications with any other school district except the four participating districts.

If you have any questions concerning the application, or any other aspect of the research project, please contact me or my secretary, Mrs. Vera Kerr, at 238-8111. We appreciate your willingness to participate in this study and look forward to receiving your application in a few days.

Sincerely,

JOHN ROBERTS
Assistant Superintendent
APPLICATION FOR A POSITION

Do not write in this box

Date of Photo ____________

Social Security Number Card

Date of Application Date Available

Date of Birth U. S. Citizenship

Sex Marital Status Educational Level

NAME, First M.L. Last Suffix Maiden Name

CARD ADDRESS, Street

City State Zip Code Business Phone Home Phone

Height Weight Spouse's First Name Spouse's Occupation No. Children Birthdate of Youngest

Do not write below this line
### Teaching Certificate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Other State</th>
<th>1 Yr. Permit</th>
<th>Provisional</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Old Type</th>
<th>Special Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area of Specialization (Limit 7)

- 01 Teacher of Deaf
- 02 Teacher of Blind
- 03 Drivers Ed.
- 06 All level – Art
- 07 All level – PE
- 08 All level – Music
- 09 All level – Sp/Drama
- 10 Elementary
- 11 High School
- 12 Junior High School
- 14 Kindergarten
- 25 Administrator
- 28 Principal

### Teaching Field (Secondary Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Years Taught</th>
<th>Semester Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.27</td>
<td>28.29</td>
<td>30.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teaching Field (Secondary Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Years Taught</th>
<th>Semester Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.33</td>
<td>34.35</td>
<td>36.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extra Curricular Activities

- □ 1 Yearbook
- □ 2 Newspaper
- □ 3 Drill Team / Pep Squad
- □ 4 Clubs
- □ 5 Speech/Drama

Extra Curricular Activities
- □ 6 Other

What extra-curricular activities can you direct?

Specify Activities, Awards, Honors, Organizations, etc.

High School

College

High School Attended

Location

Year Graduated

College or University Attended & Location

Dates of Attendance

Major Field of Study

Minor Field of Study

Type Degree

Year Earned

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

Card

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

Card
# Teaching Experience (List in chronological order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>No. of Years</th>
<th>Name &amp; Address of School</th>
<th>Superintendent</th>
<th>Grade or Subject Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mo.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>Mo.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Teaching

# Non-Teaching Experience (List in chronological order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>Name of Employer</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Kind of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mo.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>Mo.</td>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Character References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name of Reference</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>City and State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

# Professional References

List names of four references capable of giving information about your teaching and preparation for teaching. List at least one administrator on each of your teaching positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name of Reference</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>School Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Miscellaneous Information

Have you established a placement file? Where?

What serious illnesses have you had?

Report any present physical defects.

Days absent from duty due to illness last three years __________. Do you believe in the existence of a Supreme Being?

Have you ever failed to be re-elected or been discharged from a teaching position?

If "Yes" where and when?

Signed ___________________________  Applicant ___________________________  Date ___________________________
Your application for a teaching position has been received and is being processed.

Five appointments have been scheduled for you with personnel directors of Richardson, Garland, Plano, Carrollton-Farmers Branch and Region X personnel team.

All interviews will be conducted at 400 S. Greenville Avenue, the Richardson School Administration Building on date and time indicated below:

Be sure to report to the Personnel Office fifteen minutes prior to your appointment. If for any reason you are unable to keep your appointment, please call John Roberts or Vera Kerr, 238-8111, by Friday, May 4.

If you have not arranged for a transcript to be sent to my office, please do so as soon as possible as a transcript will be necessary before job offers can be extended.

We look forward to seeing you next week.

Sincerely,

JOHN ROBERTS
Assistant Superintendent
INTERVIEW RECORD

Date ____________________________ Applicant ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GENERAL COMMENTS

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Instructions to Personnel Directors and Region X Team

It is important that the following rules be observed until each personnel director and the team has completed their fourth and final rating of all twenty-five applicants:

1. The applicants will not be mentioned in any way nor will any comments be made concerning the applications, interviews, written data or any other aspect of the investigation procedure.

2. Judges will not communicate in any way with the applicants except during the interview.

3. Judges will not indicate in any way to the applicant his/her chances for receiving a job offer.

4. Judges will not discuss the applicants with any other person.

5. Judges will carefully observe the time limitations on interviews.

6. Judges will follow the format for the interviews and will use only the rating cards provided along with any informal notes the judges may take during the interview.

7. Judges will rate applicants on the basis that they are selecting teachers for non-specific positions and assignments will be made at a later date.
INTERVIEW GUIDE

Judges will conduct the interview in accordance with the following:

1. Interviews will be twenty minutes in length.

2. Judges will conduct the interview utilizing open-end questions such as:
   
   a. Will you tell me about your student teaching experience?
   
   b. Will you describe the type of teacher you think you will be?
   
   c. Will you identify the tasks of teaching in which you feel confident and those, if any, in which you do not feel confident?
   
   d. Will you tell me about your educational background?
   
   e. If you were to begin regular full-time teaching tomorrow, what changes would you make in your teaching techniques, if any, from the techniques you are using in student teaching?
   
   f. How would you organize a self contained classroom for the teaching of reading, math, or social studies?
   
   g. In what extracurricular activities have you participated?

3. Judges will instruct their secretary that there are to be no interruptions during the interviews.
INSTRUCTIONS FOR TELEPHONE INQUIRY CONCERNING APPLICANTS:

We will not follow any specific format for these inquiries. You are requested to ask the type questions you normally ask concerning applicants.

The names and telephone numbers of those you are to contact have been provided. In several cases the college supervisor is making special arrangements to be in his office, or at home, during the time indicated to receive your call.

I will pick up your fourth and fifth rating on Monday afternoon, May 21. Please note the fifth rating requires a continuous rating from one to twenty-three.
June 4, 1973

Mr. John F. Roberts, Ass’t. Superintendent
Richardson Independent School District
400 S. Greenville Avenue
Richardson, Texas 75080

Dear Mr. Roberts:

This letter will confirm that I have completed all the prescribed tasks in my evaluation of the subjects in the research study.

The procedures we used were, in my opinion, most appropriate and thorough. I was not handicapped in any way in my investigation of these applicants.

We all certainly look forward to sharing the findings of your study at the appropriate time.

Sincerely,

Kenneth N. Bush

KNB:ps

Assistant Superintendent of Personnel
and Information Services
May 21, 1973

Mr. John F. Roberts  
400 S. Greenville Ave.  
Richardson, Texas  75080

Dear Mr. Roberts:

Enclosed is the fourth and fifth rating of the twenty-three applicants. This completes my participation in the research study.

All those who were involved are anxious to see the results of your study.

The procedure we used was typical of the investigation I usually make when selecting teachers for employment.

Sincerely,

Cooper Carter  
Personnel Director
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May 24, 1973

Mr. John Roberts
400 S. Greenville
Richardson, Texas 75080

Dear Mr. Roberts:

I have completed and returned the final rating of the applicants.

The investigative procedures we used were those which I always try to utilize in the employment process. Our guidelines did not hinder me in any way in making judgments.

I hope to have the opportunity to share the results of your research.

Sincerely,

Jack Cockrill
Personnel Director

JC: fmc
May 22, 1973

Mr. John F. Roberts
400 S. Greenville
Richardson, Texas 75080

Dear Mr. Roberts:

As per your request and instructions, we of the Region 10 Team have completed our investigations of the designated applicants. It is our opinion that the procedures and methods that were used in the review and selection of these applicants were most adequate in our evaluations of their capabilities and attributes.

We have enjoyed our work in this activity and look forward to the findings of the study. We feel that it will be significant in the future employment of personnel. Thank you for inviting Region 10 to be a part of this study.

Sincerely yours,

REGION 10 TEAM
Joe Austin
Ray Hardison
Crandall J. Young

kb
May 24, 1973

Mr. John F. Roberts
400 South Greenville Avenue
Richardson, Texas 75080

Dear Mr. Roberts:

This letter will certify that I have completed the entire investigation procedure required in your research study. I will be anxious to see the results of the final report.

The procedures we used did not limit me in any way in making judgments concerning the applicants.

Sincerely,

W. E. Peters
Assistant Superintendent

WE/sh
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