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ABSTRACT

The current study investigated teacher selection in elementary schools which differ by school type, community type, and socioeconomic status (SES). The qualities sought, procedures utilized, and problems encountered by principals during teacher selection were examined. Statistical analyses were used to determine whether school types differ significantly on variables regarding teacher selection.

The present study involved collecting both qualitative and quantitative data, and was conducted in four phases. In Phase I, all elementary schools in the state were classified by community type, student body SES, and "effective" and "typical" status.

Phase II consisted of 12 site visits to "effective" schools which differed by community and SES contexts. Principals and teacher interviews were conducted, and the "effectiveness" of the schools was verified via classroom observations.

Phase III utilized interview data to develop and pilot a questionnaire that was distributed across the various "effective" school contexts. Finally, in Phase IV, the questionnaire was distributed to principals of "effective" and "typical" schools, and the data were analyzed to address research questions regarding teacher selection.

The quantitative data analyses revealed that there are differences between the qualities that principals of effective and typical schools seek. Also, there are differences regarding problems encountered between principals of low- and middle-SES schools.
The qualitative data revealed findings regarding qualities with respect to classroom management, creativity, flexibility, concern for children, and enthusiasm. A teachers' teaching background, ability to get along with others, and believing that children can learn as well as whether a teacher is a parent and a teacher's morals and values are discussed.

With regard to procedures utilized, the qualitative data revealed findings with respect to checking references, observing a teacher, recruiting student teachers, and using a relaxed talk and hypothetical questions. Also, contacting references, especially past principals, investigating personnel files, and using a selection committee are highlighted.

Regarding problems encountered, one mainly associated with middle-SES schools and five associated with low-SES schools were highlighted. Also, several problems associated with central office involvement are discussed.
CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEM

"Schools should be built better and kept up better than banks because there's more wealth in them. But no matter how important the facilities - and they are extremely important - what matters most is the quality of the teachers. It is a source of continuing amazement to me that almost all of the discourse regarding restructuring and reforming schools over the last decade has emphasized every conceivable form of change and virtually ignored the obvious: getting better teachers", (Haberman, 1993, p.1).

The current study investigates how principals of effective elementary schools select teachers. The teacher qualities sought, procedures utilized, and problems encountered are specifically examined. The basis for the present study lies in the effective schools research. School reform studies also contribute to the significance of this research project. In the following pages, a brief history of effective schools research and the characteristics related to the current study, including instructional leadership, academic culture, and high expectations for student achievement will be discussed. The integral association between the aforementioned effective school characteristics and teacher selection will also be highlighted.

School effectiveness research has undergone an evolutionary process during the past three decades. During the first period of the 1960s, educational researchers and policy-makers held a pessimistic view concerning the possible influence of school based
factors over and above the well-known influence of school input factors like the pupil's socioeconomic status (SES) and ability. The studies by Coleman et al. (1966) and Jencks et al. (1972) were taken as sufficient evidence for the proposition that 'schools do not make a difference'. The second period gave rise to a more optimistic view regarding the possible influence of school based factors on pupil functioning (Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, & Wisenbaker, 1979; Edmonds, 1979; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, & Ouston, 1979; Weber, 1971). These studies showed that school influence could not be denied, and they all reached similar conclusions regarding the characteristics that could explain differences between schools in educational outcomes.

These studies were a breakthrough with respect to rejecting the idea that schools and classrooms do not matter. In fact, within the school effectiveness movement, the goals and objectives of education were reformulated to focus upon the way in which the school contributes to academic, social, and emotional growth of pupils. In a reform effort, educational research has been looking for characteristics, variables, and factors that contribute to school effectiveness, and can be introduced into educational practice or used by educational policy makers to improve schools.

Effective schools research has concentrated on identifying schools which are unusually effective in producing student achievement in the basic skill areas of reading and mathematics. As these effective schools have been studied to determine what factors
contribute to their success, the instructional leadership of the principal emerges over and over again as a crucial factor in promoting instructional effectiveness and improvement (Manasse, 1985; Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Edmonds & Frederiksen, 1979; Madden, Lawson, & Sweet, 1976; Weber, 1971; Wellisch, MacQueen, Carriere, & Duck, 1978).

The principal's instructional leadership is logically and intimately tied to two other frequently cited characteristics of effective schools - academic culture and high expectations for student achievement (Davis & Thomas, 1989). Principals create an academic culture via administrative decisions (Davis & Thomas, 1989; Duignan, 1986). They use their discretion to upgrade instructional programs and to upgrade staff quality (Manasse, 1985). Important to the current study, Levine and Lezotte (1990) noted eight characteristics of outstanding leadership, and four had to do with teacher selection.

The fact that faculty are central to the academic mission of a school means that failure to select good faculty can harm the institution for decades (Coady, 1990). Compounding this problem, fewer students have been preparing to become teachers, and those who are may not be the best candidates for the job. A national study of teaching (Morris, 1983) revealed that less than 5% of full-time college freshmen chose teaching as a probable career, as compared to 19% in the 1970's. The reasons associated with the inability to recruit and retain high ability students into the teaching profession were low salaries, low career prestige, over abundance of certified teachers, limited career options, and
unattractive working conditions (Engelking, 1987). Given the pool of candidates, competition for the very best teachers is keen (Coady, 1990). Consequently, the teacher selection process is one of the most important tasks facing the educational administrator (Boulton, 1969; Frase, 1992; Rosenholtz, 1987; Anderson, 1992).

Done properly, the selection process takes enormous amounts of time and can cost thousands of dollars. Hundreds of hours can be spent by human resource departments and administrative members trying to determine criteria for selection, and spending countless additional hours reviewing resumes and interviewing candidates (Caldwell, 1993). Done poorly, a bad selection decision always takes its toll on the students (e.g., Keep, 1993).

How do principals of effective elementary schools select teachers who can make a contribution to the achievement of their students? What teacher qualities are sought, and what selection procedures are actually used by effective elementary principals during the teacher selection process? What problems do principals of effective elementary schools encounter during the teacher selection process? Do teacher selection practices differ by school type (effective/typical), by socioeconomic status (low/middle), or by community type (metropolitan/rural)? The present study explores answers to these questions by examining the process and strategies used by principals of effective elementary schools during teacher selection.
Background of the Problem

Teacher Selection as a Function of Instructional Leadership and School Culture

Instructional leadership and the school culture are the foundation for teacher selection in a school. The school culture is molded by and reflects the leaders' vision and goals (Owens, 1991; Ubben & Hughes, 1992). Teachers selected by the leader can positively or negatively affect the culture and academic mission of the school.

The early research on effective schools found strong instructional leaders who actively engaged in shaping the academic program (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Brookover & Schneider, 1975; Edmonds, 1979; Weber, 1971). Effective schools have been described as having assertive principals who assume responsibility for the achievement of basic skills objectives (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979); provide strong administrative and instructional leadership and a climate conducive to learning (Edmonds, 1979); and emphasize academics and interact frequently with teachers regarding their performance (Wellisch et al., 1978). Early research additionally found that these principals also focus on shaping the culture of the school as well as the professional and instructional structures of the organization (Burns, 1978; Duignan, 1986).

Later research on instructional leadership helped to refine, specify, and focus some of the actions that principals engage in to foster school effectiveness (Murphy & Hallinger,
1985; Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982; Peterson, 1982; Peterson, 1985). More recent research (Ubben & Hughes, 1992; Owens, 1991; Banner & Gagne, 1995) supports and extends the earlier findings that principal instructional leadership behavior includes cultural leadership. The cultural life of a school is shaped in part by the instructional leader and reflects a set of values, beliefs, and traditions that provide the foundation for school effectiveness (Ubben & Hughes, 1992; Owens, 1991; Banner & Gagne, 1995; Hoy & Miskel, 1991).

According to the cultural theory of principal influence on school performance, the core dimensions of a principal's work contribute to the underlying cultural processes (Mitchell, 1990). If the cultural behavior of leaders is consistent with spoken values and if the culture enhances the strategic direction of the organization, that culture is likely to be "effective" (Banner & Gagne, 1995).

Principals can take many concrete steps to aid the development of an academic orientation and high achievement expectations, virtually all of which reflect their instructional leadership role (Davis & Thomas, 1989). For example, the principal can place a priority on trying to shape instructional practice by identifying cultural linkages, which are those mechanisms that serve to coordinate the activity of people who work in the school, and using them to influence instruction. Cultural linkages affect the way teachers think about their work, and can be manipulated and changed by a principal's
symbolic activity (Firestone & Wilson, 1985). Research about effective schools and
effective principals has found that another way principals can create an academic culture
is to acquire personnel resources by selecting teachers needed for effective instruction,
and using the teachers in accordance with academic priorities (Davis & Thomas, 1989).

Effective school cultures are maintained by constant reinforcement of core values and
beliefs, as well as through the selection of people who fit in with the culture (Banner &
Gagne, 1995). Research shows that teacher selection is one of the primary personnel
tasks of effective schools (Cuban, 1984; Wynne, 1981; Frase, 1992; Haberman, 1993;
Anderson, 1992; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993), and effective principals select teachers
who reinforce their goals and values, and will work best within that school's culture
(Cuban, 1984). For example, Crone and Teddlie (1995) found that principals of effective
schools look for creativity, flexibility, and concern for children.

Rosenholtz (1987) extends this notion, adding that organizational factors influence
teacher behavior by influencing the degree of teacher commitment and the degree to
which norms and values are shared among teachers and administrators. One of the
implications for the behavior of principals is the selection of teachers. Applying school
goals to the selection of teachers appears to serve as an important control for ensuring
the school's quality. Significantly, the ability to select like-minded teachers sustains the
homogeneity of values which is central to a school's effectiveness.
Educational Reform, Principal Leadership, and Teacher Selection

The current study focused on individual schools and the decentralization of the principal's role in selecting teachers. These themes resulted from research studies, and have become an integral part of educational reform efforts. Following is a highlight of the relationship between reform, principal leadership, and teacher selection.

A wave of educational reform efforts followed the 1983 National Commission on Excellence in Education report, *A Nation At Risk*. Many reports and proposals called for dramatic improvements in education in the United States (Wimpelberg & Ginsberg, 1985). Along with the pressure to make schools better was the emphasis on the research findings that the school is the most logical focus for organizational change. School effectiveness studies indicate repeatedly that it is the individual school where change happens (e.g., Brookover, Beamer, Efthim, Hathaway, Lezotte, Miller, Passalacqua, & Tornatzky, 1982).

Another recurring theme of school reform is decentralization, the redistribution of power and authority to give individual schools more autonomy. Decentralization, in the form of site-based management, shifts the major role of selecting teachers from the district office to the principal's hands (Place & Kowalski, 1993; Kowalski, McDaniel, Place, & Reitzug, 1992). Decentralization leads to the principal's ability and authority, along with teacher leaders and school advisory councils, to select teachers who most
directly meet the needs of the school. If this shift of responsibility from the district level to the school level is unsuccessful, the process of teacher selection will not be improved, and the transfer of responsibility from district level to school level will further burden principals while raising legal and political risks for districts (Place & Kowalski, 1993). Consequently, it is imperative that procedures which build an effective school, such as teacher selection, be brought to light, which was the focus of the current study.

Certainly most would agree that it is the principal's responsibility to ensure that only competent teachers are in contact with students. The selection stage is the principal's first chance to staff the school with top-notch teachers (Frase, 1992). No decision is more important in determining the quality of schools (Anderson, 1992; Keep, 1993; Bridges, 1986; Boulton, 1969; Haberman, 1993). Each time a new teacher is selected, there is a "window of opportunity" to influence and improve the quality of programs provided to students (Anderson, 1992; Frase, 1992; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993).

If principals fail in their selection efforts, many negative consequences result. For example, if principals do not select good teachers, they become trapped in a cycle of high turnover and low school productivity (Rosenholtz, 1987; Corbett, Dawson, & Firestone, 1984; Levine & Lezotte, 1990). If selection decisions are not reliable, the school will incur losses because of unaccomplished goals (Hickey, 1970).
The potential cost of selecting an applicant who will not be successful is enormous. These costs are often incalculable and include expenses connected with a plan of improvement due to inadequate performance, expenses involved in the termination process, and the expenses involved with selecting new employees (Neely, 1993). Bridges (1986) and Castetter (1986) additionally warn that the history of selecting inadequate teachers will repeat itself unless careful attention is paid to the design and operation of the teacher selection procedures that schools devise and implement.

Research has shown that principals in effective schools exercise deliberation when choosing personnel (Wynne, 1981; Levine & Lezotte, 1990). They are personally involved in selecting staff for programs (Vallina, 1978; Phi Delta Kappa Study, 1980; Manasse, 1985; Levine & Lezotte, 1990; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993). Bridges (1992) states that during the selection process, principals need to realize that they are attempting to predict how an applicant will behave in a particular context. Deciding the necessary qualities of good teachers is an essential part of decision making for principals in teacher selection. Knowledge about the procedures available to measure reliably those necessary qualities is also essential. Determining the appropriate qualities and procedures is further complicated by problems such as limited time to screen candidates properly or low salaries which may not allow the principal to make a recommendation that the "best" teacher be selected. Thus, teacher selection is complex and often frustrating.
Given the fact that teacher selection is of utmost importance to a school's success, one would think that the steps to identifying an effective teacher were generally agreed upon and utilized by principals. There is insufficient research to show that this is the case. There are many suggested techniques in the literature on this subject. However, there is no evidence that principals follow a universal guide to ensure the appropriateness of the techniques they use during the teacher selection process.

Teacher Selection Research

The research questions explored in the present study address: (a) teacher qualities sought, (b) procedures utilized, and (c) problems encountered by principals during teacher selection. Also, differences in selection practices by (d) school type, (e) SES, and (f) community type will be explored. Research related to these issues is discussed next.

Examining the use of personal qualities for the selection of teachers has been the subject of many studies (Mortaloni, 1974; Yantis & Carey, 1972; DeWitt, 1973; Renner, 1985; Rhodes & Peckham, 1960; Buffie, 1979; Alberti, 1974; Fuhr, 1977; Galbo, Diekman, & Galbo, 1985; Bryant, Lawlis, Nicholson, & Maher, 1978; Braun, Willems, Brown, & Green, 1987; Jarchow, 1981; Thompson, 1979; Lesher & Wade, 1972; Johnson, 1976), and is repeatedly recommended. However, the findings from these studies are inconsistent. Burbage (1990) and Baldwin (1993) attempted to comprehensively study what past research had pointed out as personal qualities.
principals assess such as honesty, dependability, and compassion, during teacher selection. Both studies investigated what qualities were perceived by principals as important, how these qualities of prospective teachers were assessed, the relative importance these personal qualities actually played, and the point at which personal qualities determined the ensuing recommendation or rejection of an applicant.

Using secondary principals' perceptions, Burbage (1990) found that twenty-three personal qualities were perceived as important to very important, and that personal qualities of a prospective teacher were perceived as the most important criterion in the selection process. The interview method was used to assess sixteen of the qualities. The oral and written reference process was utilized to assess seven of the personal qualities. Interestingly, the application process, which is commonly used during teacher selection, served to assess none of the personal qualities.

Baldwin (1993) replicated the Burbage (1990) study using elementary and middle school principals, and found that eighteen personal qualities were assessed predominately by the interviews while five of the personal qualities were assessed primarily by oral and written references. Elementary and middle school principals perceive performance in previous employment or student teaching to be the most important criterion in the selection of teachers, and personal qualities to be the second highest ranked criterion utilized in the selection of teachers.
In addition to the use of personal qualities, there is a wide range of teacher selection procedures suggested in the literature. The individual interview and the group or team interview approach are suggested (Mueller, 1993; Haberman, 1993; Al-Rubaiy, 1993; Herman, 1993; Herman, 1992; Lindle & Shrock, 1993), as well as the structured interview (Caldwell, 1993; Pawlas, 1995; Anderson, 1992). Sanacore (1995) and Caldwell (1993) suggest using program needs as a basis for selecting teachers, and Ash (1992) suggests doing a brief interview screening. Conducting an initial application screening (Al-Rubaiy, 1993; Castetter, 1986; Herman, 1992; Lindle & Shrock, 1993), observing the teacher candidate (Sanacore, 1995; Caldwell, 1993; Frase, 1992), and doing a thorough background and resume check is advised (Castetter, 1986; Frase, 1992; Anderson, 1992). Frase (1992) and Ash (1992) suggest casting a wide net, because the quality of the applicants will determine the quality of the selected candidate. Portfolio assessment is also advised as a fruitful teacher selection technique (Bull, 1994; Cole & Uphoff, 1992; Bird, 1990; Furtwengler, 1985; Terry & Eade, 1983).

Haussler (1994) extended the research base by investigating personal qualities and procedures as well as problems encountered by principals when selecting teachers. His study distinguished between what teacher qualities principals reportedly value and those actually utilized during the selection process. He also addressed the difference between how principals reportedly value and utilize various procedures during teacher selection.
Haussler (1994), examining secondary administrators' perceptions, found that the most valued qualities in teacher selection, the ability to relate to students and the ability to get along with others, were consistent with the findings of Baldwin (1993) and Burbage (1990). However, the most utilized qualities were outside the findings of the Baldwin and Burbage studies, and pointed to the ability to relate to students and to control students. Haussler also addressed the most valued procedures and the most utilized procedures during teacher selection. Again they were not the same. The most valued procedures were phone calls to previous employers and being involved in interviews, but the most utilized procedures were personal references and applications.

The research of Place and Kowalski (1993) and Place and Drake (1994) reiterated these aforementioned findings. Place and Kowalski (1993) found that principals from varying size and level contexts strongly agree on the importance of qualities associated with teacher selection. However, several qualities rated as most important, such as honesty and emotional stability, are those also considered the most difficult to assess. Conversely, one of the easiest factors to measure, age, was considered one of the least important factors. The study by Place and Drake (1994) found that principals from different states agree about the priority ranking of teacher selection qualities, however the research shows inconsistencies in what qualities and procedures principals perceive as most important and what they actually utilize.
The research of problems encountered during teacher selection is very limited. Haussler (1994) found that secondary principals ranked inadequate salary or benefits and too few good applicants as the biggest problems faced during teacher selection. Also, of note, there were no significant differences between superintendents and principals regarding perceived teacher selection problems.

**Context Issues Related to the Study of Teacher Selection**

The present study investigated teacher selection within different elementary school types. The schools chosen for the current study were based on SES and community type contexts. Context is critical to educational research because it is widely recognized that factors such as SES and community type have large effects on human behavior. Sociologists, psychologists, and educators (e.g., Blumberg, 1972; Curtis & Jackson, 1977) have long recognized the importance of different SES groupings on behavior. The importance of context variables in effective schools research will be described in the subsequent sections.

Teddlie (1994) contends that the first step in conducting contextually sensitive school effects research is to select the context variable of interest and determine the number of levels that will be studied. One must also determine the number of levels that the effectiveness variable will have. The prototypical context study in school effects research involves crossing a school effectiveness variable by a context variable. The school
effectiveness variable typically has either one (effective), two (effective, ineffective), or three (effective, typical, ineffective) levels of school types. The one level school effects studies are usually case studies of particularly effective schools (e.g., Weber, 1971). One must also decide about the number of levels for the context variable. Consistent with prior research (Evans, 1988; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1985), the present study used two levels of SES communities (low, middle) as a context variable. By simultaneously studying various levels of the same context variable, comparisons across context levels can be made (Teddlie, 1994).

Beyond deciding the number of levels of the school effectiveness and the context variables is the issue of operationally defining these variables. This is a complex task, and making comparisons is problematic because of the lack of a common operational definition used across school effects studies. There have been large differences in defining levels of effectiveness (Purkey & Smith, 1983). Also, difficult methodological issues arise in defining levels of the context variable, especially for variables on which there is variance within particular schools. For example, when SES is used as a context variable, the issue of variance on that variable within schools must also be addressed (Teddlie, 1994). The question is, 'Should the SES construct be defined by the average family background for all students in the school, or should the researcher disaggregate the variable according to particular student subgroups within each school?'
Several researchers (e.g., Brookover, 1985; Edmonds, 1978; Lang, 1991; Levine & Lezotte, 1990; Lezotte, 1986; Shoemaker, 1984) have concluded that the proper identification and assessment of school effectiveness can be done only when data are disaggregated by student SES status. However, for the ease of interpreting an already complex issue, average family background based on archival data from the state Department of Education was used in the current study, an approach consistent with prior research (Teddlie & Stringfield; 1985; Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993).

Rural and urban schools have different needs in the teacher selection process. In the past, an equity orientation ruled educational research where the central question asked was 'How can we produce better schools for the disadvantaged?' But criticism of the reform orientation of those pursuing the equity ideal in effective schools research paved the way for a new orientation based on the efficiency ideal where the central question asked was 'How can we produce better schools for any and all students?' Thus, there has been a shift from equity to efficiency where context factors, which include rural and metropolitan schools, have been studied (Teddlie, 1994).

Garman and Alkire (1993) found in their survey in rural Ohio that the most important teacher qualities perceived by principals were in a different order than those perceived by principals in metropolitan areas. Rural schools often experience high teacher turnover.
rates because of characteristics related to small towns, such as geographical isolation, or lack of social and cultural opportunities (Luft, 1993; Helge & Marrs, 1981). Metropolitan schools can experience turnover rates due to the draining experience of difficult discipline situations and academically at-risk students (Haberman, 1993). The selection requirements as well as the selection procedures are unique to each of these school settings (Bull & Hyle, 1989; Duttweiler, 1987; Emmons, 1988). Thus, for the sake of equity and to make education better for all children, teacher selection practices must be researched in schools that differ by community type context. By design, the present study addresses the research equity issue.

Statement of the Problem

There has been only a modest amount of research examining principals' behavior in teacher selection. While it has been insightful, it is less than uniform (Place & Kowalski, 1993). Research to date has not sufficiently addressed principals' actions during the teacher selection process, which is the focus of the current study.

Research (Place & Kowalski, 1993; Place & Drake, 1994) suggests that a need exists to continue investigating teacher selection practices. The need for the current study lies in its exploration of school principals' views regarding teacher selection. It is intended to provide insight into the teacher qualities sought by principals, procedures utilized by principals, and problems encountered by principals during teacher selection. The current
study also investigated what, if any, differences occur in teacher selection practices in
elementary schools that differ by school type (effective/typical), socioeconomic status
(low/middle), and community type (metropolitan/rural) context. Insight was derived by
examining perceptions of practicing school principals with a minimum of three years
experience at each school.

There has been considerable attention in the literature to teacher qualities sought, and
to a lesser degree procedures utilized by principals during teacher selection, but there has
been very little attention given to problems associated with teacher selection. Further,
limited attention has been given to selection issues in schools that differ by type,
socioeconomic status, and community type contexts. A central part of the present study
was to assess whether differences exist in selection practices related to a school's
context.

Significance of the Study

Education reform received great attention when, in 1990, President Bush and the 50
Governors for American Education stated their goals for the year 2000. In a response to
the state of education, Goals 2000 declared that American children should begin school
ready to learn; graduate from school at a rate of 90 percent; demonstrate competence in
challenging subject matter and be prepared for citizenship; rise to first in the world in
mathematics and science; attend safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools; and join the workforce as literate adults and responsible citizens.

Rallying a school to the cause of improving student learning is part of every principal's job (Deal & Peterson, 1990). Important research findings are that student performance in the classroom is the most direct link to student achievement, and teachers' behaviors can affect student performance in ways that will lead to improved student achievement (Tymko, 1984). Teacher and classroom variables account for more of the variance in pupil achievement than school variables (Scheerens, Vermeulen, & Pelgrum, 1989). So crucial is the selection of a teacher to the quality of the educational program that it seems obvious that this decision should be made only with the utmost certainty regarding its utility (e.g., Frase, 1992). Yet, decisions during the teacher selection process are frequently intuitive and arbitrary (Wendel & Breed, 1988).

Contemporary administrative literature contains many suggestions of widely diverging complexity which purport to improve the selection process. However, the fact remains that very little empirical data has been gathered on these suggestions, and consequently, the process remains in many respects, a highly subjective one (Garman & Alkire, 1993).

There is a need to learn more about principals' behaviors during teacher selection. Building on the foundation of previous studies, the current study is based on the assumption that principals of effective schools intentionally shape the academic culture
of those schools. One primary way of molding an effective school culture is by selecting teachers who share the principal's values and who will be effective in the classrooms and ultimately lead students to high achievement. Effective schools research and school reform and restructuring efforts will be enhanced by discovering what principals of effective schools do in order to attain the best teachers possible for their schools.

Procedures

The present study was conducted in four phases. Operational definitions for elementary schools, effective schools, typical schools, school socioeconomic status, and community type will be presented in Chapter 3, however an outline of the current study is given in the subsequent sections.

In Phase I, elementary schools were identified as 'effective' based on regression analyses using the variables of percent free lunch, percent special education, percent gifted and talented, percent limited English proficiency, and community type to predict achievement on standardized tests for two consecutive years. The predicted mean scores were subtracted from the actual mean scores, yielding a residual score, or school effectiveness indices (SEI), for each school. Twelve schools consisting of 3 metropolitan, middle-SES; 3 metropolitan, low-SES; 3 rural, middle-SES; and 3 rural, low-SES schools that were at least +.70 above the studentized residual mean, a more stringent definition than +.674 used by Crone, Lang, Franklin, & Halbrook (1994), were
selected using stratified purposeful sampling. At least three classrooms of this initial sample of 12 schools representing different SES and community type contexts were observed and additionally screened for effectiveness with the Virgilio (1987) Teacher Behavior Inventory (VTBI) and the Stallings (1980) Classroom Snapshot (SCS). The initial sample was reduced from 12 to 11 schools made up of 2 metropolitan, middle SES; 3 metropolitan, low-SES; 3 rural, middle-SES; and 3 rural, low-SES settings.

There is a direct relationship between sample size and data analysis. As the number of units increase, it becomes more difficult to do the in-depth qualitative data gathering and analyses that makes contextually sensitive school effects research so vital (Teddle, 1994). Thus, only 11 schools were used in the qualitative portion (Phase II) of this study.

Phase II of the study entailed gathering qualitative data through principal and teacher interviews at each of the four previously mentioned effective school types. The purpose of this phase was to investigate the teacher selection practices used by principals of effective elementary schools. In these qualitative case studies, the school was the unit of analysis.

Phase III involved the development and piloting of a survey instrument based on the data gleaned from the interviews in Phase II. Face and content validity as well as reliability coefficients were determined, and the instrument was modified as needed.
Phase IV utilized the questionnaire developed in Phase III to collect quantitative data in the aforementioned four school types. Principals of effective as well as typical schools participated in the survey. Analysis of variance served to examine the applicability of key-informant interview data to the overall study groups and answer several research questions. The research questions addressed in the current study are in the next section.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed in the present study:

1. What qualities do principals look for when selecting teachers?

   1a. Do the qualities sought differ by school type (effective/ typical)?

   1b. Do the qualities sought differ by socioeconomic status (low/ middle)?

   1c. Do the qualities sought differ by community type (metropolitan/ rural)?

2. What procedures do principals utilize to select teachers?

   2a. Do the procedures differ by school type (effective/ typical)?

   2b. Do the procedures differ by socioeconomic status (low/ middle)?

   2c. Do the procedures differ by community type (metropolitan/ rural)?

3. What problems do principals encounter during teacher selection?

   3a. Do the problems differ by school type (effective/ typical)?

   3b. Do the problems differ by socioeconomic status (low/ middle)?

   3c. Do the problems differ by community type (metropolitan/ rural)?
Limitations and Delimitations

The generalizability of the present study's results may be limited by the nature of the research design as well as the schools in the sample. The sample included effective and typical schools for Phase IV. Ineffective schools were not studied. The schools were from rural and metropolitan, as well as low- and middle-SES districts in one state, and may not generalize to schools in other states. Another limitation of the present study pertains to the utilization of only elementary schools in the sample. Thus, comparisons between these schools and middle or high schools cannot be made. Utilizing only elementary schools also limits the generalizability of the findings to schools of other grade level structures.

The current study utilized strict definitions for school effectiveness, student body SES, and community type. Thus, the sample size was rather small, and the possibility of Type II errors may exist for the quantitative research findings.

The present study did not address the "effectiveness" of the teacher selection strategies, rather it investigated the teacher selection strategies used by principals of four effective school types. Also, the scope of the current study was limited. For example, research on recruitment and its relationship to and effect on selection, socialization of teachers, and the legal issues associated with equal opportunity in selection were not directly investigated in this study, and therefore are either discussed briefly or omitted.
Summary

Chapter One presented an introduction which includes a background of the problem, a statement of the problem, the significance of the study, the procedures utilized, the research questions posed, and the limitations and delimitations of the current study. The following chapters give details regarding the current study.

Chapter Two provides a review of the literature related to teacher selection. Sections are presented on the importance of teacher selection, school effectiveness research related to teacher selection, systematic approaches to teacher selection, the complexity of teacher selection, qualities valued and utilized in teacher selection, procedures valued and utilized in teacher selection, and problems encountered by principals during teacher selection.

Chapter Three begins with a description of the research methodology, followed by the design of the study which includes operational definitions for effective schools, typical schools, school socioeconomic status, community type, and elementary school. A list of the research questions is also provided. The selection of subjects, instrumentation, data processing and analysis, and methodological assumptions are presented in the remaining portions of the third chapter.

Chapter Four summarizes and discusses the research findings from the four phases of the current research study, which included both qualitative and quantitative procedures.
Specifically, the methods used for the selection of schools which participated in the current study as well as the findings from principal and teacher interviews are discussed. The development and piloting of the quantitative questionnaire, including factor analysis results which lead to instrument refinement, are explored. Finally, answers to the research questions were reported and discussed.

The final chapter, Chapter Five, will present a general summary of the current research findings and discuss conclusions which may be drawn from the data. It will close with recommendations for future research and policy implications with respect to the teacher selection process.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of the current study was to investigate how principals of effective elementary schools select teachers. The teacher qualities sought, procedures utilized, and problems encountered were specifically examined. Answers to the research questions were gleaned by examining the processes and strategies utilized during teacher selection.

The review of the literature concerns the importance and complexity of the subject. There was an attempt to review all recent studies regarding the subsections contained in this chapter. In response to the Goals 2000 agenda for student achievement, the teacher shortages, and the significant expense of hiring teachers, to name only a few reasons, the purpose of this chapter was to review current literature relating to the qualities sought, procedures utilized, and problems encountered by principals during teacher selection.

Seven themes were pursued during the literature search and research investigation: a) importance of teacher selection; b) school effectiveness research related to teacher selection; c) systematic approaches to teacher selection; d) complexity of teacher selection; e) qualities valued and utilized in teacher selection; f) procedures valued and utilized in teacher selection; and g) problems in teacher selection. The importance and significance of each theme will be further outlined in the following subsections.
Literature about the subject of teacher selection is abundant. Over 100 references were examined regarding the teacher qualities sought, procedures utilized, and problems associated with teacher selection. Although literature on teacher selection is extensive, research focusing specifically on selection decisions is somewhat limited. Studies fall into four categories including studies that examine the influence of certain variables such as age, gender, or race on selection decisions (Place, 1989; Shields & Daniele, 1982; Young & Allison, 1982; Young & Schmidt, 1987), studies that use the survey method of gathering data (Garman, 1990; Johnson, 1976; King, 1991; Haussler, 1994), studies that use a naturalistic paradigm to examine the selection process, qualities, procedures, problems, and decisions of administrators in selected geographic, cultural, or socioeconomic contexts (Owens, 1992; Sievers, 1989; Wise, Darling-Hammond, & Berry, 1987), and studies that correlate predictors, such as grade point average, ratings, and test scores, with subsequent teacher performance to identify qualities and procedures that will make selection more objective and thus less prone to error (Gillies, 1988; Nesbit & Tadlock, 1986; Obermeyer, 1989). This research on selection activities for employment focuses on qualities and procedures which provide good predictors of future candidate performance. While the relationship between teacher selection and teacher success or effectiveness is not the focus of the present study, a brief discussion of that research follows to build a context for the relevance of the current study.
The results of predictor studies are inconclusive. Interestingly, a number of them failed to find positive correlations between teacher performance and commonly used selection qualities and procedures. Nesbit and Tadlock (1986) explained that this failure to find positive correlations may be related to both the "insufficient discrimination of teaching differences produced by the evaluation procedure to justify use of the evaluation score as a criterion" and the "insufficient discrimination of applicants in the selection procedure itself" (p. 13). Also questions about the reliability of these predictors are often raised. Researchers (Kowalski, McDaniel, Place, & Reitzug, 1992) confirmed what most hiring officials sense: "no single criterion or procedure can accurately predict the success of a teacher" (p. 34). Jensen (1987) suggested that research employing multivariate analysis and multiple measures is needed and may hold the most promise in predicting success as a teacher. The multivariate studies demonstrate that combinations of cognitive and personal factors may predict success as a teacher.

Castetter (1992) defined personnel selection as "a decision-making process in which one individual is chosen over another to fill a position on the basis of how well characteristics of the individual match the requirements of the position" (p. 147). Rebore (1991) added that a selection decision may result in four outcomes. "Two are correct decisions and two are errors. The correct decisions occur when the individual hired proves to be successful on the job or when a rejected applicant would have performed
inadequately. The process has failed when a rejected candidate could have performed successfully or when the individual hired performs inadequately" (pp. 99-100).

Jensen (1987) noted that the most capable candidates may not be the first to be hired and offered the following three explanations for this phenomenon: (a) complexity of the teaching function, (b) insufficient attention to hiring, and (c) inadequate selection techniques.

Importance of Teacher Selection

Among the many tasks facing school administrators, the task of teacher selection is one of the most important when one considers the quality of education for children. There are many statements found in the literature regarding the importance of teacher selection, such as:

"The best opportunity to improve teaching and learning in a school is when a new teacher is hired" (Donaldson, 1990, p. 4).

"The quality of any school district depends more upon the quality of its staff than upon any other factor" (Jensen, 1987, p. 5).

"The teaching staff is the foundation on which a successful learning environment is built" (McPartland, 1990, p. 465).

"The most important factor in improving the quality of services delivered by a public school system is identification and selection of competent personnel" (Woods, 1986, p. 2).

Others (Bredeson, 1983; Bridges, 1986; Frase, 1991; Castetter, 1992; Frase, 1992; Haberman, 1993; Anderson, 1992; Place & Drake, 1994; Keep, 1993) concur that the selection of teachers is one of the most critical decisions made by administrators.
Although the human consequence of selection, because of its impact on learning, is considered to be of critical importance, the financial impact of poor selection decisions cannot be ignored. In other words, good selection is not only significant in fulfilling an obligation to educate children effectively but also a responsibility affecting the school district's finances. Rebore (1991) recognized the cost of selecting an employee as a major expenditure in his calculation that a typical minimum cost for selection was $1,000 per new employee. Castetter (1992) observed that "millions of dollars are involved in poor selection decisions, which create personnel problems such as alienation, tardiness, absenteeism, unsatisfactory performance, grievances, and litigation" (p. 148). Marcum (1988) and Neely (1993) concur that many new teachers are leaving the profession causing shortages; therefore, success in selecting teachers who will continue in the field is important regarding the management of the district's funds.

Even though the importance of teacher selection has long been recognized, at least in the literature, that importance appears to have been elevated in recent years for three reasons. First, the shortage of teachers in certain fields, along with shortages in certain regions of the country, has heightened the desire to be more selective and more successful where a limited pool of candidates exists. According to The Job Search Handbook for Educators: 1993 Association for School, College and University Staffing Annual, there are teacher shortages in certain fields in all regions of the country.
Generally, filling vacancies in math, science, some foreign languages, and special education has been difficult, while considerable surplus remains in physical education and social studies. Currently, there is also a shortage of candidates in many areas of the country (Association for School, College and University Staffing, 1993). Jensen (1987) noted that the teacher marketplace is increasingly competitive, especially for the urban and isolated rural areas. Thus, teacher shortages have made the task of selecting the best candidates even more challenging as districts seek ways to improve teacher supply, quality, and retention. A related reason for care relates to the departure of women and the shortage of minorities. There is evidence that the teaching profession is attracting less capable college graduates (Coady, 1990). Jenkins (1984) observed, "With fewer able young people being attracted to teaching and with the attrition of qualified women and minorities from the profession, the need for effective teacher selection methods is especially true" (p. 50). Castetter (1992) summarized the issue by stating that "as the competition increases for qualified talent to conduct the work of the educational systems, the process involved in locating, attracting, selecting, and socializing human resources becomes even more critical for organizational effectiveness" (p. 111).

A second reason for heightened concern relates to the demand for accountability in the schools and questions regarding the quality of education and of teachers in the public schools. This concern was triggered by the President's Commission on Excellence in
Education published report, *A Nation at Risk* (1983). This report, along with the other reform literature of the 1980's, appears to have brought about greater interest in improving selection techniques. Donaldson (1990) pointed out that "as attention to the quality of the teaching force has heightened, the need has grown to ... select ... the best teachers into America's schools" (p.1).

Finally, the equal opportunity of employment laws, affirmative action requirements, and numerous court decisions since the 1960s have brought about extensive changes in qualities sought and procedures used in the selection of teachers (Castetter, 1992). The basis of these legal efforts is to combat inappropriate and illegal discrimination. Discrimination in selection practices based upon age, race, color, gender, national origin, religion, and handicapping conditions is prohibited. Castetter (1992) included the following in his list of major equal employment opportunity legislation and executive orders: Civil Rights Act of 1964, Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, and Americans with Disabilities Act of 1991.

Thus, school administrators need to be not only more careful in their selection decisions, but also to avoid litigation by ensuring that their selection activities and processes are open, equitable, and legal. Many have attempted to do this by carefully scrutinizing their selection practices to avoid bias and improve their selection practices (Bredeson, 1983; Castetter, 1992). Therefore, the importance of careful selection, always recognized, may
have become even more important than in the recent past. Hale (1981) observed, "If mistakes are made in the selection process, the resulting time necessitated either in supervision or procedure for dismissal and possible litigation resulting from such dismissal is much more time consuming than sound personnel processes to enable capable personnel to be selected initially" (p. 4).

A poorly planned or hasty decision can precipitate a potentially endless flow of personnel problems. "The employment of the wrong person can reduce the effectiveness of instruction, jeopardize existing working relationships among staff members, and require costly remedial support" (Webb, Montello, & Norton, 1994, p. 151).

The selection of quality staff is of critical importance and provides school districts a "window of opportunity" to improve the quality of instruction (Bridges, 1986). This opportunity may be lost unless more effective selection processes are devised and implemented.

School Effectiveness Research Related to Teacher Selection

A brief discussion will follow which highlights some extensive, however not exhaustive, school effectiveness research related to teacher selection. These studies will be cited again in subsequent sections when appropriate. There are some interesting findings regarding principals of effective schools with respect to the teacher selection process, and this research adds to the basis of the current study.
Teddlie, Stringfield, and Desselle (1985) found that principals of effective, low-SES schools have principals who play a large role in the selection of teachers. In fact, 23% of these principals make their own selection decisions, thus working with and around central office policies.

Teddlie, Stringfield, Wimpelberg and Kirby (1987) found that a difference between low- and middle-SES schools has to do with principals' authority in selecting teachers and with the characteristics of the teachers s/he selects. For example, principals in effective low-SES schools reported having a major input in selecting teachers, while principals in effective middle-SES schools reported having less authority in teacher selection. Also, teachers in effective low-SES schools were less experienced than teachers in less effective low-SES schools. Thus, principals in effective low-SES schools may seek younger, more idealistic teachers for their schools. With respect to middle-SES schools, more experienced teachers were found in the effective schools, and less experienced teachers were found in the less effective middle-SES schools. Thus, principals in effective middle-SES schools may seek more experienced teachers.

Additional research (Stringfield & Teddlie; 1988) found that principals in effective low-SES schools were the most likely to report exerting personal influence on the teacher selection process for their school. These principals were active in both teacher selection and dismissal, taking great care in the teachers they chose. "Spark" and
"energy" were characteristics these principal sought in teachers, and they were less concerned with years of teaching experience or advanced degrees. Also, the greatest variance in principals' self reported perceptions of control regarding teacher selection was within school districts. Principals from one school district might give drastically different accounts of the teacher selection process in the district, and this perception proved to be an excellent predictor of school effectiveness, especially in low-SES schools. Further, principals of less effective schools reported almost never making a recommendation to the district office that a teacher to be terminated. Since highly effective principals reportedly do not accept their share of ineffective teachers, there is an annual floating of these teachers from school to school, called the "dance of the lemons" by Bridges (1986), and a disproportionate share of ineffective teachers end up working at a school with an ineffective principal.

Stringfield and Teddlie (1989) found that emphasis on the selection and removal of teachers probably has its greatest impact as a school is moving toward effectiveness. At this time, the principal can radically change the school's overall rates of time-on-task, classroom management, classroom instruction, and classroom climate by the removal of less effective teachers and by the careful selection of teachers to replace them. This selection of teachers who are or have the potential to be effective teachers may be a principal's most important activity in moving a school toward effectiveness. This
research was complimented by another study (Levine & Lezotte, 1990) where eight characteristics of outstanding leadership were noted. Four had to do with teacher selection, and one in particular was the aggressive selection and replacement of teachers.

Further, Teddlie, Kirby, and Stringfield (1989) found that teachers in more effective schools consistently outscored teachers in less effective schools on all indices of effective teaching. For example, teachers in effective schools were consistently more successful in keeping students on task, spent more time presenting new material, provided more independent practice, demonstrated higher expectations for students, provided more positive reinforcement, experienced fewer classroom interruptions, had fewer discipline problems, generated friendlier classroom climates, and provided more pleasant classrooms that their counterparts in less effective schools.

Virgilio, Teddlie and Oescher (1991) found that teachers from more effective, typical, and less effective schools behave quite distinctly. Teachers from more effective schools demonstrate better teaching skills than their peers in typical and less effective schools. There is also less variance in teaching behavior at more effective schools than at typical and less effective schools. For example, teachers in more effective schools behaved more similarly than those in typical or less effective schools. The range for time-on-task rates across teachers in more effective elementary schools was found to be less than 20%, while the range was over 70% for teachers in less effective elementary schools.
Stringfield and Teddlie (1991a) found that principals of effective schools actively recruit new teachers and move ineffective teachers out the school. These principals also informally recruit new teachers using current faculty. In stark contrast, principals in less effective schools reported being required to take cast-off teachers from other schools (Stringfield & Teddlie; 1991b).

Teddlie and Stringfield (1993) found that principals of effective schools investigate teacher candidates' files at the district office to find a good match for a vacancy. These principals "used" or "played" the district hiring system to get the teachers they needed at times arguing for special consideration because of a population of extremely poor or single parent families. Further, these principals actively consulted with the district office regarding vacancies to make the best match for the teaching position.

Crone and Teddlie (1995) found differences regarding how new teachers were selected in effective and ineffective schools. All teachers stated that the principal had a major role in selection. The main difference was that new teachers in ineffective schools were more likely to have been hired after being student teachers in these particular schools. However, there was no mention of new teachers being selected from student teachers in effective schools. Also, principals of effective schools reported looking for teachers who were creative, flexible, and concerned about children while principals of ineffective schools were most interested in a teacher's philosophy and discipline policy.
Systematic Approaches to Teacher Selection

School reform efforts impacted the current study through decentralization practices. Decentralization is the redistribution of power and authority from the district level to the school level. Decentralized authority has shifted the major role of selecting teachers from the district office to the individual school principal (Place & Kowalski, 1993; Kowalski, McDaniel, Place, & Reitzug, 1992). This form of site-based management leads to the principal's ability and authority, along with teacher leaders and school advisory councils, to make recommendations to hire teachers. This shift of responsibility for teacher selection needs to be successful so that principals are not further burdened with responsibilities, and legal and political risks for districts are not raised (Place & Kowalski, 1993). Therefore, it is important for teacher selection procedures at individual schools, especially effective schools, to be examined.

Interestingly, while many research findings state that principals are directly responsible for staff selection, the majority of the research on teacher selection practices has been at the district level. It is clear from the literature that district policies shape teacher selection procedures, and the majority of suggestions on teacher selection are for the district level. This notion of district level involvement was indirectly examined in the present study by the research question which inquired about problems encountered during the teacher selection process.
The literature contains consistent and forceful arguments that recognize the importance of careful and systematic teacher selection practices, which is essentially the incorporation of a rational decision-making process (Nesbit & Tadlock, 1986; Neely, 1993). The literature recognized, too, that substantial costs, efforts, time, and possibility of error reside in selection processes. Castetter (1992) asserts that, given these circumstances, an effective, systematic selection structure, or a "standard" system which all candidates follow, is a recommendation all school districts should follow. The purpose of a selection process is to organize selection data in a way that information about candidates can be compared to job qualifications or criteria in order to make good decisions (Castetter, 1992; Kopetskrie, 1983). Dale (1991) recognized that with so much riding on the quality of the teaching staff, district officials can afford nothing less than a well-reasoned, reliable hiring process.

Kahl (1980) added that because most schools do not have an established policy for selecting teachers, the most important step toward improving the process is the development of a common set of procedures and practices. A systematic teacher selection process should be tailored to the unique goals, values, philosophies, and needs of each district or school (Castetter, 1992; Frase, 1992; Mickler & Solomon, 1986; Nesbit & Tadlock, 1986). It should be used fairly, and once developed it can be tailored for future vacancies (Rebore, 1991; Saville, 1986; Webster, 1988).
There are a number of benefits derived from using a systematic selection process. First, information is collected more completely and consistently for the decision-making process, and objectivity can be heightened and random error reduced. Execution of a systematic process helps gather information pertinent to the job, reduces the likelihood that inappropriate and unnecessary questions will be asked, reduces the tendency of interviewers to talk too much, and therefore reduces inappropriate or hasty decisions. In addition, it can create a reputation for the district of being fair and of hiring only staff members of high quality. A systematic selection process minimizes the amount of wasted time, increases reliability, validity, and structural consistency; and improves the prediction of probable job success (Caliendo, 1986; Castetter, 1992; Hickey, 1970; Mickler & Solomon, 1986; Nesbit & Tadlock, 1986; Nicholson & McInerney, 1988; Saville, 1986; Caldwell, 1993; Anderson, 1992).

After the district staff has carefully developed, piloted, and adjusted procedures, the next point for a systematic selection process should be a board-adopted policy (Castallo, Fletcher, Rossetti, & Sekowski, 1992). Sound policies comprise fair treatment of candidates, proper training of interviewers, consideration of a variety of information about candidates, and ongoing assessment of selection processes (Jensen, 1987; Caldwell, 1993). A 1989 American Association of School Administrators (AASA) Critical Issues Report suggested that a "thorough understanding of the criteria and
selection procedures may deter a board member from attempting to influence the hiring process for personal or political reasons" (Steuteville-Brodinsky, Burbank, & Harrison, 1989, p. 21). A rational and uniform basis for personnel selection provides the applicant, the community, and the school staff assurance that competency is a key factor in determining the selection of a candidate (Castetter, 1992).

A good decision-making process for the selection of excellent staff is long, complicated, and time consuming (Castetter, 1992; Hickey, 1970; Sick & Shapiro, 1991). There is a need to establish role requirements or criteria for the position, to determine the kinds of data or the qualifications needed to select competent individuals for the position, to decide what devices or instruments and procedures are to be used to gather information about the candidates, and how the information will be assembled into a candidate profile for the purpose of comparison should be spelled out before entering the actual selection procedure (Nicholson & McInerney, 1988; Caldwell, 1993).

At the school level, deciding on necessary qualities of good teachers, along with the unique qualities of a specific position, is an essential part of decision making for teacher selection. Knowledge about the procedures available to measure reliably those qualities is also essential. People responsible for teacher selection must be aware of the various characteristics of teachers and methods available to determine where an individual might best serve. These issues will be discussed further in future sections of this chapter.
There are several models of the selection process in the literature. Notably they refer to the district level. The models and steps in the selection process described in the writings of Donaldson (1990) and Rebore (1991) contain many of the steps common to most of the models. Donaldson (1990) recommended the following eight steps:

a) Job analyses: determine what the job entails, b) Selection criteria: determine the teacher characteristics, qualities, knowledge, and skills required by the job, c) Generate a pool of candidates: advertise internally and externally to create the best possible pool, d) Data collection: gather data pertinent to the selection criteria, e) Paper screening of the pool: rate all candidates on the assembled data, f) Personal interview: extend an invitation to candidates to appear in the district for an interview, g) Weigh all data and make a decision: rank all candidates in the final pool, h) Notification of candidates: offer the position to the top candidate, ensure acceptance, and notify unsuccessful ones (p. 2).

Rebore's (1991) model suggested the ten following steps: a) Write the job description, b) Establish the selection criteria, c) Write the vacancy announcement and advertise the position, d) Receive applications, e) Select the candidates to be interviewed, f) Interview candidates, g) Check references and credentials, h) Select the best candidate, i) Implement the job offer and acceptance, j) Notify unsuccessful candidates (p. 100). Most selection processes include the following steps: advertising, central screening interview, completion and review of application blanks, completion of
tests required by the system, decentralized interview, background investigation, nomination, and appointment (Castetter, 1986; Neely, 1993).

In spite of the evidence that hiring good teachers is among the most important tasks performed by an administrator, "many school systems rely on a poorly conceived selection process, draw from a limited pool of candidates, and hire teachers who frankly are far from the best available", (Frase, 1991, p. 23). Most superintendents admit they need more training in selection of staff. At best, they have taught themselves, learned on the job, gone to workshops on the subject, and shared techniques with colleagues.

Castetter (1986) argued that it is not difficult to make a case for a thorough selection process, regardless of the system size. It is crucial that school administrators assess the decision-making processes and the types of information sources they rely on for the selection of personnel in their districts (Bredeson, 1983). "Structural consistency adds to the validity of the selection process, which in actuality is a procedure for determining that very costly investment for the school" (Saville, 1986, p. 3). "The expenditure of time, money, and effort is wasted when people selected for positions fail to meet organizational expectations", (Castetter, 1986, p. 151).

Again, research is stating that principals are responsible for selecting teachers, yet district policies determine how principals approach the process. The current study investigated teacher selection at the school level, which is ultimately the place it matters.
Complexity of Teacher Selection

Selecting teachers is not only one of the most important decisions principals are called upon to make, but it is also one of the most complex. Teaching is a complex task and so much of the difficulty of teacher selection arises from the complexity of the teaching function (Webster, 1988; Wise et al., 1987). "In fact, the act of teaching is so complex that it defies attempts to describe it fully or to measure it accurately. This lack of description and measurement make [sic] the selection of capable teachers particularly difficult" (Jensen, 1986, p. 3). Heynderickx (1987) commented, "The teacher selection process cannot be made simple or automatic. There is no checklist of qualities an administrator can look for to determine who is likely to become an outstanding teacher. Teachers must possess a special blend of skills, personality characteristics, and knowledge if they are to become a teacher whom students will admire, work hard for, and truly learn from" (p. 1).

Decisions regarding criteria and procedures are further complicated by a number of problems which may not allow the principal to select the best teachers, as will be seen later in this review. Thus, selection of teachers is an important, complex, and sometimes frustrating decision-making process. Bredeson (1986) recognized teacher selection as an important and complicated decision-making process which involves the perception, assessment, and evaluation of a variety of types of information that are available to a
decision maker. Because this information may be inaccurate, incomplete, irrelevant, or simply false, the decision maker must carefully filter through this information. Wise et al. (1987) added that school districts must define positions according to well-defined criteria, hire the most qualified teachers, and place them where their skills best fit the needs of the students. If the performance assessment and actual teaching context are matched, the performance measure will better predict teaching effectiveness (Wise et al., 1987, p. 7). There is, in short, a need for congruency between the teacher attributes and the position requirements.

Qualities Valued and Utilized in Teacher Selection

The purpose of the selection process is to hire individuals whose qualifications match the specific job criteria and who will be successful on the job after being employed (Castetter, 1992; Hendrickson, 1983; Kahl, 1980; Kopetskie, 1983). In order to improve teacher selection and the quality of teaching in classrooms, it is necessary to know what characterizes a competent teacher within each particular context. Steuteville-Brodinsky et al. (1989) recognized that "to ... employ the best available teachers, school administrators need a clear idea of the kind of teaching they want in their schools and the kind of teachers who will serve their students best" (p. 36). The study and conceptualization of what is wanted in an outstanding teacher is just as critical to the entire selection process as are the ultimate procedures. The purpose of selection criteria
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is to "delineate those ideal characteristics that, if possessed by an individual to the fullest extent possible, would ensure the successful performance of the job", (Rebore, 1991, p.102).

Garman (1990) stated that "while there is an overall affirmation of the need for good teachers, the criteria of exactly which qualities characterize an effective teacher are much harder to ascertain and are open to interpretation" (p. 22). Wise et al. (1987), in their case studies of several school districts, revealed that "while many district selection procedures appear on there [sic] face, to be similar, there are substantial differences in the criteria embodied in selection tools used and the weights placed on different teaching ability" (p. v). Differing selection criteria are reflected in the types and content of the selection procedures as well as in the weights applied to the various criteria. Criterion measures vary according to the values of the selection team and the philosophy of the district. Varying emphases and perceptions of teacher qualities strongly suggest that there is no firm consensus nor easily discernible pattern of characteristics which, when possessed by teachers, produce effective teaching.

Many years of research data from teacher effectiveness studies have led to the conclusion that the behavioral characteristics of effective teachers are almost too numerous and complex for generalizations. There is no single set of skills, attitudes, interests, or abilities that consistently discriminates between effective and ineffective
teachers (Wise et al., 1987). Different positions have quite different characteristics and it is erroneous to assume that a common set of criteria works in all situations. "Operational definitions of the 'good teacher' vary across and within school districts", (Wise et al., 1987, p. 83). For example, some school districts may favor academic qualifications while others favor interpersonal skills or teaching competencies.

Still, "in spite of the differences of opinions concerning the criteria of teacher selection, general agreement exists that specific traits, qualities, and competencies should govern the process of teacher selection", (Masanja, 1990, p. 74). There is overwhelming evidence that the effectiveness of different selection criteria depends largely on the nature of the local environment or context. Wise et al. (1987) suggested that effective teacher selection depends on "the goodness-of-the-fit between the character of the candidate and the school's clientele" (p. 146). Kahl (1980) suggested that criteria should be established locally and should be tailored to the specific vacancy. The school district must be clear about the nature of a position, the job expectations, and any special qualities required of applicants (Jenkins, 1984).

Consideration of the contextual conditions seems to be critical to the development of selection criteria. Selecting a candidate who is "congruent" with the context was a dominant theme in Sievers' (1989) literature review. Therefore, assessing needs and establishing specific criteria desirable in the person to fill that position is a crucial first
step in improving teacher selection (Nicholson & McInerney, 1988). The current study investigated the qualities sought during teacher selection at the school level. Schools with differing contexts were used to determine whether or not the qualities sought were the same or different.

Bolton (1973) noted that clearly defined criteria can serve as standards for measuring candidates against each other. Assuring that competent people are selected requires compiling a clear understanding of what competencies, set forth in explicit language, the school expects its staff members to possess and what criteria to use in the selection process (Woods, 1986). Kopetskie (1983) suggested that an important step in improving teacher selection is that of reviewing and updating teacher selection criteria, which includes putting those criteria in writing. However, many school districts have no written criteria regarding effective teacher characteristics (Brodinsky, Burband, & Harrison, 1989). It appears that many principals do not take the necessary time nor care sufficiently to clearly define and articulate what they are looking for in a teacher. Neither do they articulate how they will determine if the candidate meets selection criteria. Shelton (1989) states that school personnel must take the time to define, through an honest and thorough appraisal of all the pertinent factors, the kind of individual who will be most comfortable and productive working in their school. Developing clear criteria for the selection of teachers and specifying the particular vacancy increases the likelihood
of hiring a successful teacher. The candidates whose qualities, skills, and attitude best meet selection criteria should be hired. Moreover, clearly specified criteria will not only help in the selection of competent teachers, but also provides a certain level of legal protection.

Because good selection criteria are the result of analyzing the position available and developing the criteria from local sources, specific rather than general guides for the position should result. "Logical sources include your schools' teacher evaluation instrument (the criteria), the school system's curriculum guides, and your schools' overall philosophy", (Jinks, 1985, p. 23). Steuteville-Brodinsky et al. (1989) expanded that list of sources to include school board policies on staff hiring, job descriptions, and the school district's goals and objectives. Castetter (1992) further identified a number of methods of gathering information about position requirements to "include examination of the position holder, interviews with the position holder, description by the incumbent, and design of the position models for testing assumptions about actual requirements" (p. 157). These sources can help establish criteria that are closely tied to the district's conception of a good teacher. "In developing criteria for teacher selection, consideration must be given to the complex interaction of teacher behavior, learner behavior, and environmental factors in the teaching-learning process", (Bolton, 1973, p. 56).
Criteria for use in teacher selection may be developed by consultants, district administrators, or teams of teachers and principals. One earmark of professionalism is the authority wielded by members of the profession when it comes to determining the criteria by which they will be selected and evaluated (Duke & Canady, 1991).

Steuteville-Brodinsky et al. (1989) suggests that the criteria can be developed successfully by one, several, or all of the following individuals and groups: the superintendent, director of personnel and assistants, principals, teachers, board of education, a committee drawn from various segments of the school staff, and from citizen of parent groups. Steuteville-Brodinsky et al. further suggests that teachers can develop the criteria through staff development activities.

Since a single selection criterion cannot be relied on exclusively, "the employment decision should be based on a combination of techniques to maximize the probability of achieving the desired match between position and person", (Castetter, 1992, p. 164). The consensus of research findings is that principals often fail to assess multiple information sources about candidates and fail to assess thoroughly the necessary knowledge, attributes, and skills needed for good teaching. Decisions to select teachers may be based too often on inadequate selection criteria and procedures. Since teaching requires proficiency in many interrelated skills, a teacher selection decision should be based upon multiple, comprehensive, and balanced measures of academic qualifications,
personal characteristics, and teaching performance (Castetter, 1992; Jensen, 1987; Webster, 1988; Wise et al., 1987). Selection decisions should be based on the use of a variety of criteria weighted to reflect the school's definition of a good teacher. The present study investigated this theme by posing the research questions regarding qualities sought and procedures utilized during the teacher selection process.

In his historic review of the literature, Garman (1990) noted that the initial criteria for teaching in early America were simply a knowledge of the subject matter and a desire to teach, along with varieties of attention to the candidate's religion, politics, personality, and social standing. Criteria used for the selection of teachers reflected emphasis on academic performance and selected personal attributes. In Kahl's (1980) review of the literature, he found that the most widely used and valued selection criteria were student teaching performance, communication skills, personality traits, academic credentials, physical appearance, I.Q., NTE score, and educational philosophy. However, research from the past decade divides teacher selection criteria into three general areas:

(a) teaching performance or instructional skills (Galbo, Diekman, & Galbo, 1985; Wise et al (1987); King, 1991); (b) personality traits or interpersonal skills (Galbo, Diekman, & Galbo, 1985; Jensen, 1987; Wise et al, 1987; King, 1991); and (c) academic credentials or fundamental knowledge (Galbo, Diekman, & Galbo, 1985; Jensen, 1987; Wise et al, 1987; King, 1991).
Other writers have created lists of characteristics or criteria important in the selection of teachers. However the lists and findings regarding teacher selection criteria are not consistent. Burbage (1990) found that 23 personal qualities were perceived as important as well as critical to assess in the teacher selection process according to secondary principals. However when Baldwin (1993) replicated the Burbage (1990) study using elementary and middle school principals, he found the same 23 personal qualities were agreed upon as important, but were not the highest ranked criterion utilized. Most important was student teaching experience and prior teaching success. Haussler's (1994) research added to the qualities identified as important by including (a) the ability to relate to students and, (b) the ability to control students. Steuteville-Brodinsky et al. (1989) noted that a 1989 AASA survey identified 20 characteristics appropriate for the hiring of new teachers: (a) has good knowledge of subject matter; (b) is caring, loves children; (c) can plan, organize instruction; (d) can organize, manage classroom; (e) works well with people, is cooperative; (f) has excellent instructional strategies, skills; (g) is dedicated to the profession; (h) has knowledge of child development and learning process; (i) is student oriented; (j) is enthusiastic; (k) has open mind, is flexible; (l) has strong academic background; (m) has good communication skills; (n) can diagnose needs; (o) individualizes instruction (p) handles discipline well; (q) is creative; (r) is positive, upbeat; (s) has sense of humor; and (t) desires to grow professionally (p.8).
According to a 1990 survey (Association for School, College and University Staffing, 1993) of administrators, teachers, parents, and students from across the country, the following ten characteristics are desired in new teachers: (a) ability to make differences in a student's life; (b) variety of life experiences; (c) managing a classroom; (d) student teaching experiences; (e) academic preparation; (f) personal appearance; (g) sense of humor; (h) adaptability; (i) maturity; and (j) a desire to have involvement in the school and community (p.4). Place and Kowalski (1993) identified 46 factors commonly associated with teacher selection in their study, and Place and Drake (1994) used a list of nine criteria that elementary and high school principals ranked in order of importance for the selection of teachers.

Because of the inconsistency in the lists of qualities valued and utilized during teacher selection, the current study posed the research question: "What qualities do principals look for when selecting teachers?" The qualitative nature of the study dictated that no check lists were used. Principals of effective elementary schools were asked to describe the qualities they sought in teacher candidates during the selection process rather than look over a list of criteria and check off desirable qualities.

A number of studies and articles have focused narrowly on certain criteria which note some consensus. In the next two subsections, attention is given to academic qualifications and teaching competencies and personal attributes and interpersonal skills.
Academic Qualifications and Teaching Competencies

Perry (1981) found that academic criteria: (a) grade point average, (b) student teaching evaluation, and (c) professional recommendations, apparently did not significantly affect graduates' success in securing a teaching job. Grade point average was not listed as an important criterion in the Ishee (1981) survey of principals. Huarng (1985) discerned no significant relationship in his sample between university admission criteria: a) grade point average; b) test scores in reading, mathematics, and language; and c) instructor appraisal, and a principal's evaluation of teaching performance. Browne and Rankin (1986) found no significant relationship between scores on the National Teacher Examination (NTE) and success finding a job, thus concluded that superior cognitive skills did not predict employment as a teacher and that personality factors may be more important than academic skills in determining whether or not an applicant is successful in gaining employment as a teacher. Marcum (1988) sampled personnel directors and principals and discovered that IQ, grade point average, and master's degree ranked lowest on the list of 28 teacher qualities of a prospective teacher.

Why aren't the most academically talented teachers selected when it is clear that the complexity of the teaching function requires high cognitive skills? Wise et al. (1987) discovered through their case studies that some administrators tend to believe that "candidates with 'straight A's' from prestigious colleges will not necessarily make the best teacher" because "they are more likely not to have the patience to work with the average
students" and that they are actually held in disdain because they "leave the profession too quickly" (p. 18). Schlechty and Vance's (1983) study found that certified teachers were choosing to leave the field at an increasing rate. Teachers who received high academic scores were twice as likely to change careers when compared to those with the lowest academic scores. Perry (1981) recognized the complexity of teaching and offered the "reasonable belief that good grades alone do not make a good teacher" (p. 114) as an explanation for administrators' disenchantment with academic criteria alone as indicators of teaching potential.

Still, "some school districts systematically weigh the candidates' grades earned in their subject areas as well as their overall grade point average", (Wise et al., 1987, p. 59). Wise et al. also noted that some school districts consider the reputation of the candidate's college. While there is no solid evidence which supports a relationship between a teacher's academic ability and teacher effectiveness, poor academic skills may seriously undercut the effectiveness of teachers (Sykes, 1983). Academic ability independently may not predict teacher effectiveness but nevertheless should not be excluded from selection criteria. In fact, Teddlie, Falk, and Falkowski (1983) found that schools scoring above district averages had faculties with the highest NTE scores. "Teachers must be life-long learners who are able to continually update their base of knowledge, to use new strategies, and to adapt to changing student and community
needs", (Jensen, 1987, p. 22). "Increasingly, school districts are beginning to inquire about test scores of candidates", (Goldstein, 1986, p.11)

Steuteville-Brodinsky et al. (1989) noted in a 1989 AASA survey, approximately 60% of administrators indicated seeking characteristics or qualifications in candidates that they had not sought five years earlier. Of that 60%, "more than half of the new qualifications mentioned were instructional skills, techniques, and understandings" (p. 6). New criteria listed by the administrators included ability to use systematic approaches to instruction, ability to use computer-assisted instruction, ability to teach higher-level thinking and reasoning skills, ability to make the most of technology in learning, ability to use computers for classroom management, ability to teach to different learning styles, and ability to put research-based instructional skills into practice. This report indicated that administrators are displaying a renewed interest in criteria related to academic background and teaching competencies. Browne and Rankin (1986) observed that, at a time when it is increasingly important to select competent teachers, serious questions must be raised when academic factors and teaching competencies receive secondary consideration to personality factors and interpersonal skills.

Teaching competencies such as length of experience and quality of experience are criteria considered by many school districts. Wise et al. (1987), in their case studies, found that some school districts hire only experienced teachers. One example noted was
the Mesa (Arizona) Unified School District. Level of certification and area(s) of certification are other criteria considered by many school districts. "A teaching certificate from an accredited teacher education program assures school district administrators that a candidate has at least minimum qualifications and serves a useful gatekeeping function", (Wise et al., 1987, p. 58). However, certification does not necessarily have a relationship to proficiencies that make for an effective teacher (Levin, 1988). Academic qualifications and teaching competencies were investigated in the current study when principals were questioned about the qualities sought during teacher selection process.

**Personal Attributes and Interpersonal Skills**

"Academic and intellectual skills are only one set of prerequisites for the capable teacher. Personal qualities are equally important", (Jensen, 1987, p. 7). "As administrators select new teachers, they are looking more closely than in the past at their instructional skills and abilities - but this doesn't mean they are unmindful of a candidate's personal characteristics", (Steuteville-Brodinsky et al. 1989, p.13). Teachers should not be hired only on the basis of teaching competencies and academic qualifications, without objectively assessing a candidate's affective attributes such as attitudes and values. If certain personal attributes and interpersonal skills are characteristic of good teachers, some assessment should be made to determine whether candidates possess those attributes and skills. Browne and Rankin (1986) suggested that cognitive ability should
be a secondary consideration for those who select candidates and that personality factors may be more important than knowledge in determining whether or not the novice teacher receives a position. "All in all, while there is certainly a new emphasis on the instructional skills and strategies of teacher candidates, their personal traits and noninstructional talents appear to be just as important - and in most cases examined first", (Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989, p. 15). There are many personal attributes and interpersonal skills found in the research, but there is not one comprehensive list. Most research has been at the district level and only rarely at the school level. Notably, school size and context affect the list. The present study investigated the personal attributes and interpersonal skills sought by principals of effective elementary schools by using qualitative research. We will now review past research findings regarding this theme.

Researchers have found nonverbal cues, such as appearance, voice quality, and dress, are part of administrators' selection criteria. Hatfield (1978) noted four types of candidates' nonverbal traits which were likely to influence selection decisions: a) body language; b) appearance; c) touching behavior, and d) proximities. Young (1984) also found that interviewee's interpersonal performance style influence interviewers' decision.

Webb (1980) surveyed superintendents and found that classroom management and vitality or enthusiasm were the most important characteristics analyzed both in the student teacher evaluation and in the interview. Communication skills were evaluated by
the interview and the application form. Integrity, emotional adjustment, and personal appearance were the other personal characteristics most often assessed in the selection processes. However, it should be noted that Kahl (1980) found no relationship between appearance and teaching success. Booth's (1985) survey of principals found that a likable personality, neat and clean appearance, and effective communication skills were the most valued criteria. Like other studies (Braun et al., 1987; Marcum, 1988), Booth's study revealed an indifference toward academic qualifications.

Stringfield and Teddlie (1988) found that principals of low-SES schools look for "spark" or "energy", and are less concerned with years of teaching experience and advanced degrees. Also, Crone and Teddlie (1995) found that principals of effective schools sought teachers who were creative, flexible, and had a concern for children.

In their search for selection criteria, Johnson and Prom-Jackson (1986) surveyed young adults asking them to describe characteristics of memorable secondary and elementary teachers. The primary characteristics were social or interpersonal skills and affective qualities: a) approachable; b) pleasant; c) easy to relate to; d) accepting; e) tolerant; f) helpful; g) caring; h) and sensitive to the needs of students.

Wise et al. (1987) found that the Rochester (New York) School District employed as the single most important characteristic to be possessed by a teacher was "the capacity to teach in a multicultural, ethnically diverse environment" (p. 44); the characteristics
valued by the Durham County (North Carolina) School District were "enthusiasm, cooperativeness, ability to handle student diversity, willingness to be involved in school activities, and familiarity with the districts' reading program" (p. 51); and the interpersonal qualities measured in the Montgomery County (Maryland) School District were empathy, flexibility, innovation, objectivity, enthusiasm, democratic orientation, and firmness. Wise et al. (1987) found that many other school districts' top criteria were warmth, caring, and enthusiasm. They pointed out that some school systems give first consideration to personal and interpersonal skills "because they believe that human interactive skills, unlike academic and instructional competencies, cannot be taught to teachers" (p. 17). Teaching competencies can be learned, but problems with incompetent teachers seem to be with personal and interpersonal skills, rather than instructional skills.

Braun, Willems, Brown, and Green (1987) found that the variables most likely to influence an administrator in an interview were honesty, interpersonal skills, use of oral English, and personal appearance. Again, grade point average was ranked low as a priority. O'Hair (1989) concurred with Braun et al. stating that "interviewers want to hire individuals possessing exemplary communication skills, both interpersonal communication skills and small group/ public skills" (p. 55). Owens' (1992) review of the 1980's literature identified "teachers who have good communication skills and can build relationships with their students" (p. 20) to be the most effective.
Marcum (1988) sampled 150 personnel directors and 161 principals in Texas and discovered that personal attributes were the most important characteristics they looked for in a prospective teacher, with enthusiasm valued as the most important single quality followed by capacity for classroom management. She also noted that academic background was held to be the least important with IQ, grade point average, and master’s degree being ranked low on the list of 28 teacher qualities.

Because of changing demographics, changes in schools, new state mandates, research on effective schools, more at-risk students, and the need for positive role models, several personal talents and attributes have increased in importance (Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989). Superintendents reported in a 1989 AASA survey that they have been searching increasingly for teachers who possess the following: a) are enthusiastic, positive, upbeat; b) have high expectations for students; c) believe all students can learn; d) are good role models; and e) can respond to the needs of at-risk students.

According to the 1989 AASA survey, 15 of the 20 major characteristics of good teachers, that is, those criteria mentioned most frequently by administrators, were personal traits (Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989). School districts are seeking candidates who have interpersonal skills, ability to get along with co-workers, pleasing manners, a likable personality, and can work with minority students or multiethnic groups.
Garman (1990) studied the criteria utilized by employing officials in selecting public school teachers in Ohio. He found that vitality, high enthusiasm, personal integrity, and control of student behavior were most associated with positive employment decisions. He found differences for preferred teacher characteristics among various school sizes, with vitality and enthusiasm heading the list in small rural schools, while the most important criteria listed by the medium-sized school districts and large school districts were personal integrity and control of student behavior, respectively. Age and marital status were found to have significantly higher levels of importance in small rural schools than in medium-sized and large school districts. Attitude toward cultural differences was found to have significantly higher levels of importance in large districts than in small rural school ones. Notwithstanding these differences, Garman's study found a high level of agreement among employing officials across urbanicity contexts concerning beginning teacher selection criteria.

King (1991) surveyed principals and personnel administrators and found the following characteristics of prospective teachers valued most highly: a) ability to get along with others; b) ability to relate to students; c) ability to stimulate student interest; d) honesty; and e) high expectations for student performance. The characteristics valued least by those hiring officials were identification with school district, length of experience, and ability or willingness to coach or direct extracurricular activities. Of the
four cluster areas including academic qualifications, interpersonal skills, personal skills, and teaching performance, interpersonal skills was rated as most important followed by teaching performance, academic qualifications, and personal skills.

Kowalski, McDaniel, Place, and Reitzug (1992) sampled suburban school principals and discovered the five most important qualities sought in a prospective teacher were respect for students, honesty, ability to work with peers, verbal communication, and quality of previous teaching experience. The principals ranked age, commitment to performing community service, and involvement in high school or college activities lowest on the list of 46 teacher qualities.

Teddlie, Stringfield, Wimpelberg, and Kirby (1987) found principals of effective low-SES schools may seek younger, more idealistic teachers. They also concluded that principals of effective middle-SES schools may seek more experienced teachers.

It should be noted that the criteria listed as most important in many of the studies are attributes that are not easily assessed. Procedures to measure with adequate reliability qualities of personal attributes and interpersonal skills are usually quite expensive and time consuming. For these reasons, "we need to develop more effective procedures to measure important variables such as honesty, ability to work with others, and respect for students", (Kowalski et al., 1992, p. 38). The present study examined the qualities sought by principals of effective elementary schools and procedures utilized to do this.
Procedures Valued and Utilized in Teacher Selection

Not only is it essential for district personnel and school principals to develop and articulate criteria that encompass all the duties and skills required for a teaching opening, it is just as essential that they decide on what kinds of evidence they will gather in appraising candidates on the basis of the stated criteria. Employing officials need to determine what types of procedures they will utilize. Garman (1990) notes that almost as difficult as defining the good teacher is establishing a process that will ensure that the right individual will be employed. In other words, deciding what the necessary qualities of good teachers are, along with the unique qualities for a specific position, is an essential part of decision making for school administrators in teacher selection. In addition, knowledge about the procedures available to measure those qualities reliably is also essential. "Once the selection criteria have been established, decisions must be made about which performance predictors will be used and what employment standards will be specified", (Castetter, 1992, p. 164). "Selection practices have become sophisticated managerial tools which attempt to discover potential personnel capable of entering an organization and successfully accomplishing a given task", (Cureton, 1990, p. 4).

The number of selection procedures used and the purpose for which they are used vary widely among school systems. This variance occurs for two basic reasons. First, gathering information from which to make judgments on the criteria is not always easy
because of the variety of operational definitions of a "good teacher", along with the notion that effective teaching behaviors vary across grade levels, subject areas, types of students, and instructional goals (Wise et al., 1987). Therefore, selection procedures and how they are used and weighed should indeed vary among school districts according to the criteria emphasized (Webster, 1988; Jensen, 1987; ). Bredeson (1985) and Wise et al. (1987) suggest that administrators should give various kinds of applicant information different weights or values according to the district's definition of good teaching.

Second, this variation results from different views of how consistently mechanisms assess candidates, and how accurate, comprehensive, and balanced the mechanisms are in assessing the candidate's potential for effective teaching. In a district or school, teacher quality depends on the predictive power of measures, congruence of measures and goals, and congruence of measures with the teaching concept (Wise et al, 1987).

The basic idea behind the selection procedure is to organize selection activities so that information about applicants can be compared to the criteria for the position (Castetter, 1992. Castetter (1992) counsels that procedures used by school districts should lead to reliable and valid assessments of a candidate's qualifications, attributes, and skills. Formalization of the procedures can help ensure that only factors related to performance expectations and other job-related criteria lead to the identification of the best candidate.
"The consensus of research findings is that school administrators often fail to gather multiple information about candidates and fail to thoroughly assess the necessary knowledge, attributes, and skills needed for good teaching" (Jensen, 1987, p. 16). Therefore decisions to hire teachers may be based on inadequate selection procedures. "Unsatisfactory results in the selection process are frequently due to misapplication or nonapplication of selection techniques", (Castetter, 1992, p. 148).

"The number employed varies, depending on system size, sophistication of the selectors, cost, time consumption, and importance of the selection process in the eyes of the system", (Castetter, 1992, p. 166). The case studies conducted by Wise et al. (1987) revealed that school districts use, to varying degrees, the following methods to assess candidates: a) reviewing of certification and college transcripts; b) checking of personal references; c) conducting formal, standardized interviews; d) consulting informal networks; and e) observing actual teaching performance. The selection procedures should be uniquely designed to meet the needs and resources of individual school districts. This design typically includes a variety of activities ranging from initial collection of written information to final interview and decisions to hire (Bredeson, 1985). Kahl (1980) noted that "many of the techniques which are used in teacher selection apparently are dictated more by expediency than by reasoned and knowledgeable considerations of what are the best selection procedures" (p. 3).
Wise et al. (1987) warned that the formal screening mechanisms and logistics of selection have great influence on the quality of staff hired. Lengthy, bureaucratic, and impersonal procedures may discourage some candidates, but good procedures are neither bureaucratic nor impersonal, however they may be lengthy. None the less, if teacher selection procedures are too informal or haphazard, candidates may develop the perception that the district is not committed to hiring competent teachers.

Like criteria, procedures should be established at the district level and tailored to the needs, mission, and context of each school. "Techniques of selection are best validated at the local level", (Jensen, 1987, p. 27). Jensen (1987) also noted that tailoring the procedures around locally valued criteria is an investment that pays rich dividends compared to the financial and emotional cost of dealing with an incompetent teacher.

With the elevated interest in good teacher selection, many school districts are expanding and developing more thorough selection procedures. The 1989 AASA survey showed that one third of the school systems had developed, within the past five years, new techniques, strategies, and instruments for identifying the presence of desirable characteristics in teachers and teacher candidates. Further, 45% of the administrators have developed new instruments to aid in the identification of good teachers (Steuteville-Brodinsky et al, 1989).
A review of the literature, however, reveals a paucity of recent educational research into selection procedures. Jensen (1987) stated that "studies of hiring practices are few, validation of procedures is minimal, advice to well-intentioned personnel directors is scarce" (p. 16). Many administrators have been on their own in teacher selection so far as validated procedures are concerned. For example, Teddlie and Stringfield (1993) found that principals of effective schools investigated candidates' files at the central office to find a good match for a vacant position, argued for special consideration, and actively consulted with the central office regarding vacancies. The lack of consensus regarding fruitful selection procedures for schools of differing context was investigated in the current study, because information regarding effective selection procedures lends itself to effective schooling.

Garman (1990) analyzed the procedures utilized by employing officials in selecting public school teachers in Ohio. His study found very few differences in screening procedures among school districts of various sizes. He found procedures were ranked in the following order: a) principals involved in the interview; b) personal references; c) structured interview; d) official transcript; e) letter of application; f) unstructured interview; g) written exercise; h) Teacher Perceiver Interview; i) teachers involved in the interview; j) NTE scores; k) videotape of candidate teaching; l) audiotape of candidate teaching; and m) lay citizens involved in the interview.
King (1991) surveyed 300 principals and 100 personnel administrators in North Carolina and found the most commonly used procedures, in frequency of use, were interviews, recommendations, transcripts, application forms, and videotapes. However, the administrators' rank order of confidence in procedures were transcripts, application forms, interviews, videotapes, and recommendations. Because the following categories of data collection procedures appear in the literature as useful information sources for selection decisions: a) examinations; b) interviews; c) observations; and d) background checks, the current study investigated the utilization of them by posing the research question, "What procedures do principals utilize to select teachers?" A discussion of each procedure is presented next.

**Examinations**

Teacher testing has been a topic of active discussion in education for many years. The widespread accusations that public schools are doing a poor job and that many teachers are themselves deficient in basic academic skills have caused many states and localities to turn to competency tests to evaluate their teachers and applicants. During the 1980s, a strong trend toward the use of standardized tests for initial certification and hiring took place (Wise et al., 1987). "The ease of administering standardized tests, together with their objectivity and the time they save, can be attractive features", (Khamis, 1986, p. 6). Most of the tests used in the selection of teachers are state mandated, test for minimum
competencies, and are used for gross screening purposes. Minimum competency testing of teachers in basic skills and knowledge has now become an activity occupying the time of many state education officials. "Most states involved in certification testing assess beginning teachers with performance-based evaluations, multiple-choice tests, or both. Some tests are designed to measure basic academic skills; others are developed to measure basic pedagogical knowledge; and, others purport to measure content area knowledge", (Kromrey & Renfrow, 1991, p.1).

Salzman and Whitfield (1989) suggest that test content should measure such knowledge base components as content knowledge, general pedagogical knowledge, curriculum knowledge, and pedagogical content knowledge. In addition, skills in applying this knowledge base, interpersonal, oral and written communications skills, ability to reframe a problem, and the ability to plan and implement instruction so that students demonstrate measurable learning are skills that should be measured. However, examinations of teacher candidates are not limited to testing their knowledge base or performance skills. Exams can be used to gather information by testing intelligence, aptitude, interest, achievement, medical well-being, writing skills, and personality.

No single test score can predict teacher competency and should not be interpreted as a single, adequate predictor of teaching performance, but they may establish a baseline of skill levels essential for a teacher (Jensen, 1987). Any test of knowledge is likely to
measure only a sample of the important qualities necessary to be a teacher and therefore is only a piece of the puzzle (Darling-Hammond, 1986).

Considerable attention needs to be directed toward the selection of test content and the creation of a test structure more responsive to measuring the sophisticated profile of a competent teacher. Kromrey and Renfrow (1991) encouraged practitioners to "consider the broad possibilities of multiple-choice testing, beyond the previous limits of measuring the lowest level of cognitive ability" (p. 1). The literature recognizes the limitations of traditional multiple-choice tests and recommends more authentic assessment techniques. Kromrey and Renfrow (1991) stated that "Several projects are underway to explore more "authentic" approaches to teacher assessment, using videotapes of classroom instruction, essay questions, portfolio evaluation, and simulation exercises. These assessment approaches are appealing to their face validity; however, they are significantly more expensive to administer and score, and their psychometric rigor has not been thoroughly appraised" (p. 3).

Even though there are a number of examinations used in the selection of teachers and valuable information may be obtained through employment tests, Castetter (1992) cautioned, "because of the costs, specialized personnel needed, variations in predictive validity and reliability, applicant acceptance of test requirements, charges of discrimination when tests are required, possibility of litigation, and union as well as other
pressures to eliminate testing, the addition of tests to the selection process becomes a matter for careful deliberation" (p. 171).

According to Rebore (1991), exams should be locally developed and administered, matching the school district needs and the position to be filled. Also, when selecting an exam, administrators should check its validity and reliability, be aware of all legal and ethical issues, and never use it as the sole data source for selection. Legal rulings require that tests, be clearly job related to justify their use. However, while many of the minimum competency exams have raised ethical and legal questions, "such tests can provide useful measures of knowledge if their content is related to the types of knowledge deemed important", (Wise et al., 1987, p.85).

Many locally developed teacher examinations remain unvalidated. However, "proponents argue that regardless of whether such tests exhibit anything more than face validity, the kind of cognitive competence they purport to measure is an important prerequisite to teaching and such tests reassure a wary public that there is some objective standard for teacher selection", (Wise et al., 1987, pp. 5-6).

The test battery in widest use nationwide is the NTE which measures skills in reading, writing, and mathematics, as well as academic knowledge in special areas. Numerous studies indicate that scores on the NTE do not correlate highly with actual teacher performance in the classroom (Browne & Rankin, 1986; Olstad, Beal, & Marrett, 1987;
Wise et al., 1987). In 1977, the Dallas Independent School District decided to replace the NTE with the more expedient Wesman Personnel Classification Test (WPCT). The WPCT examines applicants' verbal and quantitative ability and can be administered locally in less than one half an hour (Webster, 1988).

Given the increasing utilization of tests for the initial licensure of teachers, the National Computer Systems (NCS) expanded the teacher licensure assessment options in 1990 by developing the Content Master Examination for Educators (CMEE). The test begins with 15 videotape-based items, followed by 120 multiple-choice, paper and pencil items. The videotape-based CMEE incorporates the live-action and scripted-stage segments with real teachers and real students engaged in the teaching/learning process. Test items were created to assess teachers' knowledge of central pedagogical concepts across grades K-12. The test requires not only that the examinees have a good working knowledge of pedagogical principles, but also that they be able to observe and identify the application or misapplication of those principles as they occur during classroom instruction (Stanley, 1990). The test is intended to assess candidates' pedagogical prowess by having the examinees assess actual teaching/learning episodes on tape.

A different type of teacher examination asks the question, what causes the differing degrees of success among teachers with equal intelligence, training, and knowledge of subject matter or similar credentials? Since the late 1960's there has been considerable
research in determining the personal qualities or attitudes that are possessed by good teachers. Most people today accept the idea that a positive teacher attitude is conducive to higher achievement for students (e.g., Mickler & Solomon, 1986). Jensen (1987) noted that school administrators are fully aware that important social and personal characteristics are required for scholars to become successful teachers.

Selection Research Inc. (SRI) is a private consulting firm in Lincoln, Nebraska, that specializes in providing training on the selection of professional staff for schools. Sixty questions are asked in the Teacher Perceiver Interview, five for each of the 12 different themes; an interviewer’s guide notes what to listen for in candidate responses. The 12 SRI themes are mission, empathy, rapport, individualized perception, listening, investment, input, activation, innovation, gestalt, objectivity, and focus. The SRI Perceiver Academies have published a number of studies which support the validity of the Teacher Perceiver Interview (SRI Perceiver Academies, 1991).

Project Empathy, developed by the Omaha Public Schools, was the forerunner for the Teacher Perceiver Interview. It is similar to the Teacher Perceiver Interview but simpler. In the early 1970's Omaha Public Schools, under Project Empathy, surveyed thousands of students, teachers, parents, and administrators to determine the qualities needed by a teacher to be the most effective in the classroom. The eight themes that emerged as characteristics of great teachers were as follows: a) relationship; b) democratic
orientation; c) rapport; d) empathy; e) student orientation; f) acceptance; g) student success; and h) work and professional orientation. From this information a 32-item Omaha Teacher Interview (OTT) instrument was developed to differentiate between average and above average teachers by assessing attitudes and personalities (Mickler & Solomon, 1986).

Some studies question the validity of such tests in determining the effectiveness of teachers (Mickler & Solomon, 1986; Mills, 1987; Smith, 1980). Yet administrators like these instruments because candidates are compared based on application of consistent criteria. Also efficiency is increased, and teachers may be identified who have the traits which work well with students (Wise et al., 1987).

Nicholson and McInerney (1988) include the ability to write English clearly in their list of teacher effectiveness dimensions. Usage examinations should not only provide information about the applicant's ability to spell, punctuate, and use good syntax, but also to organize thoughts and to think and communicate in writing. Most standardized tests used in the country have focused on the technical skills of writing and have not indicated whether or not a candidate could actually write clearly, coherently, and accurately. "More and more frequently, districts are supplementing the state-required tests with their own exercises, usually tests of written expression", (Jensen, 1987, p. 24).
In 1977, the Dallas Independent School District initiated a standard essay test for applicants in their teacher selection program. The test was entitled the Personnel Services Department Essay Test (PSDET) (Webster, 1988). The purpose of the PSDET is to gain information about each applicant's ability to deal with three specific components of writing: a) legibility of handwriting; b) mechanical skills - punctuation, grammar, capitalization, and spelling; and c) composition - a composite of clarity, congruence, and organization.

School districts particularly concerned with the communication skills of new teachers ask candidates to submit various types of writing samples. Most of the district officials emphasizing writing skills in the selection criteria assume that, unless a teacher writes well, students cannot receive quality instruction in writing. Further, these district officials assume the probability exists that candidates who write poorly will not stress writing and often will be unable to respond appropriately to the efforts of students (Hendrickson, 1983). "Especially useful are the writing samples that give screeners insight into a candidate's attitudes, teaching ideas, philosophies, and good judgment", (Steuteville-Brodinsky et al. 1989, p. 31). The written statement should contain ideas, beliefs, and values related to class planning, teaching objectives, familiarity with educational literature, and special skills with appropriate evidence supporting the statements (Caliendo, 1986).
Interviews

The interview continues to be the most common procedure used in the selection of teachers (Castallo et al., 1992; Castetter, 1992; Kahl, 1980; Saville, 1986; Caldwell, 1993). The interview is not only the most widely used but also the most influential selection technique (Jensen, 1987). "The interview reveals insights and information about prospective teachers that other selection strategies cannot", (Wise et al., 1987, p. 8). "An interview helps employers evaluate a candidate's social and personal characteristics", (Jensen, 1987, p. 18). All too often, what appears magnificent on paper is disappointing face to face. One can learn more about an individual through a well-conducted interview than through resumes, application forms, and letters of reference (Balistreri, 1991).

The prime objectives of the interview are information giving, information receiving, and checking on individual "chemistry" (Saville, 1986). "Even though the findings concerning the limited reliability and validity of the employment interview are well known, it continues to be a widely used technique in teacher selection. When choosing personnel, the interview is about the only way one can see what the applicant looks like, of getting a check on their personality, of selling the organization to a promising applicant, of getting acquainted with them as a person, or simply to see if there is any type of "interactive chemistry" with this individual", (Saville, 1986, p. 3).
In spite of the caveats from research findings, a well-conducted, tailored interview is believed to be a vital part of the whole selection process and holds great potential for gathering information about the potential candidate that cannot be obtained in any other way. There are many definitions of an interview. Regardless of the definition, however, its success will be determined by the atmosphere of the interview (Martin, 1993). "Most school districts conduct two sets of interviews—preliminary and final", (Castallo et al., 1992, p. 82).

**Structured Interviews**

Interviews can be either structured or unstructured. The information derived from a structured interview is more informed and dependable for use in the employment decision-making process than information obtained through an unstructured interview (Castetter, 1992; Kahl, 1980; Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989; Caldwell, 1993). The structured interview utilizes a standard list of questions prepared in advance from which the interviewer does not deviate. If all candidates are asked the same questions, they will be treated equally, and the interviewers will have a common base upon which to evaluate candidates (Castetter, 1992; Nesbit & Tadlock, 1986).

Interviewers are advised to select a candidate on the basis of the characteristics of the vacancy. "A logical connection should exist between job requirements, job description, and the interview questions", (Castallo et al., 1992, p. 89). A well-constructed structured
interview should provide decision makers with evidence relevant to the characteristics of
the applicants and their qualifications (Castallo et al., 1992; Clifford, 1975). Interview
questions should elicit explicit information (Goldstein, 1986). "The most useful
structured interviewing requires developing questions that center on the traits and skills
the district considers important, developing a rating system for the replies, and training
interviewers in interviewing techniques - eliciting responses, note taking, tape recording
of answers, reviewing tapes, assessing a candidate’s replies, etc.", (Steuteville-Brodinsky
et al., 1989, p. 32).

Another benefit of the structured interview is that it helps gather information
pertinent to the job and reduces the likelihood that inappropriate and unnecessary
questions will be asked that may lead to an inappropriate decision. Also, a structured
interview protocol reduces the tendency of interviewers to talk too much or make hasty
decisions. "In view of the fact that the structured interview provides a firmer base and
has the potential for higher predictive validity than the unstructured interview, greater
attention is given to its employment", (Castetter, 1992, p. 172).

Young and Heneman (1986) pointed out the importance of interviewers to be alert to
applicants' body language. O'Hair (1989) stated that "body language (hand shake, eye
contact, posture, dress, vocal rate and pitch, and energy level) send immediate feedback
about the applicant's enthusiasm and their ability to fit into the school district" (p. 55).
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When nonverbal and verbal cues conflict, interviewers tend to remember the nonverbal message more readily than the verbal.

**Unstructured Interviews**

The unstructured interview encourages candidates to talk openly about topics introduced by the interviewers to suit the occasion (Jensen, 1987). The unstructured interview usually is not based on predetermined questions. It allows the interviewer freedom in eliciting information from different types of applicants (Castetter, 1992).

"Typically, the interview is unstructured, lasts less than one hour, and is influenced by first impressions, appearance, nonverbal behavior, and conversational skills. Untrained interviewers tend to ask unchallenging questions and use the interview as an opportunity to talk about their accomplishments or philosophy", (Jensen, 1987, p. 18).

Jinks (1985) pointed out that it is not uncommon for interviewers to ask few questions, and then arrive at their decision to hire or reject an applicant within the first five minutes of the interview based on a relatively small amount of information. The remainder of the interview is used to find evidence to support the predetermined choice (Jensen, 1987).

**Team Interviews**

One popular and effective strategy for improving teacher selection is to make greater use of group judgment. A growing number of school systems are involving more people
in the selection of teachers by creating selection teams. The selection process can be
made more fair, effective, and reliable by combining the judgments of principals,
teachers, parents, and school board members as it is more free from one person's bias
(Gips & Bredeson, 1984; Mueller, 1993; Jensen, 1987; Kahl, 1980; Kopetskie, 1983;
suggested that several people should be involved in the development of the interview
questions and in the evaluation of candidates. Clifford (1975) stated that a benefit of the
team interview technique is the fact that students and staff, in his experience, "are more
cautious and thoughtful in the hiring process" (p. 20). "When a team approach is used in
hiring, candidates may also have the chance to meet potential fellow teachers, other
district administrators, and possibly even parents, board members, and students",
(Castallo et al., 1992, p. 82).

Wise et al., (1987) and Herman (1993) suggested that teachers as well as principals
should be involved in the selection process. Their involvement enhances the validity of
the process by providing great insight into candidates' subject matter competence and
teaching philosophy and conveys a view of teaching as a professional role (Wise et al.,
1987).

Phillips (1989) added another benefit of teacher involvement in the hiring process and
stated that when boards empower teachers, staff selection policies take on greater
importance. One criterion often used in the selection process is a shared school philosophy and vision. And who better to evaluate these attributes in candidates than the teachers of that school? "The chance of selecting the right candidate is enhanced by inclusion of members of the teaching staff in the interview", (Wise et al., 1987, p. 63).

Wise et al. (1987) recognized that an important opportunity for teachers to define and implement professional standards is provided by their participation in the selection of teachers. They found that teachers welcome the additional responsibility of being involved in teacher selection, the measure of control it gives them to choose their colleagues, and the opportunity to rethink their own beliefs. Teachers' involvement in selection has increased their investment in new teachers (Wise et al., 1987). Phillips (1989) added the following advantages to increased level of teachers' participative decision making: a) human growth and development; b) more willing acceptance of decisions; c) enhanced quality of decisions; d) enhanced sense of belongingness; e) satisfaction of teachers' desires for democratic structures and control in their organizational work life. (p. 26)

Teachers should be invited, not ordered into the selection process. Where in the selection process and to what extent they want to be involved depends upon interest, knowledge, and experience concerning the decisions to be made (Sick & Shapiro, 1991). However, Gips and Bredeson (1984) found that teachers were rarely involved in the
selection of teachers until recently, even though greater job satisfaction resulted from asking staff for their opinions. Teachers in rural districts reported the highest level of participation. The 1989 AASA survey showed almost 75% of school districts were involving the faculty to either some or a large extent in teacher selection (Steuteville-Brodinsky et al, 1989). Teacher selection, once thought of as primarily an administrator's function, thus has recently evolved into a mutually shared responsibility involving teachers and administrators.

The selection of staff should also involve community-spirited citizens with background relevant to the position being filled. Some school districts are including parents in interviewing and selecting candidates to fill teacher vacancies. The experience shows that giving parents a direct role in choosing teachers can be the basis for a productive partnership between parents and school (Herman, 1993). "Involvement of both teachers and citizens increases the reliability of staff selection without the board, or superintendent, forfeiting any of their prerogatives", (LaMarche, 1981, p. 10).

Al-Rubaiy (1993), assistant superintendent in Chagrin Falls (Ohio) Exempted Village Schools, found that in her district team interviewing resulted in different groups viewing the candidate's qualifications differently. The central office looked for people who could contribute to the district's overall program; principals looked for people who could have a positive effect in their schools; teachers were concerned about how the teacher would...
affect a specific grade or subject area; and parents were interested in how the
prospective teacher would relate to and meet the needs of the individual child. Not only
were parents concerned about the academic education of their students, but they viewed
students' social education as being very important as well. Quite an interesting finding in
view of the fact that this would seem to be the mission of the district and school.

Interviewer Training

Teachers and principals need training as interviewers to assess data. Most educational
courses do not offer school hiring officials extensive information or training in interview
techniques in the selection of teachers. Jensen (1986) suggested that school systems
conduct formal training for interviewers so that uniform hiring standards and practices
exist throughout the school system, and the chance that desirable candidates are "run
off" will be decreased. "Careful training improves interrater reliability between
interviews", (Shelton, 1989, p. 8). "Tailoring or targeting the interview not only adds to
the reliability and validity of the selection process, it also provides a certain degree of
findings suggest that the personality characteristics of the interviewer can significantly
influence the applicant's decision to accept or reject a job offer. The authors suggest that
by training interviewers to be sensitive and fair toward all applicants, a school district
can gain a competitive edge in selecting the best teachers.
During the interviews, it is imperative that all unlawful inquiries be avoided. Among those established by recent court decisions and legislative actions as illegal inquiries are questions regarding age, color of skin, religious preference, ancestry, national origin, marital status, disabilities, and certain diseases. State laws vary with respect to other limitations. Structuring the interview within the respective state and federal laws provides the interviewer with necessary legal protection (Castallo et al., 1992).

Interviewers should become knowledgeable about what is acceptable in interviews and applications. Castallo et al. (1992) noted, "A district is wise to conduct annual training dealing with laws and their impact on the selection process. The persons conducting the interviews should know about equal employment laws and regulations that guarantee a person's rights to fair treatment in employment" (p. 85).

Despite its limitations, interviews remain one of the most powerful tools for securing information and impressions about an applicant. It can yield data and observations about candidates that other methods cannot provide. Reliability increases when interviews are structured and a candidate participates in a series of interviews with a selection team (Castetter, 1992; Jensen, 1987). Clearly, the interview process can be a valuable procedure in teacher selection. The current study investigated the use of interviews during teacher selection with the research question: "What procedures do principals utilize to select teachers?"
Observations

A relatively new but rich source of data in the teacher selection process is the use of observation. Employers should consider various kinds of information about candidates. Information may be gathered by viewing an audio-visual portfolio, by directly observing an applicant's performance, or a combination of the two. Observation of a teacher candidate provides an opportunity to check the instructional skills, level of knowledge, interactive skills, and teaching strategies of the applicant to get information on a candidate's teaching proficiency. Frase (1991) stated, "The most reliable method of assessing a candidate's teaching ability is to observe that candidate in the classroom. One way to arrange for this observation is to invite prospective teachers to your school system and put them in a classroom with a lesson plan. Another is to arrange for a staff member traveling on business in the candidate's area to stop by to observe a lesson. A third approach is to ask the teacher to send a videotape of a lesson." (p. 23)

"Many districts have adopted the strategy of having candidates teach sample lessons to classes of students" (Castallo et al., 1992, p. 103) in spite of the fact that classroom observations can be expensive, inconvenient, and time consuming. Yet, how can a teacher's instructional skills and abilities be evaluated except through observation? "There is consensus that demonstration teaching would significantly improve selection. However, both teachers and administrators believe that the time required for involving
the selection teams and candidates in the process would be prohibitive", (Wise et al., 1987, p. 51). In spite of the difficulties, direct observation is needed to select the very best teachers.

Woods (1986) suggests that each applicant should be asked to submit lesson plans, a sample unit, bulletin board ideas, and other evidence of the types of school activities he or she has been engaged in to be used as evaluative information. She further suggests that observations be conducted by selected teams of the school's best teachers.

Caliendo (1986) recommends that several significant performance variables, including pupil responses, participation, and instructional objectives and techniques, be rated by evaluators during the observed lesson. He suggests that immediately following the lesson, each candidate should be interviewed by the observation team. The interview can be used as an opportunity for candidates to ask questions and explain decisions they made during the performance evaluation.

Braun et al. (1987) reported that 76% of the administrators in Wyoming indicated that they were interested in seeing a videotaped lesson. They recommended a development of teaching portfolios for teacher education students that include a videotape of the applicant teaching a lesson displaying specific teaching skills.

Another type of observation technique is the assessment center. Assessment centers are where supervisors have an opportunity to observe candidates for a particular job.
Candidates are taken through a series of simulations dealing with teaching problems which will probably be encountered on the job (Rebore, 1991). Assessment center data have been used in the past primarily in the selection of administrators. Its use in teacher selection has been limited because of cost in time and money; yet, the process holds great potential for supplying a rich base of information on a wide variety of criteria.

**Background Information**

"According to a number of studies, the most useful evidence of future success is past success in a similar position", (Castallo et al., 1992, p. 75). Much of the background evidence can be gathered through a variety of procedures. Castallo et al. suggests that prior to inviting candidates in for an interview, an exhaustive check of each candidate's background should be conducted in a uniform manner. Reviewing background data serves primarily as a gate-keeping function which enables districts to process large pools of candidates efficiently (Wise et al., 1987). "Screening applicant paperwork is an integral part of teacher selection", (Shelton, 1989, p. 5). Individual schools differ on the background information they desire from applicants (Shelton, 1989). Unless there are uniform criteria for the position, the degree of emphasis attached to the various procedural checks on background varies widely depending on the perceptions of the person conducting the screening process (Khamis, 1986). In reviewing background information, uniform hiring standards and practices should exist throughout the school.
system so that applicants will be treated equally, and the interviewers will have a common base on which to evaluate candidates.

"Whether obtained by telephone, mail, or direct contact, information should be checked to determine its accuracy and to ensure its adequacy", (Castetter, 1992, p. 173). Failure to check references thoroughly can create problems in the selection process (Castallo et al., 1992). Rebore (1991) warns that "the risk of hiring a person who has a criminal record has created much concern for personnel administrators over the past few years" (p. 109). Parents are becoming active in suing districts for hiring teachers who are technically incompetent (DeMitchell, 1990), and who have been convicted of moral misconduct, and so on (Shakeshaft & Cohan, 1995). An increasing number of states and local education officials are subjecting prospective school employees to rigorous background checks including fingerprinting and criminal record checks. "Some argue that such checks are humiliating, insulting, and an invasion of a job candidate's privacy. Others say such checks are the least that can be done to make schools safe for kids". (Zakariya, 1988, p. 17). There may be legal problems if the employee turns out to have a criminal record and injures a student (Zakariya, 1988; Shakeshaft & Cohan, 1995). The school could be sued for negligent hiring.
"Since the publication of *A Nation at Risk* districts have increasingly sought transcripts as evidence of an applicant's academic achievement", (Jensen, 1987, p. 23). While transcripts lack predictive power with respect to suitability for the type of child to be taught as well as the probability of longevity in the district, "good transcripts mean good students and serve as one guarantee that candidates have acceptable mastery of the subjects they are licensed to teach", (Goldstein, 1986, p. 15). "Credentials are the authentications of one's legal and personal fitness to perform services requiring defined skills in an area of work. Compiling all credential material needed to apply for a teaching job is a tedious but necessary task", (Goldstein, 1986, p. 15). University transcripts are the best indicators of an applicant's scholarship, and they should be scrutinized by school personnel (Goldstein, 1986; Shelton, 1989). Transcripts and credentials should be reviewed for each of the applicants, inspecting for depth of study in a particular subject field (Jenkins, 1984). Transcripts and credentials should also be reviewed to ascertain certification and to establish salary eligibility (Goldstein, 1986).

As a selection tool, the application blank is efficient, robust, and highly valid as a predictor for a broad spectrum of very practical criteria. The application blank is an important selection tool for collecting standardized biographical data on candidates during initial paper-screening activities. Applications are usually used as pre-screening tools to weed out those who do not meet the basic employment requisites. A
well-structured application form provides a uniform method for collecting pertinent data, and, if read carefully, usually yields telling information (Castallo et al., 1992). In addition, the standardized application blank has a high degree of face validity for employees and employers. Application blanks provide low-cost means to gather biographical data, previous job experiences, educational background, and a variety of personal information that would otherwise be impossible or impractical to collect on individuals (Bredeson, 1988).

Bredeson (1988) provides three general reasons supporting the use of data related to the assessment of past accomplishments and performance records of individuals secured in application blanks: a) past behavior is the best indicator of future behavior; b) samples of past behavior are preferable to signs; and c) biodata are samples of past behavior and are the best indicators of future behaviors. (p. 69)

Rebore (1991) discussed the use of two different types of application forms in the selection process. The first format emphasizes detailed and extensive factual information and is used to gather basic information about a candidate's background and related experiences. The second format emphasizes the candidate's opinions, attitudes, and values. Castetter (1992) states that "instead of limiting the employment application to its traditional purpose of a factual summation, this selection device can be designed to secure attitudinal information which can be explored during the interview" (p. 169).
Caliendo (1986) notes that the applicant questionnaire can be used to determine knowledge in the educational field and also of writing skills. Castetter (1992) adds that another emerging issue in the design of application blanks is the inclusion of items designed to elicit personal information, authorization to verify information, or agreement to certain conditions if employed (Castetter, 1992). However, application forms should only ask for information that the employers really need to know and should be reviewed to see if they elicit truly pertinent information (Castetter, 1992; Goldstein, 1986). "It is probably true that there are superfluous items on a majority of application blanks". (Castetter, 1992, p. 168).

Bredeson (1986) investigated the effects of letters of recommendation on teacher selection decisions following Tucker and Rowe's (1979) discovery that impressions formed on the basis of reference letters had a strong influence on the final interview decision. Four hypothetical letters of recommendation for a social studies teacher were constructed which contained identical items of information about the candidate. Letters were varied by tone of the information (favorable or neutral) and length of the letter (short or long). After sending the four different letters to a random sample of 160 high school principals, it was concluded that there is no significant difference in the rating of applicants who presented long or short recommendation letters. However, favorable information had a significant effect on the high school principals' ratings of candidates.
Because of the perceived unreliability of personal references which are often open to interpretation, some school systems no longer ask applicants to submit letters of recommendation or ask for character references. Instead some districts require application blanks which ask for details including exact periods of employment, exact duties, why the applicant left the job, and whether the individual would rehire the applicant. In addition, school districts working to improve teacher selection processes are providing the former principals and other supervisors of candidates evaluation forms for rating the performance and personal characteristics of applicants (Saville, 1986).

The reliability and validity of the information gained through references is limited because raters are presented with broad categories representing a range of interpersonal behaviors (Wise et al., 1987); applicants do their best to give reference forms only to people who will respond favorably (Castallo et al., 1992; Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989; Wise et al., 1987); and principals' rating of teachers who are applying for new positions is often suspect (Goldstein, 1986; Wise et al., 1987). This suspicion is raised because an administrator may be trying to "dump" a poor teacher and because letters of recommendation offered by an applicant tend to be glowing and filled with unsupported praise. Perhaps reference letter writers are intimidated because of "sunshine" laws and are cautious about putting anything in writing that could later be used against them in litigation (Castallo et al., 1992; Goldstein, 1986; Shelton, 1989). Castallo et al.,
recommends that school district officials determine that the candidate's file contains all letters that would logically be included.

Examinations of resumes with professional references are often used to narrow the field of candidates. Professional references can "indicate the extent to which a candidate's previous professors, principals, or colleagues consider him or her to have the interpersonal skills necessary to be an effective teacher", (Wise et al., 1987, p. 60).

"In effect, professional references can provide appraisals of past performance and classroom observation appraisals of current performance. Because past and current performance are the best predictors of future performance, these mechanisms may provide the most reliable and valid assessment of how effectively candidates will teach", (Wise et al., 1987, p. 64). Jensen (1987) notes that "the ratings of cooperating teachers were found to be the best predictors of teaching performance three to six years after the completion of teacher education" (p. 25).

Goldstein (1986) stated, "An antidote to the sterility and sameness of many letters of recommendation as well as to invigorate fact-finding, judicious use of the telephone is necessary" (p. 19). While it is advisable to have references in writing, administrators agree that more fruitful, precise, and reliable information on candidates' abilities is obtained by talking with former or present principals, supervisors, and employers on the telephone (Goldstein, 1986; Jenkins, 1984; Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989).
"Telephone calls are the most common form of employment verification", (Castallo et al., 1992, p. 79). Besides being convenient, telephone calls can serve as a means of gathering valuable information on candidates. Most listed references will discuss a candidate more candidly on the telephone than in writing. Castallo et al. (1992) encouraged administrators to contact all former employees "to verify a candidate's past performance and professional characteristics - strengths, weaknesses and reason for leaving the previous job" (p. 75). Goldstein (1986) recommends that "candidates should be told that their references may be contacted on the telephone as one or more ways of getting to know you" (p. 19). Castallo et al. (1992) warned that use of the telephone does provide a security risk. "An administrator receiving a phone call from an alleged administrator does not know whether the caller is in fact an administrator" (p. 80).

**Legal Concerns**

There are some other concerns to address during teacher selection, for example, the employment of the disabled. Employment of the disabled has become a sensitive issue since the enactment of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act (EEOC) of 1972 and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Bredeson, 1986; Goldstein, 1986). Until the passage of those two acts, school districts were free to ask for whatever information they wanted regardless of its relation to an individual's ability to perform effectively in the position. Sensitivity regarding the employment of the handicapped has been elevated further since
the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1992. Care must be taken to avoid illegal questions concerning race, religion, marital status, or personal habits or handicaps. Bredeson (1988) states, "Materials and practices which are discriminatory are not only illegal, but when combined with requests for irrelevant candidate information, together they are not likely to compromise a school district's goal of hiring the most capable individuals who have the potential for high quality performance in the organization based on job related experiences" (p. 77). Bredeson and Caldwell (1988) reported the results of an analysis of legal compliance by public school districts in the use of application blanks in a large northeastern state. They found that 45.7% of respondent districts were using application blanks for professional positions which contained from one to as many as nine specific requests for information which were in violation of EEOC guidelines.

In summary, there appear to be evolving methods and tools available for teacher selection. Administrators should explore the potential of such methods and tools. Steuteville-Brodinsky et al. (1989) suggests the following: a) review and improve selection procedures; b) involve more people in the selection process; c) use screening tests and devices; d) check references and credentials; e) use team interviews, structured interviews, commercial instruments; f) observe candidates at work in the classroom; and g) provide inservice on teacher selection (p. 28). The current study explored the use of selection procedures in effective elementary schools.
Problems in Teacher Selection

Almost all school districts face a number of problems and hurdles during the process of selecting good teachers. The number of hurdles and types of problems vary widely among school systems. Decision making in the selection process can be improved through an understanding of internal and external school elements including transfers, inadequate or flawed information systems, inadequate funding for recruitment and selection, lack of applicants, court decisions, and legislation (Castetter, 1992; Saville, 1986; Wise et al., 1987). Although research regarding the problems associated with selection of teachers is almost nonexistent, there are an identified number scattered throughout the literature. These problems are examined in subsections entitled a) institutional problems; b) job-related problems; c) logistical problems; d) geographical problems; and e) organizational problems. The significance of discussing the problems associated with teacher selection is that the current study investigated this theme in an attempt to shed light on problems which may need to be overcome in order that selection procedures be more productive.

Institutional Problems

Most superintendents and principals consider teacher selection an important administrative task. Yet very few districts train their administrators in the theory and practice of teacher selection (Kahl, 1980; Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989), or allocate
a significant amount of time or money to teacher selection (Jensen, 1987). Most districts lack teacher selection policies and processes (Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989), offer inadequate salary or benefits to attract quality candidates (Barker, 1985), and allow systematic bias to influence decisions (Young & Voss, 1986).

Seldom do the hiring officials have any training in selection techniques. Steuteville-Brodinsky et al. (1989) found that "few courses in educational administration provide useful theory and practice in teacher selection" (p. 27). Donaldson (1990) supports this contention by stating that "most administration courses do not offer principals extensive information or training in these activities (selection and induction); such a goal would require the better part of a course" (p. 1). This lack of training and inservice means that most administrators and selection teams learn their selection skills through trial and error. Steuteville-Brodinsky et al. strongly recommended training for administrators in the teacher selection process. Members of selection committees need training in learning how to develop position criteria and utilize selection procedures effectively.

Heynderickx (1987) noted that school districts may not be allocating adequate time, energy, and money to the selection of teachers. In addition to these inadequacies, Jensen (1987) noted that many districts lack the policies to do well in selection. Decisions to hire teachers may be based on inadequate selection criteria and procedures. Steuteville-Brodinsky et al. (1989) states, "Researchers have given school districts bad
marks for paying insufficient attention to the selection of teachers. They cite, among
other faults and deficiencies, absence of policy for selection of employees, loose and
unwritten procedures, lack of thoroughness, and poor coordination in the
recruitment-selection-hiring process" (p. 28).

Most school systems have no written criteria covering the characteristics desired in
new teachers. A 1989 AASA survey showed that only 10% of the responding school
districts had a policy describing the kind of teacher their district considers excellent
(Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989). Even if the districts have written policies regarding
teacher selection, "the process and policies of the administrators charged with employing
new teachers are often not well articulated", (Braun et al., 1987, p. 45). The criteria
oftentimes are vague, unrealistic, and of no value. The failure of many school districts to
review and update their selection criteria in writing is a selection problem.

Even if the selection policies and the selection criteria are clearly spelled out, this may
not guarantee a good selection process. "One of the major problems in the evaluation of
teacher candidates has to do with the quality of the measuring devices", (Kahl, 1980, p.
iv). Problems related to selection procedures include inadequate resources to utilize the
appropriate and best selection procedures; the lack of use and misuse of available
procedures; and the problem with information gathered through interviews, tests,
reference checks, application blanks, and inventories being incomplete, erroneous, or
misleading (Bredeson, 1983; Castetter, 1992; Ewell & Chaffee, 1981; Hickey, 1970; Kopetskie, 1983; Nicholson & McInerney, 1988). "Falsified information has often been provided about matters such as certification status and past legal entanglements", (Castallo et al., 1992, p. 79). Adding to these problems is the fact that "different individuals reviewing the same information often differ markedly in their judgments about its meaning, and the importance they attach to different components of information", (Castetter, 1992, p. 151). The same information oftentimes is interpreted in widely different ways by different members of the selection team (Wise et al., 1987).

Steuteville-Brodinsky et al. (1989) expanded on the common problem of misleading information stating, "College educators find it difficult to admit that a student who received passing grades and graduated, earning teaching credentials, would not be a competent teacher. Some school administrators, being more than happy to see certain teachers leave, will side step questions to avoid negative comments; many an administrator will be ambivalent about a personable employee whose teaching skills are deficient" (p. 27). In addition to misleading information found in the references, interviewees also can mislead decision makers. "Some candidates have the ability to talk a good game", (Steuteville-Brodinsky et al, 1989, p. 27).

The most capable candidates may not be the first to be hired because of insufficient attention to the selection process. Research shows that administrators often fail to gather
enough information about candidates (Jensen, 1987). Nesbit and Tadlock (1986) recognized that the expense and administrative details of selection can be considerable. Decision makers in the selection process are asked to balance the reduction of uncertainty that a piece of information provides about a decision, on one hand, with the known cost of acquiring the information, on the other hand (Ewell & Chaffee, 1981: Hickey, 1970. "School practitioners face the realistic constraints on the types and quality of information they can gather about candidates, underdeveloped methods and ambiguous criteria for teacher selection, and political and financial costs in implementing a chosen teacher selection system", (Wise et al., 1987, p. 10).

Some districts have the additional difficulty of the best teachers getting away because of inadequate salaries and benefits when compared with neighboring communities and other professions. Wise et al. (1987) recommends that districts should check the attractiveness of their teaching openings by examining the district's teacher salaries "to see if they are competitive with others and should seek to improve the conditions of work which are important to teachers, such as the provision of adequate support for new teachers" (p. vii).

Hooper (1987) noted that "salaries in rural districts rarely are competitive with those in larger districts" (p. 17). Barker (1985) discovered that salaries for rural teachers are 20-25% lower than those received by metropolitan and suburban teachers. Also, most
districts impose a salary cap on experienced candidates (Wise et al., 1987). In order to take a position, experienced teachers may have to take a cut in salary and benefits. In some geographic areas, the teacher marketplace is becoming much more competitive. Districts must attract good candidates continually, and financial rewards must match the position's responsibilities. Some rural districts are starting to attract applicants by promising benefits ranging from bonuses to relocation services to reductions in rent (Jensen, 1987).

Even though the best ways to improve instruction in schools is through the careful selection of teachers, school administrators often fail to capitalize on this opportunity to improve the quality of teachers by making biased selection decisions. "Selection decisions made by school administrators have been found to be biased systematically by factors that were not related to teacher performance", (Young & Voss, 1986, p. 40). Young and Voss's research revealed that selection decisions are influenced by factors that are unrelated to an individual's teaching performance, including chronological age of the teacher candidates and the amount of reference information describing teacher candidates. Merritt (1971) found principals preferred candidates with attitudes similar to their own. Attitude congruence between the principal and the candidate predicted selection better than did qualifications for the job.
Job-related Problems

Some districts experience difficulty in attracting applicants. This constraint often centers around the attractiveness of the job itself, such as the absence of specialized equipment or space, too many preparations, too many extracurricular assignments, and a requirement to teach in two or more curriculum areas.

Hooper (1987) revealed some of the job-related problems unique to many rural and small school districts by stating, "Factors affecting teacher supply that are unique to rural and small school districts are not limited to locations - which often are far from the stimulus of metropolitan areas. The increasing emphasis on subject-area specialization in many teacher education programs also plays a part: fewer graduates are prepared for the demands of rural schools, where teachers may have responsibility for several subjects and extracurricular activities" (p. 17).

Teachers in small schools oftentimes are required to teach in two or more curriculum areas, along with coaching extracurricular activities, necessitating the need for a wide range of abilities and certification in more than one area or level (Harper, Weiser, Armstrong, 1990; McCracken & Miller, 1991). In addition, Jensen (1986) noted that "they may need to adjust to the community- to its expectations, its lifestyle, and its available support systems. Often the teacher in a rural school must be capable of a high degree of autonomy; supervision may be remote" (p. 3). Rural educators fault many...
teacher education programs for not offering courses to introduce students to the
challenges and satisfactions of teaching in a small or rural district (Hooper, 1987).

"Some districts have additional problems of the best teachers getting away because
the district or school has a reputation for bad working conditions (i.e., large class sizes,
discipline problems, staff unrest)", (Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989, p. 28).

"Prospective candidates may not be interested in pursuing a job opportunity in a
particular school district because of that district's image in the community", (Rebore,
1991, p. 76). "A position that is viewed as anxiety-laden may not interest people",
(Rebore, 1991, p. 77). Effective selection depends to a large degree on the attractiveness
of the position. Working conditions such as few discipline problems, small classes, no
cafeteria or bus duty, and reduced teaching loads can make a position more attractive.

**Logistical Problems**

Two logistical problems sometimes encountered by schools are the problems of too
many applicants and too few good applicants. Duke and Canady (1991) state that "the
likelihood of finding talented teachers is related, in part to the size of the applicant pool"
(p. 114). Wise et al. (1987) found that school district characteristics such as geographic
location, climate, neighborhood and student characteristics, cost of living, class size, and
other working conditions affect teacher supply. The applicant pool should be ample to
provide a number of qualified candidates, but should not be so large that the task of
working through the information on all applicants becomes unmanageable. Achieving this ideal in the real world is not always possible.

Information is necessary to arrive at a decision, but too much information and/or inappropriate information can impede the selection process (Ewell & Chaffee, 1981; Wise et al., 1987). A problem in teacher selection decisions is assessing the attributes of candidates, particularly if the assessment takes a long time, requires extensive amounts of information, and involves a large number of applicants (Hickey, 1970; Kopetskie, 1983). In the case of too many applicants, efficiency of selection is paramount (Webster, 1988). "Collecting, analyzing, reporting, and disposing of vast amounts of information from job applicants is one huge responsibility of your school system's personnel department", (Sawyer, 1988, p. 23). If school administrators are to select the best available teachers, then the information they collect must be the right information and it must be accessible. Wise et al. (1987) recommends that schools develop computerized management information systems to handle the volumes of information associated with large pools of candidates. A large applicant pool does not always guarantee a higher quality pool of applicants. In Jensen's (1986) words, "Even a large reserve of candidates may not include enough applicants who fit districts' specific needs, nor does it guarantee highly qualified teachers" (p. 5).
Maxwell (1987) stated, "Logistical problems stymie hiring." "Although school districts collect extensive information on candidates, they aren't technologically equipped to cross reference such things as applicants qualified in more than one subject or possessing particular skills." "Principals do not have equal access to information about teaching applicants. Favored or aggressive principals will acquire it while others won't" (pp. 2-3).

It appears that competition for top talent in teaching has increased in recent years. College students' interests are shifting away from the field of education and causing the most academically able to pursue other careers (Schlechty & Vance, 1983; Coady, 1990). Accordingly, teacher shortages have diminished the size of many applicant pools and have made the task of selecting the best candidates in some subjects and grades even more challenging (Coady, 1990).

Other factors act to diminish the applicant pool. For instance, state certification requirements can make it difficult to recruit out-of-state teachers, and district transfer policies can limit applicants (Okeafor & Teddlie, 1989). After district transfer requests have been processed, many of the most promising outside candidates may have accepted positions elsewhere. Frase (1991) found that hiring practices are usually limited to reviewing unsolicited applications." It's unlikely that such a limited pool of applicants will produce top talent. Your odds improve dramatically when you expand your search beyond the applications filed in your personnel office" (p. 23).
"All too often, personnel are chosen on the basis of politics, nepotism, popularity, seniority, physical fitness, compromise, ethnic background, natural succession, test results, personality traits and salesmanship", (Castetter, 1992, p. 150) rather than on the basis of merit. Selection decisions oftentimes are made in a political environment (Wise et al., 1987) where pressure is used to force the consideration of particular candidates. Castallo et al. (1992) noted that rural districts are often the most vulnerable to the problem of nepotism since the candidate pool may be limited by geography, and the individuals who have the required education and certification are often members of the same family, along with the common belief that people who grew up or lived in the school district automatically should be given preference in hiring. Castallo et al. recommends a clear board policy to curb nepotism. There is also a tendency for administrators to hire only "known quantities - candidates they have worked with previously", (Wise et al., 1987, p. 64). Nepotism, favoritism, familiarity, or a candidate's ability to make a good impression should not be allowed to replace qualification.

In addition, policy constraint, legal constraints, and local labor market conditions limit a school district's ability or willingness to search for and select the best candidates (Wise et al., 1987). These constraints on school districts create a problem by limiting their opportunity and ability to select the best teachers, forcing them to "satisfize" as opposed to "maximize" when choosing among the candidates (Wise et al., 1987).
Geographical Problems

The location of a school can play a large part in determining the number of applicants. Some districts encounter additional difficulties of attracting quality applicants because their schools are in some undesirable location such as the inner-city or a rural, small town. Barker and Beckner (1987) contends, "Although the basics of instruction are similar in urban, suburban, and rural schools, there are important demands of the rural instructional setting which are different. Teachers are generally more isolated from ongoing developments in their field and from teachers with similar subject matter expertise. The cultural and geographical isolation common to many rural areas is thereby compounded by a sense of professional isolation" (p.1).

Helge and Marrs (1981) found that many teachers who left rural districts cited cultural and social isolation as reasons for leaving. Teachers may leave small rural communities because they do not fit into the community rather than that they do not have the competencies to be an effective teacher in that school. Barker and Beckner (1987) further note, "rural teachers often experience difficulty in locating adequate housing, and they may later have difficulty selling property" (p.1). Along with these problems, teachers in small communities often have limited privacy and often are required to work with inadequate supplies.
Administrators of isolated rural schools face unique challenges. "Potential applicants may know more about rural schools' disadvantages than about the advantages they frequently offer, for example, small classes, greater participation in decision-making, and community support", (Jensen, 1987, p. 8). Wise et al. (1987) pointed out that advantages for attracting teachers include a desirable place to live, school's reputation for supporting teachers, the region's culture, the district's stable leadership, and community support for its public schools. Other benefits or positive aspects of a small rural community include easy going life styles and unique recreational opportunities, along with the fact that they are often friendly and scenic. Rural schools often have few discipline problems, greater flexibility in programming studies, and overall higher quality of education (Luft, 1993; Matthes & Carlson, 1987). However, Wise et al. (1987) cautioned that many of the school districts that have the natural recruiting advantages have limited administrators' willingness to expend extra effort to find the best teachers.

With the diminishing supply of teachers in many subject areas, rural school districts face a more critical problem than do their urban or suburban counterparts. In discussing the problems of selection in rural districts, Seifert (1982) suggested that selection teams should look for qualities within the applicant such as: a) acceptance of the rural culture; b) behaviors appropriate for the rural environment in which they will live; c) generic skills; d) interest in gaining knowledge of the local community; and e) ability to develop
local and long distance support systems. If weather or location necessitate long periods of isolation, self-entertainers and those who are self-sufficient are less likely to leave (Miller & Sidebottom, 1985). In selecting a candidate, it is best to choose those with behaviors, interests, and skills compatible with the community. If teacher selection is to be successful, securing a high degree of match between the value and life style of the individual and the community is imperative.

Organizational Problems

Good teacher selection requires resources and logistical arrangements which are more demanding than many districts are able or willing to provide. The Wise et al. (1987) case studies revealed that organizational demands limited schools districts' ability to generate reliable and valid information about teacher candidates. The limitations were related to poor management information systems. Other organizational problems included vacancies not reported promptly, vacancies occurred at unexpected or inopportune times (e.g., late resignations, mid-year requests for release), inaccurate projections of teacher demand, delays associated with budget decisions, necessity to make choices during the summer months when many staff members were unavailable, and lack of time to make good selection decisions.

Organizational problems are not restricted to smaller rural schools. Some larger schools tend to be characterized by more bureaucratic and impersonal screening.
practices (Duke & Canady, 1991; Maxwell, 1987). Wise et al. (1987) recommend that "the ... hiring and placement phases of the selection process must be coordinated so that bureaucratic processing, red tape, and lapses in time do not result in the loss of desirable candidates" (p. vii).

Natter and Kuder (1983) found that administrators do not allocate a significant amount of time and finances to the selection process. The problem in selection is that it is difficult to assess attributes of a candidate, particularly in the length of time available for the typical assessment process (Nicholson & McInerney, 1988). Selection activities are more or less invisible during the normal working day; they often happen after hours or over the summer months. Donaldson (1990) recognized these problems and stated that "a context needs to be built that supports the principal's heavy investment of time and energy in selection" (p. 1).

Summary

This chapter provided an examination of literature relating to the importance of teacher selection, school effectiveness research related to teacher selection, systematic approaches to teacher selection, the complexity of teacher selection, the qualities and procedures valued and utilized during teacher selection, and the problems encountered in teacher selection. The following chapter presents a description of the methodology used to conduct the present study.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Educational research has established that effective schools are places with strong instructional leadership and effective classroom instruction. One way principals facilitate effective classroom instruction is by teacher selection. The present study investigated teacher selection practices in effective schools that varied by school type (effective/typical), SES (low/middle), and community type (metropolitan/rural). Qualities sought, procedures utilized, and problems encountered by principals during teacher selection were specifically studied. A description of the research methodology, study design, operational definitions, research questions, selection of subjects, instrumentation, data analysis, and methodological assumptions are presented in the current chapter.

Description of Research Methodology

Methodologists (Patton, 1990; Denzin, 1978) state that in many cases, a combination of both quantitative and qualitative approaches is superior to either. The present study utilized a mixed methodology using naturalistic inquiry to collect qualitative data via a standardized open-ended interview guide followed by content analysis. Based on the interview findings, a questionnaire was developed and piloted to establish validity and reliability. Quantitative data were collected and analyzed using this questionnaire.
Design of the Study

The present study was divided into four phases (Appendix A). Phase I encompassed selection of elementary schools which differ on two independent context variables, socioeconomic status (SES) and community type. Schools were further classified as "effective" or "typical". Based on these data, a sampling matrix was constructed to classify schools into eight types: a) "effective" and "typical" metropolitan, middle-SES; b) "effective" and "typical" metropolitan, low-SES; c) "effective" and "typical" rural, middle-SES; and d) "effective" and "typical" rural, low-SES.

After the school types were identified by a procedure discussed later in the chapter, superintendents were contacted to get permission to conduct research. Principals were then contacted to determine whether they met the criteria to participate in the current study. Principals had to have been at the school for a minimum of three consecutive years, have selected at least three teachers in the past three years, and allow two of the most recently selected teachers to be interviewed. The principals who responded that teacher selection was done mainly by the central office or was controlled by collective bargaining were disqualified. Principals who maintained they had active involvement in teacher selection, would allow classroom observations, and would allow two teachers to be interviewed were kept as possible candidates for study. Based on these criteria, an initial sample of 12 schools were chosen.
Phase II involved visiting only "effective" schools, and observing in classrooms as an additional screener to determine school effectiveness. The initial pool of 12 schools consisted of 3 metropolitan, middle-SES; 3 metropolitan, low-SES; 3 rural, middle-SES; and 3 rural, low-SES schools. Discussed later in the chapter, norm-referenced and criterion-referenced test scores were used to categorize schools as effective or typical. Similar to previous research, (Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993), at least three classrooms were observed using the Stallings (1980) Classroom Snapshot (SCS) and the Virgilio (1987) Teacher Behavior Inventory (VTBI).

The SCS, a low-inference measure of time-on-task and interactive teaching, provided classroom behavioral data. It has been used in evaluation studies, early childhood studies, and student teaching studies (Stallings & Freiberg, 1991; Stallings & Kaskowitz, 1974). The VTBI, a higher-inference measure of teaching behavior, measures classroom management, instructional strategies, instructional presentation, classroom social/psychological climate, and classroom physical climate. A school mean of at least 80% on the SCS and scores of at least 3.50 on all five areas of the VTBI were required for participation (Virgilio, Teddlie, & Oescher, 1991).

The SCS and VTBI results narrowed the initial pool of 12 schools to 11, consisting of 2 metropolitan, middle-SES; 3 metropolitan, low-SES; 3 rural, middle-SES; and 3 rural, low-SES schools, for the qualitative portion of the study.
Phase II also involved the collection of qualitative data through interviews with the principal and two of the most recently selected teachers in each of the four school types. The purpose of this phase was to explore the teacher selection practices used by principals of effective elementary schools. In the qualitative case studies, the school was the unit of analysis.

One day per school was scheduled to conduct the interviews as well as observe in three to five classrooms using the SCS and the VTBI. After consent forms were signed, tape-recorded interviews were conducted which lasted 30 minutes to one hour. An open-ended standardized interview guide was used. The development of this guide will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter. After interviews were completed, the next phase, Phase III began.

Phase III consisted of several steps and involved the development of a questionnaire. First, content analysis (Patton, 1990) of the interview data was completed. The results of this analysis formed the foundation for step two, which entailed the development of an item pool from which the questionnaire could be constructed. In step three, both face and initial content validity were established by a panel of experts representing principals, university professors, and personnel staff from central offices in both metropolitan and rural districts. Panel members modified and eliminated items on the questionnaire with respect to three domains and several content areas. The questionnaire was modified.
based on the input from the aforementioned panel, and 74 items were retained based on
the panel's input. The next step, step four, involved pilot testing the questionnaire with a
sample of 21 principals from effective schools that represented the categories of SES and
community type previously described. A response rate of 90% was obtained in the pilot.
The pilot study included 5 metropolitan, middle-SES; 4 metropolitan, low-SES; 5 rural,
middle-SES; and 5 rural, low-SES schools. Finally, in step five, internal consistency
reliability was established using Cronbach's alpha. The reliability coefficients obtained
were: (a) .76 for the qualities subscale, (b) .83 for the procedures subscale, (c) .78 for
the problems subscale, and (d) .73 on the total survey.

Phase IV involved the collection of quantitative data in the four types of effective as
well as typical elementary schools using the questionnaire developed in Phase III.
Principals of typical schools were included in the survey for an important reason, which
was to determine whether the teacher selection practices used by principals of effective
schools differed from those used by principals of typical schools. Principals in each of the
four effective and typical school types: a) metropolitan, middle-SES, b) metropolitan,
low-SES, c) rural, middle-SES, and d) rural, low-SES were surveyed. Questionnaires
were numbered for identification, and follow up letters were sent to principals who had
not responded within 14 days of the initial mailing. The survey yielded a sample of 107
respondents, which was an 84% response rate.
Operational Definitions

Effective Schools

Schools were categorized as "effective" based on the following procedure. Data from the Spring 1995 and Spring 1996 statewide administration of both Norm-Referenced (NRT) and Criterion-Referenced (CRT) language arts and mathematics scores were used to classify schools as consistently effective over a two year period. The NRT provides a measure of a student's performance in comparison to other students in the nation. The CRT is designed to measure the attainment of state and district curriculum guide requirements (e.g., Crone, Franklin, Caldas, Ducote, & Killebrew, 1992; Lang, 1991). Grades 3, 5, and 7 are tested with the CRT, and grades 4, 6, and 9 are tested with the NRT. With regard to grade-level span, this is an extensive testing program (Kino and Roeber, 1990).

Levine and Lezotte (1990) say that whenever possible, both CRTs and NRTs should be used in classifying a school as effective or ineffective. Researchers for the Bureau of School Accountability at the state Department of Education concluded that the two different types of tests do indeed provide different information, and that both would be valuable in measuring a school's performance (Crone, Franklin, Caldas, Ducote, & Killebrew, 1992). Their study determined that the combined composite scores on the CRT and NRT were the most effective and equitable indicator of a school's academic
performance. These combined scores, referred to as SEIs, in a regression analyses, were regressed onto two predictor variables (SES and community type) to identify school effectiveness. The General Linear Model Procedure and the Correlation Procedure in the computer program SAS (SAS Institute, 1985) identify whether a significant relationship exists between these variables.

The process of converting the NRT and CRT scores to SEIs involved a five step procedure used in recent research (Jarvis, 1997):

1. Student raw scores on CRT mathematics and language arts for 3rd and 5th grade LEAP tests, and NRT total battery raw scores on 4th grade NRT tests were converted into student scaled scores for each subject area and grade level using the SAS statistical package (SAS Institute, 1985).

2. Student scaled scores for each subject area and grade level were converted into student z scores for each subject area and grade level, using the state means and standard deviations. Combining NRTs and CRTs is appropriate for this calculation since the z score is a standardized score (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1988).

3. Student z scores for each subject area and grade level were converted into mean student z scores for each subject area and grade level by summing the student scaled scores for each subject area and grade level of each test, and then dividing by the total number of students in the school who participated in that test.
4. School level $z$ scores were calculated for each subject area and grade level.

5. School level $z$ scores were converted to SEIs by dividing the school level $z$ scores at each subject area and grade level by the number of subject areas and grade levels in the school.

The result of this five step procedure was a listing of each elementary school in the state and its SEIs for two consecutive years. These SEIs were utilized as the dependent or criterion variable in the two regression models (1995, 1996). An output file that included a residual score that determined the school effectiveness indices (SEI) resulted. In the current study, schools with residual scores greater than +.70 of the studentized residual mean were considered "effective". Previous studies have utilized a similar method (Teddlie, Falkowski, Stringfield, Desselle, & Garvue, 1984; Teddlie, Stringfield, & Kirby, 1989; Stringfield & Teddlie, 1990; Lang, 1991; Crone, Lang, Franklin, & Halbrook, 1994).

**Typical Schools**

The regression procedure described above was used to classify schools as "typical". Consistent with prior research (Lang, 1991; Lang, Teddlie, & Oescher, 1992), schools whose studentized residuals were $\pm$ .40 of their predicted scores were considered typical.
School Socioeconomic Status

The predictor variable, SES, was determined based upon the percentage of students in the school receiving free lunch. Data indicating the number of students participating in the school's free lunch program are reported to the Department of Education. Since requirements for participation in this program are related to family income, student enrollment in the program serves as the best available approximation for SES.

The percentage of students participating in the free lunch program in a school is computed in the state by dividing the number of students enrolled in the program by the total number of students attending the school (Crone et al., 1992). Those students eligible for reduced price lunch were not included in these calculations, since it has been determined that the percentage of students participating in the free lunch program alone is a better indicator of student achievement (Crone et al., 1992). Data used in these calculations were obtained from the Department of Education Bureau of Food and Nutrition, which maintains a database containing the number of students participating in the free lunch program in each school in the state.

Based upon results of previous analyses of these data (Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993), two levels of SES were used in the regression analyses. These analyses indicate that due to the poverty rate of the state where the current study was conducted, it is not unusual for a school to have 100% of its students participating in the free lunch program.
Thus, low-SES schools were identified as those schools having at or above 70% of their students receiving free lunch. Middle-SES schools were identified as schools having less than 69% of their students receiving free lunch (Freeman, 1997).

**Community Type**

The second predictor variable, community type, was also obtained from the Department of Education. Community type identifications were based upon population figures, population density measures, and the presence of a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) as defined by the United States Office of Management and Budget. These data describe a school based upon the demographic characteristics of the community where it is located, and identifies seven community types including large city, mid-size city, urban fringe of a large city, urban fringe of a mid-size city, large town, small town, and rural.

A SAS data file was developed which included the community type of each elementary school in the state which was used as a predictor variable in the regression procedure. These data were coded as continuous variables ranging from large city to rural for the regression procedure (Crone et al., 1992). Consistent with concurrent research (Jarvis, 1998), the following codes were used for community type categories at the school level: Large City (1); Mid-size City (2); Urban Fringe of a Large City (3); Urban Fringe of a Mid-size City (4); Large Town (5); Small Town (6); and Rural (7).

The current study used two of the community types, per these definitions:
1. **Mid-size City**: This category includes schools that are identified as being located in a city that is considered a social and economic hub by the United States Office of Management and Budget, and has a population more than 25,000 but less than 250,000.

2. **Rural**: This category includes schools located in an area with a population of less than 2,500 and/or a population density of less than 1,000 per square mile.

**Elementary School**

An elementary school was defined as any school whose grade structure fell within the range of pre-kindergarten to sixth grade. For example, schools with pre-kindergarten or kindergarden to second or third grade were included in the study.

**Research Questions**

The current study examined teacher selection practices in effective and typical rural and metropolitan elementary schools which differed by socioeconomic status. Three main areas of teacher selection were investigated including qualities sought, procedures utilized, and problems encountered.

Teacher qualities which a principal may look for during the selection process might include personal traits like marital status and parental status, and professional traits like grant writing ability and flexibility with instructional strategies. The procedures a principal may employ during teacher selection might include checking references, screening resumes, and conducting interviews, or making observations and utilizing
portfolio assessment. Problems encountered by principals during teacher selection might include financial constraints and time constraints. Other problems may include geographic isolation and poor salaries.

With regard to these three teacher selection areas, the following research questions were developed for the current study:

1. What qualities do principals look for when selecting teachers?
   1a. Do the qualities sought differ by school type (effective/ typical)?
   1b. Do the qualities sought differ by socioeconomic status (low/ middle)?
   1c. Do the qualities sought differ by community type (metropolitan/ rural)?

2. What procedures do principals utilize to select teachers?
   2a. Do the procedures differ by school type (effective/ typical)?
   2b. Do the procedures differ by socioeconomic status (low/ middle)?
   2c. Do the procedures differ by community type (metropolitan/ rural)?

3. What problems do principals encounter during teacher selection?
   3a. Do the problems differ by school type (effective/ typical)?
   3b. Do the problems differ by socioeconomic status (low/ middle)?
   3c. Do the problems differ by community type (metropolitan/ rural)?
Selection of Subjects

Based upon regression analysis described for Phase I, a population was identified from which a sample was selected during Phase II. Stratified purposeful sampling (Patton, 1990) and screening techniques using the SCS (1980) and the VTBI (1987) resulted in a sample representing the four previously defined effective school types.

The screening techniques narrowed an initial sample of 12 schools to 11 consisting of 2 metropolitan, middle-SES; 3 metropolitan, low-SES; 3 rural, middle-SES; and 3 rural, low-SES schools, based on observations in at least three classrooms using the SCS and the VTBI. Frequency calculations were converted to percentages for the SCS providing time-on-task and interactive teaching data. A school mean was calculated which ranged from .00 (0%) to 1.00 (100%). Results from the VTBI, which utilizes a five point scale (1-poor, 2-below average, 3-average, 4-good/ above average, 5-excellent), were calculated for each classroom followed by a school mean calculation. An unobserved item was excluded as part of the school mean. Scores on the VTBI, which measures classroom management, instructional strategies, instructional presentation/questioning, classroom social/psychological climate, and classroom physical climate, ranged from 1 (low) to 5 (high). The final sample of 11 schools met the criteria of a total school mean of at least 80% on the SCS (Virgilio, Teddlie, & Oescher, 1991), and a score of at least 3.50 on all three areas on the VTBI (Virgilio, Teddlie, & Oescher, 1991).
In Phase II, only schools classified as "effective", or having a studentized residual mean of at least +.70 (Lang, 1991), were included. The current study used intensity sampling, a form of purposive sampling defined by Patton (1990) as "information-rich cases that manifest the phenomenon intensely, but not extremely. One seeks excellent or rich examples of the phenomenon of interest, but not unusual cases" (p.171). Principals were chosen based on several criteria Spradley (1979) deems imperative. First, the informants must be encultured into the school. Thus, all the principals had at least three full years experience at the school site and had to be on the job, not on any type of leave. This ensured their current involvement in the school. They also had to have selected at least three teachers during the past three years, and allow the researcher to interview two of those most recently selected teachers. Next, all informants were able to volunteer at least one hour for an interview with the researcher, so that in-depth interview data were obtained in each of the four effective school types.

In Phase III, the development and piloting of the questionnaire, a sample was chosen by the regression procedure in Phase I. A total of 21 principals consisting of 5 metropolitan, middle-SES; 4 metropolitan, low-SES; 5 rural, middle-SES; and 5 rural, low-SES schools were asked to complete the questionnaire. Nineteen of the 21, or 90% of the principals, completed the pilot questionnaire.
In Phase IV, principals in the four effective and typical school types (metropolitan, middle-SES; metropolitan, low-SES; rural, middle-SES; and rural, low-SES) identified by the regression analysis in Phase I, yielding a total of 127, were contacted to respond to the questionnaire. One hundred seven, or 84%, of the principals responded. Individual responses were aggregated so that school type was the unit of analysis.

Instrumentation

Phase I

Phase I entailed identifying elementary schools in the state by type (effective, typical), community (rural, metropolitan), and SES (low, middle). Regression analyses followed by site visits to additionally screen for "effectiveness" were utilized for this procedure.

Phase II

In Phase II, qualitative data were gathered via interviews with principals and teachers, using an open-ended standardized interview guide was used (Appendix B & C). It was developed based upon research in three main areas of teacher selection: a) qualities sought; b) procedures utilized; and c) problems encountered by principals during the teacher selection process. Much research has been done regarding the qualities principals seek in teacher candidates, but as Kahl (1980) suggested, those qualities should be established locally and tailored to the specific vacancy. Jenkins (1984) added that the nature of a position, the job expectations, and any special qualities
required of applicants must be clear. Siever (1989) concurred that consideration of the
contextual conditions seems to be critical to the development of selection qualities.
Therefore, assessing needs and establishing specific qualities desirable in the person to
fill a position is the crucial first step in improving teacher selection (Nicholson &
McInerney, 1988). Thus, the current study investigated the qualities sought during
teacher selection at schools with differing contexts to determine whether or not the
qualities were the same or different.

Not only is it essential to develop and articulate qualities that encompass teaching,
but it is just as essential to decide what kinds of evidence will be gathered to appraise
candidates based on the stated criteria. Principals need to determine the procedures they
will utilize to ensure that the right teacher is selected (Garman, 1990). In addition,
knowledge about the procedures available to measure the stated qualities reliably is also
essential (Castetter, 1992). The number of selection procedures and the purpose for
which they are used vary widely among school systems. The consensus of research is
that principals often fail to gather information about candidates from multiple sources,
and fail to assess candidates' teaching skills thoroughly (Jensen, 1987). Therefore,
decisions to select teachers may be based on inadequate selection procedures due to
misapplication or nonapplication of selection techniques (Castetter, 1992). Because
studies of selection practices are few and validation of procedures is minimal (Jensen,
1987), questions on the interview guide were posed to investigate the procedures used in
effective schools and to further investigate whether selection procedures differ according
to school type, SES, and community type context.

Almost all schools face a number of problems during the teacher selection process.
The number and types of problems vary widely (Haussler, 1994). Decision making
during the selection process in different school types with varying SES and community
type contexts can be improved through an understanding of these problems. The
research regarding the problems associated with selection of teachers is almost
nonexistent, therefore the present study investigated this theme during interviews with
principals and teachers.

**Phase III**

In Phase III, a questionnaire was constructed and used in the pilot study to establish
face and content validity as well as internal consistency reliability coefficients. The steps
in developing this questionnaire were spelled out previously in the design of the study.

**Phase IV**

In Phase IV, the 76 item questionnaire, piloted in Phase III, was used to collect data
in the four types of effective as well as typical elementary schools which differed by SES
and community type. A total of 127 principals were surveyed. A response rate of 84%
(107 surveys) was obtained.
The questionnaire was divided into three sections. The first section regarding *qualities sought* had 29 items, and used a 4 point Likert-type scale that ranged from "not important" to "very important". The second section, regarding *procedures utilized*, had 27 items and used a 4 point Likert-type scale ranging from "never used" to "always used". Two items in this section were open-ended. The third section, regarding *problems encountered*, had 18 items and used a 4 point Likert-type scale ranging from "never encountered" to "always encountered".

**Data Processing and Analysis**

In Phase I, a sample was identified from the population of all elementary schools in the state by community type, student body SES, "effective" and "typical". Using SAS (SAS Institute, 1985), a regression analyses was conducted where the criterion variable represented by the combined composite scores on the CRT and NRT was regressed onto the predictor variables, free lunch (SES), special education, gifted and talented, limited English proficiency, and community type. These analyses resulted in an output file that included a residual score (SEI) for each elementary school in the state. The positive or negative residual scores indicate how well a school performed in comparison to how well it should have performed based upon its specific context as defined by SES and community type.
Phase II involved selecting a sample of schools and visiting them for qualitative data collection purposes. As discussed in the design of the study, "effective" schools, having +.70 residuals for a two year period (1995, 1996), were considered for the sample of 12 schools (Teddle, et al., 1984; Teddlie, et al., 1989; Stringfield & Teddlie, 1990).

In Phase II, analysis of the qualitative data began with numbering the pages of transcribed interviews (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). The data were read at least two times, and preliminary codes were written. Ethnograph, a qualitative program for the analysis of text based data (Seidel, Friese, & Leonard, 1995), was used to analyze the interview responses. Emerging themes were identified within each school type using Lincoln and Guba's (1985) constant comparative method. These analyses provided a basis for constructing case studies which provided insight into the teacher selection processes of effective elementary schools. Comparisons between the four school types were made using Spradley's (1979) Developmental Research Sequence. This technique suggests the development of domains and taxonomies that are then compared and contrasted through componential analyses. The emergent themes identified for each of the four school types served as the basis for Phase III.

Phase III, the development and piloting of a questionnaire, included four steps. First, content analysis (Patton, 1990) where primary patterns in the interview data were identified, coded, and categorized. Second, an item pool was generated. Third, both face
and initial content validity were established by a panel of experts. Items were modified and eliminated resulting in 74 items retained on the questionnaire. Fourth and last, the questionnaire was piloted using a sample of 21 principals of effective elementary schools. Nineteen of the 21 (90%) principals returned usable surveys. Cronbach’s alpha was calculated, and according to Borg and Gall (1989), yielded high coefficients for a new instrument. The reliability coefficients were: a) .76 on the qualities subscale; b) .82 on the procedures subscale; c) .78 on the problems subscale; and d) .73 on the total survey.

Phase IV consisted of gathering data using the questionnaire piloted in Phase III. A total of 127 principals from typical and effective, low- and middle-SES, and metropolitan and rural schools were surveyed. A response rate of 84% (107 surveys) was obtained.

First, Cronbach’s alpha was used to determine reliability coefficients. The coefficients were: a) .83 on the qualities subscale; b) .73 on the procedures subscale; c) .72 on the problems subscale; and d) .83 on the total survey.

Next, construct validity was established by factor analysis where an initial principle components analysis with a varimax rotation was conducted. The initial factor analysis yielded 27 factors with eigenvalues of at least 1.00 and explained 77.13 percent of the variance. Due to a small sample size, there were many cross loadings of variables on each factor, which was a problem because the survey was developed with three principle factors: a) qualities sought; b) procedures utilized; and c) problems encountered.
Due to the initial factor analysis results, instrument refinement was conducted. The item-total correlation statistics for each subscale produced by the reliability analysis were used to identify items to retain on the revised questionnaire. Borg and Gall (1989) recommend retaining items with at least +.50 correlation values. This procedure reduced the original 74 item survey to a 38 item survey. Exploratory analyses employing principle components analysis with a varimax rotation was conducted. Six factors, consistent with the theoretical constructs being studied and having eigenvalues of at least 2.00, emerged and explained 46.37% of the variance.

The revised 38 item instrument is composed of three subscales. Two factors per subscale were also identified. The first subscale, qualities sought, is comprised of personal teacher qualities and professional teacher qualities. The second subscale, problems encountered, is comprised of school system related problems and school location problems. The third subscale, procedures utilized, is comprised of pre- and post-interview strategies as well as interview strategies used by principals during teacher selection.

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to determine whether school types differ significantly on variables. Where a statistically significant difference occurred, item by item analysis, using Levene's homogeneity of variance test, was utilized to highlight those differences.
Methodological Assumptions

Assumptions are made in every research project. The current study is no exception. There were three main assumptions that merit mention. The first assumption was that data obtained from the state Department of Education were correct, valid, and reliable for research purposes. The second assumption was that principals and teachers were candid in their responses to interview questions, and principals were honest in their responses to the mailed questionnaire. The third assumption was that teacher selection practices are relatively stable over time.

Summary

Chapter three gave a description of the research methodology used for the current study. It also discussed the design of the study including operational definitions for effective schools, typical schools, school socioeconomic status, community type and elementary school, which were utilized in the present study. Research questions, selection of subjects, and instrumentation regarding the four phases of the current study were also discussed. Finally, the data processing and analysis, as well as the methodological assumptions were presented. The next chapter, Chapter Four, will focus on the presentation of the analyses and findings of the present study.
CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSES AND FINDINGS

The current study investigated the teacher selection process in elementary schools which differ by school type, community type, and socioeconomic status (SES). The qualities sought, procedures utilized, and problems encountered by principals during teacher selection were specifically examined. Statistical analyses were used to determine whether school types differ significantly on variables regarding teacher selection.

The current study was based on the assumption that principals of effective schools intentionally shape the academic culture of those schools (Ubben & Hughes, 1992; Banner & Gagne, 1995). One primary way of molding an effective school culture is by selecting teachers who appear to share the principal's values and who will likely be effective in the classrooms and thus lead students to high achievement (Cuban, 1984).

Overview of the Study

The present study involved collecting both qualitative and quantitative data, and was conducted in four phases. In Phase I, all elementary schools in the state were classified using three context variables, two of which were community type and student body SES. Using a regression analysis, schools were further identified as effective and typical, the third context variable. These procedures allowed construction of a sampling matrix so
that schools could be selected for each of the remaining phases of the study. The sampling matrix consisted of eight cells and classified schools as effective or typical, metropolitan or rural, and middle- or low-SES. Schools that were ineffective, urban, high-SES, or in a location having a population of greater than 250,000, were not considered for participation due to avoiding subgroups that were too similar or atypical. No school used in one phase of the current study participated in a subsequent phase.

For reasons detailed later, Phase II schools were restricted to the "effective" classification, though these schools differed by community and SES contexts. The selected schools were visited so that interviews could be conducted with the principals. Two of the most recently selected teachers were also interviewed in order to confirm and triangulate the information given by the principals. Interview questions probed issues concerning the selection of teachers. In addition, during site visits the "effective" classification of these schools was verified through classroom observations to protect against the potential of misclassifying a school through the previously mentioned regression analysis.

Phase III utilized the interview data in the development of a questionnaire that could be distributed across the various school contexts included in the sampling matrix. This questionnaire was pilot tested as part of Phase III. As occurred in Phase II, schools in the "typical" category were excluded.
Phase IV involved distributing the questionnaire to principals at schools across the sampling matrix. These data were analyzed to answer the research questions described above. Each phase and the associated results are fully discussed below.

Phase I

In Phase I, all elementary schools in the state were identified by community type and student body SES. Schools were further classified as "effective" or "typical" based on regression analyses using the variables of percent free lunch, percent special education, percent gifted and talented, percent limited English proficiency, and community type to predict achievement on CRT and NRT standardized tests for two consecutive years. The resulting predicted mean scores were subtracted from the actual mean scores, yielding a residual mean score for each school. Based on these data, a sampling matrix was constructed to classify schools by school type (effective or typical), community type (metropolitan or rural), and SES type (middle or low). To participate in subsequent phases of the current study, principals also had to meet several criteria: a) have been at the school for at least three consecutive years; b) have selected at least three teachers in the past three years; and c) allow two of the most recently selected teachers to be interviewed. Having developed the sampling matrix and having identified principals at schools in the matrix who met the above criteria, the next phase of the study began. This second phase is discussed next.
Phase II

Phase II involved selecting a sample of schools and visiting them for data collection purposes. For this phase, only those schools classified as effective, that is, schools with a studentized residual mean of +.70 or above (Lang, 1991), were considered, though these schools differed by community and SES type. Using a stratified, purposeful, sampling procedure (Patton, 1990), 12 schools were identified to participate in Phase II.

Restricting the sample for this phase to effective schools deserves some discussion.

Effective schools research has focused on identifying schools which are unusually effective in producing student achievement in the basic skills of reading and math. As these schools have been studied to determine what factors contribute to their success, principal leadership emerges repeatedly as a crucial factor in promoting instructional effectiveness and improvement (Manasse, 1985; Brookover & Lezotte, 1979). Several characteristics of outstanding leadership have to do with teacher selection (Levine & Lezotte, 1990). Thus, Phase II focused on investigating the qualities sought, procedures utilized, and the problems encountered by principals of "effective" elementary schools.

Sample Selection

As previously mentioned, regression analysis was conducted in Phase I to classify a school according to "effectiveness". In Phase II, as an additional screening for effectiveness, observations occurred in at least three classrooms in each of the 12
schools. Using the Stallings (1980) Classroom Snapshot (SCS) and the Virgilio (1987) Teacher Behavior Inventory (VTBI), observation data were collected. In order to be retained in the Phase II sample, a school had to meet two criteria established by Virgilio, Teddlie, and Oescher (1991): a) a total school mean of at least 80% on the SCS, and b) a score of at least 3.50 on all five areas of the VTBI, which are presented in Table 1.

Table 1  Community Type, Percent Free Lunch, SES Designation, and Residual Mean Scores for 12 "Effective" Phase I Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School No.</th>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>Percent Free Lunch</th>
<th>SES Designation</th>
<th>Residual '94-'95 Scores</th>
<th>Residual '95-'96 Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>54.95</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>54.74</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>47.48</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>33.87</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>52.73</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>79.29</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>90.11</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>77.20</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>86.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>90.87</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>79.73</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Frequency calculations, which were converted to percentages for the SCS, provided interactive teaching data and total time-on task. A school mean was calculated which ranged from .00 (0%) to 1.00 (100%). As shown in Table 2, ten schools had at least a 65% interactive teaching rate. Thus, teachers were interacting while teaching students.

Scores from the VTBI, which utilizes a five point scale (1-poor, 2-below average, 3-average, 4-good/above average, 5-excellent), were used to calculate a mean for each school. An unobserved item on the VTBI is not figured as part of the school mean score. The VTBI measures classroom management, instructional strategies, instructional presentation and questioning, classroom social/psychological climate, and classroom physical climate. As can be seen in Table 3, one school, school 005, failed to meet the criteria established for the VTBI, and was deleted from the current research project. The final sample of 11 schools, utilized in Phase II of the current study, consisted of 2 metropolitan, middle-SES; 3 metropolitan, low-SES; 3 rural, middle-SES; and 3 rural, low-SES schools. In Phase II, the school was the unit of analysis.

The interviews, which investigated the qualities sought, procedures utilized, and problems encountered by principals during teacher selection, were analyzed using Ethnograph, a qualitative computer program for the analysis of text based data (Seidel, Friese, & Leonard, 1995), Lincoln and Guba's (1985) constant comparative method, and Spradley's (1979) developmental research sequence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School No.</th>
<th>Interactive Time-on-Task</th>
<th>Noninteractive Time-on-Task</th>
<th>Total Time-on-Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3  
**Means on the Virgilio Teacher Behavior Inventory for 12 Site Visits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School No.</th>
<th>Classroom Mngt.</th>
<th>Presentation &amp; Questioning</th>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Social / Psycho. Climate</th>
<th>Physical Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.4*</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.1 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Less than 3.50 required score
Teacher Qualities Sought

The qualitative data analyses identified several teacher qualities sought by principals of effective schools, though some qualities varied by school context. To be considered for the questionnaire, a quality had to be mentioned as important during the interviews by principals or teachers in at least two schools. These qualities are presented in Table 4.

Nineteen teacher qualities were sought in every school context. The qualities which emerged during interviews are: a) the ability to establish relationships with students and parents; b) the ability to discipline students and use good classroom management techniques; c) the ability to use good teaching strategies such as being creative and meeting students' needs; d) a teacher who "goes the extra mile" by working long hours in planning before and after school, making home visits, creating teaching props, etc.; e) a teacher who has effective communication skills; f) a teacher who is a delayed entrant or someone who comes into the teaching profession later in life after another career possibly, or women who have raised children of their own; g) a teacher who desires to continue their own education; h) dedication; i) enthusiasm; j) a teacher's knowledge base; k) the ability to motivate students; l) a teacher who loves children; m) a teacher who will share their ideas and resources; n) a teacher's teaching background and experiences; o) a teacher who really wants to teach and loves to teach; p) a teacher who "fits in" with the culture of the school; q) a teacher who is friendly and gets along well with others;
| 1. relationships with students & parents | MM | ML | RM | RL |
| 2. discipline/ classroom management | MM | ML | RM | RL |
| 3. good teaching: creative/ meets students' needs | MM | ML | RM | RL |
| 4. "goes the extra mile" | MM | ML | RM | RL |
| 5. communication skills | MM | ML | RM | RL |
| 6. delayed entrant/ mother | MM | ML | RM | RL |
| 7. continues own education | MM | ML | RM | RL |
| 8. dedicated/ determined/ tenacious | MM | ML | RM | RL |
| 9. enthusiastic/ energetic | MM | ML | RM | RL |
| 10. knowledge base | MM | ML | RM | RL |
| 11. motivates students | MM | ML | RM | RL |
| 12. loves children | MM | ML | RM | RL |
| 13. shares ideas/ resources | MM | ML | RM | RL |
| 14. teaching background/ experiences | MM | ML | RM | RL |
| 15. really wants & loves to teach | MM | ML | RM | RL |
| 16. "fits in" | MM | ML | RM | RL |
| 17. friendly/ sociable/ gets along with others | MM | ML | RM | RL |
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(Table 4 cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>RL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. an asset/ adds something/ &quot;new blood&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. religious/ moral character</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. academic background/ good student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. certified/ qualified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. has extracurricular interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. high expectations/ all kids can learn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. economic status</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. marital status</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. has &quot;roots&quot;/ vested interest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. a role model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. stable (low turnover)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The number of tally marks indicates the number of mentions each quality received by school context.

* Sought in every school context
# Sought in all but RM contexts
+ Sought in only Low SES contexts
^ Sought only in Rural contexts

Sample: 11
Key: MM = Metropolitan, Middle SES
     ML = Metropolitan, Low SES
     RM = Rural, Middle SES
     RL = Rural, Low SES
r) a teacher who adds diversity or is a new asset; and s) a teacher's religious beliefs and moral character.

Mentioned as important in all but the rural, middle-SES (RM) schools were the academic background of a teacher, teacher certification and qualification to fill a teaching position, and a teacher who has extracurricular interests outside of teaching. This does not mean necessarily that these teacher qualities are not important in a RM setting, but that the principals or teachers did not mention them in the interviews.

Interestingly, high expectations and the belief that all children can learn were mentioned only in low-SES schools. Other findings were that in low-SES schools, the principals felt a teacher's socioeconomic status and marital status were important qualities. These principals seek teachers who understand the students' backgrounds, and at the same time want to avoid selecting a teacher who has marital problems which might interfere with teaching effectiveness.

The principals in rural contexts were more likely to seek teachers who have "roots" in their community and who have a vested interest in seeing the children do well in school. Surprisingly, a teacher who is likely to remain at the school, was mentioned in every school context except the metropolitan, low-SES schools, which is where teacher turnover rates are often high (Steuteville-Brodinsky, Burbank, & Harrison, 1989).
Procedures Utilized

It is true that some of the qualities mentioned as important are those a principal may not observe before selecting a teacher. For this reason, principals were asked to discuss various selection procedures utilized to determine whether or not a teacher candidate possesses the qualities sought. Again, to be included in the present study, a procedure had to be mentioned during the interviews by either principals or teachers in at least two schools. These procedures are presented in Table 5, where they are divided into major categories.

NTE scores, GPAs, and transcripts were used by principals in every context. Also, when available, principals investigated a teacher's personnel file to peruse evaluations. Principals in every context also peruse employment records and past observations. And, judicious use of the telephone was advocated by these principals. Also, principals in every context stated that they always call a candidate's past principal(s) or supervisor(s).

Principals were contacted about vacancies in different ways. Principals were most often contacted by central office regarding candidates for vacancies. Principals in every context stated that they were also contacted directly by teachers wanting to transfer within their school district. Additionally, principals in every context maintained that present faculty members informed them of teachers who they believe would successfully fill a teaching vacancy.
### Table 5  Procedures Reportedly Used by Principals During Teacher Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>RL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Background check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. NTE scores</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GPA/ transcripts</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. personnel file (evaluations, employment record, observations)</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. certification/ qualifications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. criminal background</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. recommendations</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. resume/ application</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Reference check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. principal(s)</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. supervising teacher</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. professors (beginning teachers)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The number of tally marks indicates the number of mentions each procedure received by school context.

* Used in every school contexts  
+ Used in only Low-SES contexts  
~ Used in only Metropolitan contexts  
^ Used in only Rural contexts

**Sample:** 11

**Key:**  
MM = Metropolitan, Middle SES  
ML = Metropolitan, Low SES  
RM = Rural, Middle SES  
RL = Rural, Low SES
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>RL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Contacted about vacancies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. central office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. transfers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. present faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. tell about position &amp; students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. discuss discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. discuss teaching experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ask about teaching strategies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. relaxed talk (no standard interview guide)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. use a committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ask &quot;Can you do this job?&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The number of tally marks indicates the number of mentions each procedure received by school context.

* Used in every school contexts
+ Used in only Low-SES contexts
~ Used in only Metropolitan contexts
^ Used in only Rural contexts

Sample: 11
Key: MM = Metropolitan, Middle SES
     ML = Metropolitan, Low SES
     RM = Rural, Middle SES
     RL = Rural, Low SES
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>RL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Interview (Cont'd)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ask teacher's philosophy on teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. notice demeanor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. principal makes final decision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. interview more than once</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. show teacher around my school</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. ask about teacher's personal life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. ask why s/he went into teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ask about career goals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. ask situational questions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. look at their portfolio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. ask if s/he has any questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The number of tally marks indicates the number of mentions each procedure received by school context.*

* Used in every school contexts
+ Used in only Low-SES contexts
~ Used in only Metropolitan contexts
^ Used in only Rural contexts

Sample: 11

**Key:**
- MM = Metropolitan, Middle SES
- ML = Metropolitan, Low SES
- RM = Rural, Middle SES
- RL = Rural, Low SES
(Table 5 cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>RL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Interview (Cont'd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. ask what position s/he prefers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. interview may last 2 to 3 hours</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. get a &quot;gut feeling&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. take notes/ rank candidates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Offer position immediately</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. teacher observes at my school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I observe at teacher's school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I observe/ evaluate student teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The number of tally marks indicates the number of mentions each procedure received by school context.

* Used in every school contexts
+ Used in only Low-SES contexts
~ Used in only Metropolitan contexts
^ Used in only Rural contexts

Sample: 11

Key: MM = Metropolitan, Middle SES
     ML = Metropolitan, Low SES
     RM = Rural, Middle SES
     RL = Rural, Low SES
The interview was a very important procedure used in all the schools. Principals in every context reported telling a candidate specifically about the position and the students. Also, in all school contexts, principals asked candidates to discuss discipline, their teaching experiences, and their teaching strategies. And principals in every context reported using a relaxed "talk" rather than a standardized interview. A principal in every context also reported using a committee during the selection process.

Principals in low-SES schools said they used a committee to help select a teacher, but were more likely to make the final decision alone. Also principals in low-SES schools discussed the importance of offering a position either on the spot or the next day. This, they stated, was to keep their first choice from getting away. Interestingly, principals in both metropolitan and rural low-SES contexts admitted to conducting their own criminal background investigation of teacher candidates. Additionally, principals in low-SES schools reportedly ask a candidate to discuss their philosophy of teaching as well as asking very directly, "Can you do this job?".

Principals in metropolitan settings emphasized the importance of interviewing a candidate more than once. These principals also reported asking candidates about their personal lives. They did this in a nondirect way, such as, "Is there anything about your personal life that you would like to share?" Also, principals in metropolitan settings were likely to show a candidate around their school.
Principals in rural contexts stated that during interviews they ask a candidate to discuss why s/he went into teaching, and pose situational or hypothetical questions. They also ask about a candidate's career goals.

Observing the candidate teaching was reported as an important selection technique in all but RM settings. Principals were likely to have a teacher come observe at their school, but two principals in MM settings reported going to observe candidates also. All principals except those in MM settings stated that they carefully observe student teachers in their schools which may actually be a form of recruitment. The principals declared that they were more likely to select someone who had successfully completed a student teaching experience in their school than a candidate whom they had not observed.

Problems Encountered

The final aspect of teacher selection that principals and teachers were asked to discuss was problems encountered. Again, to be included in the present study, a problem had to be mentioned during the interviews by either principals or teachers in at least two schools. These problems are presented in Table 6.

Five problems reported in all school contexts were that other principals try to "pass on bad teachers", interviews can be misleading, there is a shortage of black teachers, there are time constraints that influence selection procedures, and on occasion there may be pressure from central office to take a teacher a principal otherwise would not choose.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>RL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. other principals &quot;passing bad teachers&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. misleading interviews</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. shortage of black teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. time constraints</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. pressure from central office to take a teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 1st year teachers (state assessment paperwork)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. fear of making a mistake</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. central office politics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. too many applicants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. too few applicants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. shortage of male teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. location of school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The number of tally marks indicates the number of mentions each problem received by school context.

* Encountered in every school context
# Encountered in only Metropolitan contexts
^ Encountered in only Rural contexts

Sample: 11

Key: MM = Metropolitan, Middle SES
     ML = Metropolitan, Low SES
     RM = Rural, Middle SES
     RL = Rural, Low SES
There were four teacher selection problems reported in metropolitan settings. First was the paperwork required for the state teacher assessment program for beginning teachers. Principals in metropolitan areas have an advantage of a large applicant pool, and said they avoid selecting first year teachers because the assessment process is too time consuming. Next, every principal in a metropolitan setting expressed having a great fear of making a mistake, and having to work hard not to be hindered by this fear during the selection process. Central office politics is reportedly a problem in metropolitan settings, as well as too many applicants.
There were three problems reported by principals in rural settings. First, there are too few applicants. Second, these principals pointed out that there is a shortage of male teachers. The third problem reported by principals in rural settings was the location of the school. They stated that many good candidates simply will not move or travel to isolated areas.

Five other problems were reported in a cross section of school contexts. One was relying on an unknown candidate's student teaching experience as an indication of how a candidate will teach in their own classroom. Also, a shortage of special education teachers, and the fact that some principals had been required to select a teacher based on race were reported problems. Fourth, the timing of vacancies can be a problem, especially when they occur during the school year when the applicant pool is small or nonexistent. And last, some principals reported the problem of teachers applying not because they want to teach, but because they just "want a job".

To summarize, during Phases I and II, a sample of 11 schools was chosen, and data were collected and analyzed with regard to the qualities sought, procedures utilized, and problems encountered by principals of effective elementary schools during teacher selection. The next two sections of this chapter will explain and summarize Phases III and IV, the quantitative data collection and analysis components of the current study.
Phase III

Phase III involved the development and piloting of a survey instrument based on the data gleaned from the interviews in Phase II and included four steps. In step one, a content analysis (Patton, 1990) was completed where primary patterns in the interview data were identified, coded, and categorized. Step two involved the development of an item pool. In step three, both face and initial content validity were established by a panel of experts representing principals, university professors, and central office personnel from both metropolitan and rural districts. After panel members modified and eliminated items, 74 items were retained on the questionnaire. The final step, step four, involved pilot testing the survey.

Consistent with procedures used to select the sample for Phase II, a sample of 21 principals of effective elementary schools was identified. The pilot sample was comprised of principals of 5 metropolitan, middle-SES; 6 metropolitan, low-SES; 5 rural, middle-SES; and 5 rural, low-SES schools. Nineteen of the 21 (90%) principals returned usable surveys. Profile data for all 21 schools are presented in Table 7.

In order to determine the internal consistency reliability, Cronbach's alpha was calculated. The coefficients were: a) .76 on the qualities subscale; b) .82 on the procedures subscale; c) .78 on the problems subscale; and d) .73 on the total survey. These coefficients are high for an instrument under development (Borg & Gall, 1989).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School No.</th>
<th>Comm. Type</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>Residual '94-'95 Scores</th>
<th>Residual '95-'96 Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>78.13</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>87.68</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>92.84</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.70 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>89.07</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>94.44</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.50 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>90.02</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>29.98</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>52.73</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>66.16</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>77.20</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>93.15</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** * Survey not returned

**Key:**
- MM = Metropolitan, Middle SES
- ML = Metropolitan, Low SES
- RM = Rural, Middle SES
- RL = Rural, Low SES
(Table 7 cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School No.</th>
<th>Comm. Type</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>Residual '94-'95 Scores</th>
<th>Residual '95-'96 Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>83.91</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>70.26</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>83.11</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>33.27</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>23.31</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>36.48</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>54.74</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>50.82</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** * Survey not returned

**Key:**
- MM = Metropolitan, Middle SES
- ML = Metropolitan, Low SES
- RM = Rural, Middle SES
- RL = Rural, Low SES

Additionally, principals were asked to write suggestions for improving the instrument, however no recommendations were made. Consequently, the questionnaire was considered ready for large scale distribution in Phase IV. This phase of the study is discussed next.
Phase IV

Phase IV utilized the questionnaire to collect quantitative data from principals at schools across the sampling matrix. A total of 127 principals were surveyed. The profile data are similar to those shown for the 21 pilot schools, and are in Appendix D.

A response rate of 84% (107 surveys) was obtained. In order to determine the reliability, or an estimate of the instrument's consistency, Cronbach's alpha was calculated. The coefficients were: a) .83 on the qualities subscale; b) .73 on the procedures subscale; c) .72 on the problems subscale; and d) .83 on the total survey. For a newly developed instrument, the aforementioned reliability coefficients are respectable for the purpose of conducting research (Borg & Gall, 1989).

Next, factor analysis was conducted in order to establish construct validity. Factor analysis provides an empirical basis for reducing many variables to a few factors by combining variables that are moderately or highly correlated with each other. Each set of variables forms a factor, which is a mathematical expression of the common element that cuts across the combined variables (Borg & Gall, 1989). Using factor analysis, the 74 survey items could be reduced by determining whether several items were contributing to the measurement of the same variable. Therefore, an initial principle components analysis with a varimax rotation was conducted. The initial factor analysis yielded 27 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.00 and explained 77.13 percent of the variance.
There were also considerable cross loadings of variables on each factor. Due to the high number of factors and the cross loadings, obviously, there was a need for instrument refinement. However, there are reasons for the results of the initial factor analysis, and a discussion of those reasons follows.

For survey research Sudman (1976) suggests that there be at least 100 subjects in each major subgroup whose responses will be analyzed. To meet Sudman's criteria would have required as many as 800 respondents, or at a 70% response rate, a sample of 1,150 (Heberlein & Baumgartner, 1978). However, Borg and Gall (1989) state that because of time and financial constraints, research in many important areas of education must be done with small sample sizes or not done at all. Table 8 displays the subgroups for the survey research.

Although this was a statewide study, strict definitions of "effective" schools, community type, and socioeconomic status were utilized. While including ineffective or urban schools would have increased the sample size and reduced the possibility of Type II errors, obtaining a larger sample size would have compromised the integrity of the study by expanding the aforementioned variable definitions at the risk of finding no statistically significant differences between subgroups because the groups would have been so similar. For these reasons, the current study was conducted with a relatively small sample size.
Table 8  
Subgroups for 107 Teacher Selection Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metropolitan</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>SES Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-SES</td>
<td>Middle-SES</td>
<td>Low-SES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Effective&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Typical&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instrument Refinement

The researcher, observing the initial factor analysis results, then used the item-total correlation produced by the reliability analysis to identify survey items with correlation values of at least +.50, as recommended by Borg and Gall (1989), to be retained on the revised survey instrument. This procedure reduced the original 74 item survey to a 38 item survey. Appendix E represents the survey instrument revisions.

After instrument refinement, several exploratory analyses were run utilizing principle components analysis with a varimax rotation using the 38 item survey. The factor structure most consistent with the theoretical constructs under study resulted in six factors with eigenvalues greater than 2.00, which is more stringent than some previous research (Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993), and explained 46.37% of the variance.

The revised 38 item instrument contains three subscales: a) teacher qualities sought, b) problems encountered, and c) procedures utilized by principals during teacher selection. The factor analysis identified two factors per subscale, represented in Table 9.

Subscale A regarding teacher qualities sought, contains six items comprising factor one, and can be defined as *personal qualities* of a teacher. A sample item is: "Teacher candidate's age". Subscale A also contains nine items comprising factor two, which can be defined as *professional qualities* of a teacher. A sample item is: "Teacher candidate's communication skills".
Table 9  Factor Analysis Results for 38 Item Teacher Selection Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Qualities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Qualities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Parental status (has children)</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Marital status</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Age</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher's socioeconomic status</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Delayed entrant</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.198</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Religious convictions</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Professional Qualities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Shares materials/ ideas</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interested in professional growth</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 9 cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Qualities (Cont'd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Works outside school (fundraisers, PTA)</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Writes grants</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>-.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Puts in extra time before &amp; after school</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Communication skills</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Has interests outside education field</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>-.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Changes teaching for students' needs</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Can teach all types of children</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. School System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. C.O. sends &quot;best&quot; to friends</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 9 cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Problems (Cont’d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pressure from C.O. to take a teacher</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. C.O. denies my request for a teacher</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. C.O. withholds negative information</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. C.O. controls who interviews</td>
<td>-.198</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Being required to select based on race</td>
<td>-.255</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teachers apply just to have a job</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other principals try to &quot;pass bad teachers&quot;</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>-.172</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. School Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Too few applicants</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The location of my school</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Problems (Cont'd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Finding certified/qualified teachers</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>-.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The reputation of the students</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Too many applicants</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>-.604</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Pre-/Post Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Employment record (personnel file)</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>-.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Attendance record (personnel file)</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>-.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluations (personnel file)</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I contact references</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I contact a candidate's previous principal</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 9 cont.)

C. Procedures (Cont’d)

VI. Interview Procedures

1. I use a committee to select a teacher
   - .099  -.077  -.028  .110  .052  .729

2. I ask a standard series of questions
   - .099  .077  .142  -.026 .082 .694

3. I ask actions in hypothetical situations
   .163  .221  .204  -.050 -.084 .553

4. I score or rank candidates
   -.122  .263  -.043  .062  .042 .547

5. I interview a candidate more than once
   .161  -.027  -.122  .055  .091 .511

Eigen values
   3.332  3.198  3.132  2.994  2.609  2.355
Subscale B regarding problems encountered, contains eight items comprising factor three, which can be defined as *school system related* problems, for example, "Being required to select based on race". Subscale B also contains five items comprising factor four, defined as *school location* problems, for example "Too few applicants".

Subscale C regarding procedures utilized during teacher selection, contains five items comprising factor five, which can be defined as *pre- and post- interview strategies*. A sample item is: "I consider a candidate's attendance record (personnel file)". Also, Subscale C contains five items comprising factor six, which can be defined as *interview strategies*. A sample item is: "I ask a candidate's actions in hypothetical situations".

Teacher selection practices among school contexts were investigated to answer several research questions, which are highlighted later in this chapter. However, as preliminary statistical analyses necessary for the analysis of variance procedures which addressed the research questions, the means and standard deviations of survey respondents were calculated, and are presented next in Tables 10 to 12.

**Qualities**

Regarding qualities, Table 10 shows communication skills, the ability to teach all types of children and change instruction based on student's needs, willingness to share materials, and an interest in professional growth have overall means which ranged from 3.5 to 3.9, and are important teacher qualities to principals regardless of school type.
### Table 10: Means and Standard Deviations for Qualities Sought During Teacher Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>SES Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eff. N=46</td>
<td>Typ. N=61</td>
<td>Metro N=57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. communication skills</td>
<td>3.98 .25</td>
<td>3.85 .40</td>
<td>3.91 .29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. can teach all types of children</td>
<td>3.91 .28</td>
<td>3.92 .28</td>
<td>3.95 .23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. changes instruction based on student's needs</td>
<td>3.98 .15</td>
<td>3.82 .22</td>
<td>3.98 .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. shares materials/ ideas</td>
<td>3.64 .49</td>
<td>3.52 .62</td>
<td>3.60 .56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. interested in professional growth</td>
<td>3.62 .49</td>
<td>3.50 .62</td>
<td>3.70 .53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. works outside school (fundraisers, PTA)</td>
<td>3.47 .69</td>
<td>3.30 .70</td>
<td>3.37 .67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. puts in extra time before &amp; after school</td>
<td>3.06 .76</td>
<td>2.80 .90</td>
<td>2.93 .75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>SES Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eff. N=46</td>
<td>Typ. N=61</td>
<td>Metro N=57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. writes grants</td>
<td>2.94 .73</td>
<td>2.95 .69</td>
<td>2.76 .77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. has interests outside</td>
<td>2.62 .71</td>
<td>2.46 .80</td>
<td>2.50 .81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education field</td>
<td>2.13 .80</td>
<td>1.91 .79</td>
<td>2.16 .74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. religious convictions</td>
<td>2.06 .76</td>
<td>1.74 .74</td>
<td>2.20 .86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. age</td>
<td>1.70 .69</td>
<td>1.42 .57</td>
<td>1.68 .68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. teacher's SES</td>
<td>1.62 .77</td>
<td>1.44 .73</td>
<td>1.80 .95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. delayed entrant</td>
<td>1.66 .79</td>
<td>1.40 .62</td>
<td>1.74 .83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. parental status</td>
<td>1.34 .52</td>
<td>1.33 .58</td>
<td>1.38 .57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Response choices were  
1 = not important  
2 = somewhat important  
3 = important  
4 = very important
Table 10 shows the qualities that principals, regardless of school type, feel are important to somewhat important with overall means ranging from 2.1 to 3.4. Examples are works outside of school at, for example, PTA events, puts in extra time before and after school, writes grants, has interests outside the education field, and a teacher's religious convictions.

Table 10 also highlights the qualities that principals, across school types, feel are somewhat important to not important for which the overall means were 2.0 or less. Some examples are a teacher's age, socioeconomic status, marital status, delayed entrance into teaching, parental status, and marital status.

**Procedures**

With respect to procedures utilized, Table 11 shows that principals, in all school types, usually to always use some selection procedures due to overall means ranging from 3.0 to 3.5. These include calling a candidate's previous principal(s), and investigating employment records and past evaluations. Also, asking hypothetical questions, investigating attendance records, ranking candidates during interviews, and contacting a candidate’s references are usually used by principals across school types.

Table 11 shows several procedures, that principals across school types sometimes use. These procedures are asking a series of question during the interview, interviewing a candidate more than once, and using a committee during the teacher selection process.
Table 11  Means and Standard Deviations for Procedures Utilized During Teacher Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>SES Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eff. Typ.</td>
<td>Metro Rural Low Middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=46</td>
<td>N=61 N=57 N=50 N=34 N=73</td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Mean SD Mean SD Mean SD Mean SD Mean SD Mean SD Mean SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. call previous principal</td>
<td>3.70 .69 3.40 .69 3.42 .84 3.66 .48 3.59 .70 3.51 .71 3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. employment record</td>
<td>3.45 .72 3.40 .85 3.32 .87 3.54 .68 3.56 .70 3.36 .82 3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. evaluations</td>
<td>3.28 .77 3.48 .75 3.47 .71 3.30 .81 3.53 .61 3.33 .82 3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ask hypothetical questions</td>
<td>3.30 .91 3.22 1.03 3.40 .88 3.08 1.05 3.50 .79 3.14 1.03 3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. attendance record</td>
<td>3.30 .86 3.03 .96 3.11 .99 3.20 .83 3.12 1.01 3.16 .88 3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. rank candidates</td>
<td>3.11 1.01 3.13 .98 3.28 .94 2.94 1.02 3.29 .87 3.04 1.03 3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. contact references</td>
<td>3.09 .80 2.87 .93 2.88 .95 3.06 .79 3.15 .74 2.88 .93 3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ask series of questions</td>
<td>2.77 1.03 2.75 1.02 2.91 .99 2.58 1.03 2.82 1.00 2.73 1.03 2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. interview more than once</td>
<td>2.45 .77 2.17 .85 2.30 .84 2.28 .81 2.35 .81 2.26 .83 2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. use committee</td>
<td>1.68 1.11 1.95 1.06 1.95 1.11 1.70 1.05 1.65 .95 1.92 1.14 1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Response choices were 1 = never used 2 = sometimes used 3 = usually used 4 = always used
As can also be seen by looking at Table 11, a couple of the procedures, including asking a standard series of questions during interviews and using a committee to select a teacher, are reportedly used less often by principals across school types. These procedures have large standard deviations which range from .99 to 1.14, which suggests a lack of agreement within school types.

Problems

Finally, data represented in Table 12 show, there are some similarities in the reported frequency that principals encounter problems during the teacher selection process. The problem principals encountered more often than others, regardless of school type, was that of finding certified teachers to fill a vacancy. This is a recognized dilemma for education in general throughout the nation (Morris, 1983; Coady, 1990). There were also several problems that principals in all school types sometimes encounter. They are too few applicants, teachers apply for a position just to have a job, and the third was that other principals try to "pass on" bad teachers.

Likewise, there were problems that principals in all school types sometimes to never encounter with overall means of 1.2 to 1.7. Those problems include the school’s location, too many applicants, Central Office involvement, and the reputation of the students. The least frequently encountered problems were Central Office denying a principal's request for a teacher and withholding negative information about a teacher.
Table 12  **Means and Standard Deviations for Problems Encountered During Teacher Selection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>SES Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eff. N=46</td>
<td>Typ. N=61</td>
<td>Metro N=57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. finding certified/ qualified teachers</td>
<td>2.19 .99</td>
<td>2.15 .95</td>
<td>2.12 .93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. too few applicants</td>
<td>2.02 .94</td>
<td>1.80 .82</td>
<td>1.88 .93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. apply just to have a job</td>
<td>1.79 .41</td>
<td>1.87 .54</td>
<td>1.82 .50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. other principals &quot;pass on&quot; bad teachers</td>
<td>1.74 .57</td>
<td>1.77 .56</td>
<td>1.72 .56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. school's location</td>
<td>1.72 .95</td>
<td>1.62 .83</td>
<td>1.60 .82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. too many applicants</td>
<td>1.49 .69</td>
<td>1.83 .87</td>
<td>1.72 .84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. C.O. pressure to select based on race</td>
<td>1.32 .52</td>
<td>1.62 .87</td>
<td>1.68 .89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. C.O. controls who interviews</td>
<td>1.38 .71</td>
<td>1.58 .79</td>
<td>1.58 .84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 12 cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>SES Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eff. Typ.</td>
<td>Metro Rural</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=46 N=61</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=57 N=50</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=34 N=73</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. C.O. sends &quot;best&quot; to friends</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. C.O. pressure to take a teacher</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. students' reputations</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. C.O. denies request</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. C.O. withholds negative information</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Response choices were
1 = never encountered
2 = sometimes encountered
3 = usually encountered
4 = always encountered
In general, lower overall means ranging from 1.2 to 2.2 suggest that problems are not usually encountered. All but one problem are below the 2.0 midpoint of the scale.

Using the revised 38 item survey instrument, several research questions were addressed. The research questions explored whether or not principals in different contexts differ in a statistically significant way regarding qualities sought, procedures utilized, and problems encountered during the teacher selection process. In order to answer the research questions, MANOVA was used. Where a statistically significant difference occurred, an item by item analysis, using Levene's homogeneity of variance test, was utilized.

The level of significance of a statistical test is closely related to sample size. Thus, a .05 alpha level was chosen to avoid Type I errors and to identify differences among subgroups. Additionally, items which resulted in a statistical difference at a .10 alpha level, which is a less stringent measure, are also reported to identify differences among subgroups. Type II errors, where a difference occurs between subgroups but is not identified, remains a possibility in the current study due to small sample size. The MANOVAs which address the research questions are presented and discussed in the following sections.
Qualities Sought During Teacher Selection

With regard to the qualities sought during teacher selection, a statistically significant difference was obtained by school type. In other words, principals in effective elementary schools reported several teacher qualities to be more important than did their peers in typical elementary schools. These data are represented in Table 13.

Principals of effective elementary schools, more than principals of typical elementary schools, are interested in selecting teachers from socioeconomic backgrounds who will understand and relate to the students. These principals, more than principals of typical schools, also seek teachers who have an interest in professional growth. Also, principals of effective elementary schools reported the quality of having strong communication skills as being more important than their counterparts in typical schools. These same principals deemed the teacher quality of working outside of school to make home visits, participating in fund raisers, and facilitating PTA projects as more important than principals of typical elementary schools. Further, principals of effective elementary schools reported changing instructional techniques based on students' needs as being more important than their peers in typical schools. These data may be seen by referring to Table 14.
Table 13  **Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Teacher Qualities**

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Type</td>
<td>489.786</td>
<td>7.091</td>
<td>.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Type</td>
<td>13.596</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School SES Type</td>
<td>5.143</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable = Qualities

*p < .05

No interactions were significant

Table 14  **Qualities Sought which Differ by School Type (Effective/ Typical)**

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Typical School</th>
<th>Effective School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. teacher's socioeconomic status</td>
<td>1.42 .56</td>
<td>1.70 .69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. interested in professional growth/attends training sessions</td>
<td>3.50 .62</td>
<td>3.62 .49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. communication skills</td>
<td>3.85 .40</td>
<td>3.98 .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. works outside of school (PTA)</td>
<td>2.80 .90</td>
<td>3.06 .76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. changes instructional techniques based on students' needs</td>
<td>3.95 .22</td>
<td>3.98 .15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Independent Variable = School Type

**p < .05
*p < .10

Scale: 1= Not Important, 2= Somewhat Important, 3= Important, 4= Very Important
Procedures Utilized During Teacher Selection

The procedures utilized by principals during the teacher selection process were investigated, and analyses was done to determine whether or not principals in different contexts differ in a statistically significant way regarding procedures utilized. The results showed no statistical difference with regard to the school type, community type or socioeconomic status of the school with respect to procedures utilized. These data are represented in Table 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Type</td>
<td>145.458</td>
<td>2.132</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School SES Type</td>
<td>059.535</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Type</td>
<td>008.006</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable = Procedures
Computed using alpha = .05
No interactions were significant
Problems Encountered During Teacher Selection

The problems encountered by principals during teacher selection had no statistically significant difference with regard to school type or community type. However, the perceived problems differed with regard to the socioeconomic status of the school. The data, represented in Tables 16 and 17, show that principals of middle-SES schools more often have a problem with too many applicants, while principals of low-SES schools reported the opposite, that of having too few applicants to fill teaching positions. Also, principals of low-SES schools reported that the reputation of their student population, the location of their schools, and finding certified teachers during the selection process were problems they more often encountered than did principals of middle-SES schools. Likewise, principals at low-SES schools reported having a more frequent problem, than did principals of middle-SES schools, with other principals trying to "pass on" bad teachers to their schools.

Table 16  Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Problems Encountered

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Type</td>
<td>045.500</td>
<td>1.563</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School SES Type</td>
<td>144.311</td>
<td>4.958</td>
<td>.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Type</td>
<td>000.029</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>.975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable = Problems
*p < .05
No interactions were significant
Table 17 Problems Encountered which Differ by School SES (Low/ Middle)

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Low SES</th>
<th>Middle SES</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. too many applicants</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. too few applicants</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. students' reputation</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. school's location</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. finding certified/ qualified teachers</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. other principal's &quot;pass on&quot; bad teachers</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Independent Variable = School SES
*p < .05
Scale: 1= Never, 2= Sometimes, 3= Usually, 4= Always

Summary

Chapter Four has summarized and discussed the research findings from the four phases of the current research study, which included both qualitative and quantitative procedures. Specifically, the methods used for the selection of schools which participated in the current study as well as the findings from the principal and teacher interviews were discussed.
The development and piloting of the quantitative questionnaire, including factor analysis results which lead to instrument refinement, were explored. Finally, answers to the research questions were addressed and reported.

The next and final chapter, Chapter Five, will present a general summary of the current research findings and discuss conclusions which may be drawn from the data. It will close with recommendations for future research and policy implications with respect to the teacher selection process.
CHAPTER FIVE

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of the current study was to investigate the teacher selection process in elementary schools which differ by school type (effective/typical), community type (metropolitan/rural), and socioeconomic status (low-/middle-). Specifically, the qualities sought, procedures utilized, and problems encountered by principals during teacher selection were examined. Analyses of both qualitative and quantitative data were conducted to determine whether teacher selection practices differ among school types.

As suggested by previous research (Wendel & Breed, 1988; Garman & Alkire, 1993), there is a need to learn more about principals' behavior during teacher selection. Thus, building on the foundation of former studies, the current study is based on the assumption that principals of effective schools intentionally shape the academic culture of those schools. One primary way of molding an effective school culture is by selecting teachers who share the principal's values and who will be effective in the classrooms and ultimately lead students to high achievement. Therefore, the current study was based on the premise that effective schools research and school reform and restructuring efforts will be enhanced by discovering what principals of effective schools do in order to attain the best teachers possible for their schools.
As previously stated, the present study involved collecting both qualitative and quantitative data, and was conducted in four phases. In Phase I, all elementary schools in the state were classified using the context variables of community type and student body SES. Using a regression analysis, schools were further identified as effective and typical. These procedures led to the selection of schools for each of the remaining phases of the study. The sampling consisted of schools classified as effective or typical, metropolitan or rural, and middle- or low-SES. Schools that were ineffective, high-SES, or in a location having a population of greater than 250,000, were not considered for participation. A school used in one phase of the current study was excluded from participation in subsequent phases.

For reasons outlined in the previous chapter, Phase II schools were classified as "effective", but differed by community and SES contexts. The sample schools were visited and both principal and teacher interviews were conducted regarding teacher selection. In addition, during site visits the "effective" classification provided by the regression analysis was verified through classroom observations.

Phase III used the interview data to develop and pilot test a questionnaire that was distributed across various "effective" school contexts. The final phase, Phase IV, involved distributing the questionnaire to principals across all the differing school contexts. These data were analyzed to answer several research questions.
Findings

Based on analysis of the qualitative and quantitative data produced by the current study, greater knowledge regarding teacher selection practices may be gleaned. A discussion regarding the findings of the present study as they relate to and extend previous research will be presented next.

Qualities Sought

Research by Wise, Darling-Hammond, and Berry (1987) and Garman (1990) revealed that teacher selection criteria vary according to the values and philosophy of the selection team, and there is a need to affirm the qualities which characterize an effective teacher. Masanja (1990) agreed that specific teacher qualities should be identified and govern the teacher selection process. The current research extended previous studies by finding that the teacher qualities principals seek differ by school type.

In comparison to principals of typical elementary schools, principals of effective elementary schools were more likely to seek teachers who said they changed instructional techniques to fit the needs of the students and who were willing to work outside of school hours. These principals were also more interested, than were their peers at typical schools, in teachers with strong communication skills and who pursued professional growth. Interestingly, a teacher's socioeconomic status (SES) was an important quality to principals at effective schools, though not at typical schools.
A brief discussion regarding the aforementioned teacher qualities which were sought more in effective elementary schools than in typical elementary schools follows. First, a teacher who changes instructional strategies to meet the needs of students demonstrates creativity, flexibility, and dedication toward students (Wise et al., 1987; Crone & Teddlie, 1995). This trait also demonstrates genuine care for student learning and achievement on the part of the teacher (Crone & Teddlie, 1995; Burbage, 1990; Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989). It demonstrates ongoing monitoring of student achievement, a characteristic of effective schools (Vann, 1994), and also helps ensure a high rate of student time-on-task, an indicator of effective instruction (Vann, 1994).

A teacher who works outside of school hours is seemingly interested in spending school time with students. This type of teacher may reserve hours before and after school to serve on the PTA, communicate with parents, grade and prepare paper work, and decorate or enhance the classroom physical environment, all of which are correlates of effective schools (Vann, 1994; ).

A teacher who has strong communication skills (Kahl, 1980; Haussler, 1994; Owens, 1992; Burbage, 1990) is likely to establish rapport with students, parents, and peer teachers which facilitates the school climate and enhances the home-school relationship (Vann, 1994). This type of teacher also models appropriate speech, an area in which many students need to gain additional proficiency.
Principals of effective elementary schools also seek a teacher who is interested in professional growth. This quality demonstrates dedication to the education profession. It also shows that a teacher critiques him or herself and wants to grow or improve (Burbage, 1990; Steuteville-Brodinsky, 1989). It is an indication that a teacher has the potential to serve as a model for peer teachers and help with staff development. When time and financial constraints are overwhelming, a teacher who grows professionally is an asset who enriches both the school and district.

Principals at effective elementary schools were concerned about a teacher's SES. They seek teachers who will understand the background of the student population which they will teach. They reported wanting teachers who would relate to students and parents, and empathize with and facilitate the students' abilities to succeed academically. This finding confirmed previous research (Wise et al., 1987) that a valued teacher quality is the ability to handle student diversity.

With regard to disciplining students, Garman (1990) found large urban school districts place classroom management and the ability to discipline students as the most important teacher quality. Interestingly, the current study found through interviews with principals of effective elementary schools, regardless of context, these same qualities are sought during the teacher selection process. This finding confirms other effective schools research where a safe, orderly climate has been noted repeatedly (Vann, 1994).
The current research, via interviews with principals of effective elementary schools, confirmed prior research by Crone and Teddlie (1995) that principals of effective schools look for creativity, flexibility, and concern for children. These principals said they inquire about what teaching methods a teacher has used in the past, and what accommodations he or she has incorporated in order to be successful when teaching. A general concern for children and their success was another quality these principals seek.

Enthusiasm has been noted as an important teacher quality in much research (Burbage, 1990; Steuteville- Brodinsky et al., 1989; Place & Drake, 1994; Marcum, 1988). Garman (1990) found that rural districts placed enthusiasm as the most important quality a teacher can have. Stringfield and Teddlie's (1988) findings that principals in effective low-SES schools look for "spark" or "energy" was extended by the current study where principals of effective elementary schools, regardless of school context, reported looking for energy and enthusiasm.

Principals of effective elementary schools, across all school contexts, participating in the present study, also did not mention having an advanced degree or years of teaching experience as important teacher qualities, which confirmed Stringfield & Teddlie's (1988) finding regarding principals in effective low-SES schools. These aforementioned principals did, however, state that the variety or diversity of a candidate's teaching background and experiences were important.
Kowalski, McDaniel, Place, and Reitzug (1992) sampled principals in suburban schools, and discovered the most important teacher qualities sought were the ability to get along with peers and the quality of previous teaching experiences. The current study extended this finding by showing that principals of effective elementary schools in various contexts seek these same teacher qualities. Thus, the ability to get along with others is a quality sought not only in suburban schools, but in effective schools, regardless of context. Also, principals of effective elementary schools seek teachers who they believe have previous teaching experiences which enhance their ability to work with students. For example, a 1989 AASA survey found teachers who have high expectations for students and believe all students can learn were sought.

The current study extended this finding. Interestingly, principals of effective schools in both metropolitan and rural, low-SES schools stated seeking these qualities. This may be an indication that students from middle-SES backgrounds are exposed to the notion, at both home and school, that they can and will learn. It may be less important for middle-SES students to have teachers who believe they can learn, because the students already have this mindset. However, students from low-SES backgrounds may need teachers who believe they can and will learn. This may be an idea they are rarely exposed to at home and in the community. Research has shown that teacher expectations are powerful indicators of student involvement and achievement (Good, 1987; Vann, 1994).
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Procedures Utilized

Research using case studies (Wise et al., 1987) revealed that school districts use, to varying degrees, reviewing certification and college transcripts, checking references, consulting informal networks, and observing actual teaching performance as procedures to assess teacher candidates. Interviews with principals of effective elementary schools, conducted in the current study, confirmed three of these procedures including reviewing certification, NTE scores, and college transcripts. Also, checking references and observing actual teaching performance were reported as procedures utilized in various ways by principals, regardless of school context.

Interviews conducted in the current study failed to corroborate Crone and Teddlie's (1995) finding that, in effective schools, no mention was made of new teachers being selected from student teachers. In fact, closely observing student teachers as potential faculty members was mentioned as common practice in rural schools and one metropolitan, low-SES school. Because the small size of the applicant pool in rural schools is a recognized problem (Hooper, 1987), and metropolitan, low-SES schools have a problem getting teachers to come work with at-risk students in inner-city areas (Steuteville-Brodinsky, 1989), this procedure might actually be a form of recruitment. This procedure is also a way principals can observe firsthand a potential candidate to assess whether or not s/he has the qualities they are seeking.
The present study confirmed Stringfield and Teddlie's (1991) finding that principals of effective schools informally recruit teachers using current faculty. During interviews, principals in every context said they approach the current faculty regarding potential teachers, and vice versa. These principals let the teachers know when there is an opening, and ask the teachers if they might know of someone who would be an asset in the position. Likewise, it is reportedly a common procedure for current faculty to go to the principal if they know of a good candidate for a teaching vacancy. This procedure may serve several purposes, one being to continue the established culture of the school by acquiring teachers who will share the common philosophy and work well with other teachers and the school community (Cuban, 1984; Frase, 1992; Haberman, 1993). This procedure may also be a form of site based management, or a way for a principal to have more control than central office administrators over who s/he interviews and ultimately selects. As will be discussed later in the chapter, the present study revealed several problems encountered during teacher selection are associated with central office involvement. Bureaucratic screening practices (Duke & Canady, 1991; Maxwell, 1987) conducted by central office may actually serve to discourage or frustrate potential teacher candidates. Keeping central office out of the teacher selection process for as long as possible may be a conscious decision on the part of principals of effective elementary schools.
The current research failed to confirm the extensive use of structured interviews suggested by Castetter (1992) and Nesbit and Tadlock (1986). Rather, a relaxed talk and hypothetical questions were utilized by principals participating in the present study, regardless of school context. These principals said they prefer to have a relaxed conversation about "kids" and society in general to get a feel for the candidate and his or her philosophy. They also find it easier to discuss aspects which are potentially illegal, such as the candidate's marital status and stability, whether or not they have children, religious convictions, health status, and the like. While the principals know these are illegal and personal questions, they said these are things they want to know. For example, one principal said he avoids selecting a teacher who is having problems in his or her marriage. He feels that teaching is stressful enough without having problems at home, and frankly he did not want a teacher who might be upset and take out frustrations on the children at school. Principals reported wanting to know whether a teacher has children of their own. In general, the current study found that principals believed people who have children are more empathetic toward child development. They reported seeking teachers who enjoy children, and feel that being a parent is usually an asset as a teacher. Principals also want to get an idea about a candidate's morals and values. They made no apologies for wanting to select a candidate who had character consistent with accepted Judao-Christian beliefs.
While using letters of recommendation and contacting references was generally not suggested in the research (Wise et al., 1987; Goldstein, 1986; & Shelton, 1989), this procedure was reported, during interviews, to be extensively used by principals of effective elementary schools in every school context. Also, the current study revealed that contacting past principals to thoroughly investigate a candidate's history (Shakeshaft & Cohan, 1995) is a procedure usually utilized by principals regardless of school context. Principals said they contact past principals and supervisors to inquire about a teacher for several reasons. One is to hear the sincerity in the voice of a former principal or supervisor when discussing a teacher candidate. Principals said it is much easier to mark an application blank and indicate that a teacher has had satisfactory performance, when she or he really had many areas of needed improvement, than it is to be dishonest in person to a principal who is considering a teacher for a vacancy. This is a means of avoiding a teacher who another principal "wants to get rid of" or as Bridges (1986) described as "the dance of the lemons". Another reason for phoning a candidate's previous principal is that many administrators avoid making negative comments in writing due to potential litigation regarding some of the aforementioned illegal topics. However, these same principals will candidly discuss a candidate in a private conversation to help a peer avoid a teacher who has performance problems or personal problems which may interfere with the successful functioning of a school.
The current study confirmed Teddlie and Stringfield's (1993) finding that principals of effective schools investigate candidates personnel files at central office. During interviews with these principals from all contexts, they stated that they investigate personnel files to examine previous evaluations and employment records.

Interviews conducted during the current study also confirmed using a committee to select a teacher, as suggested by Gips and Bredeson (1984), Mueller (1993), and Herman (1993). This may actually be an indication of leadership style. Effective leaders establish friendship, trust, warmth, interest, and respect between themselves and subordinates (Halpin, 1966). These leaders experience a wide zone of acceptance from subordinates, and involve them in decision-making (Leverette, 1984).

Research has shown that, in general, teachers do not frequently participate in decision making at the school or district level (Schneider, 1985; Taylor & Bogotch, 1994). However, effective schools research, for example Rutter et al. (1979), has long recognized that improved student outcomes tend to be found in schools where teachers have increased participation in decision making. Further, teachers involved in decision making have some of the most positive attitudes toward students (Taylor & Tashakkori, 1997). Principals who utilize a teacher selection committee are implementing an aspect of school reform and restructuring which may ultimately enhance student achievement (Rutter et al., 1979) and lead to greater job satisfaction for teachers (Conway, 1984).
Problems Encountered

The current study added to the field of research by revealing seven major problems encountered during teacher selection. One is mainly associated with middle-SES schools, and five are associated predominately with low-SES schools. Another problematic area that principals encounter is related to central office involvement during the teacher selection process. A discussion of each of the aforementioned problems follows.

In comparison to principals of low-SES elementary schools, principals of middle-SES elementary schools were more likely to encounter the problem of having too many applicants for each teaching vacancy. Research (Duke & Canady, 1991; Ewell & Chaffee, 1981) has shown that the size of the applicant pool is a logistical problem. Too many applicants equates to too much information to process (Wise et al., 1987), the likelihood of inappropriate information being gathered (Hickey, 1970), and the daunting task of collecting, analyzing, processing, and disposing of the candidates' information (Kipetskie, 1983; Webster, 1988; Sawyer, 1988). Due to a lack of time for selecting teachers (Natter & Kuder, 1983), which is often the case, a large applicant pool only exacerbates this obstacle. It stands to reason that middle-SES schools are faced with this situation because of the associated benefits, such as, motivated students, parental involvement, and often desirable school locations. It should also be recognized as a problem which should be addressed. One solution might be for the central office to
facilitate the screening of applicants by highlighting teacher characteristics in personnel files which could be easily accessed and perused by principals seeking certain qualities or teaching experiences. This measure could be enhanced if the personnel files were in a computer data bank and networked throughout the school system.

In contrast to having too many applicants, Hooper (1987) found that rural schools encounter the problem of too few applicants for teaching positions. The current study found, however, that this problem was associated with the SES of the school, not the community type. Principals in low-SES schools reportedly encounter this problem more often than their peers in middle-SES schools. Research has shown (Wise et al., 1987) that the applicant pool is affected by student characteristics, geographic location, and neighborhood characteristics. These traits are often associated with low-SES schools in a negative way, which not surprisingly affects the size of the applicant pool in these schools.

The next problem is associated with the previous one. Steuteville-Brodinsky et al. (1989) and Rebore (1991) found that some principals feel the student body's reputation for being at-risk or discipline problems is an obstacle during teacher selection. The current study found that principals of low-SES schools reported encountering this problem more often than principals of middle-SES schools. Again, this finding might be expected.
The current study found another problem associated with low-SES schools. Compared to principals of middle-SES schools, principals of low-SES schools reported the location of their school as a problem frequently encountered during teacher selection. This problem is associated with the two previously discussed problems. Again, research has shown that the geographic location and student characteristics (Wise et al., 1987) as well as the stress and undesirable working conditions (Steuteville-Brodinsky, 1989) often associated with low-SES schools is problematic during the process of teacher selection.

The current research found that principals of low-SES schools also reportedly encounter the problem of finding certified teachers to fill vacancies more frequently than principals of middle-SES schools. This problem is associated with the previously mentioned problems that low-SES schools encounter. The applicant pool size, the student body's reputation, and the school's location certainly influence a principal's ability to find certified teachers. Research (Murnane, Singer, Willett, Kemple, & Olsen, 1991; Coady, 1990) has revealed that a teacher shortage is a national problem. The most academically able candidates pursue other careers, state certification requirements affect the ability to recruit out of state, and local transfer policies contribute to this problem.

The current study confirmed previous research by Bridges (1986) and Steuteville-Brodinsky et al. (1989) that some principals will avoid negative comments about a teacher to get rid of him or her. The current study revealed that principals of
low-SES schools reported encountering this problem more often than did principals in middle-SES schools. The "dance of the lemons" (Bridges, 1986) is yet another problem that principals of low-SES schools face which is not so surprising.

Wise et al. (1987) and Okeafor and Teddlie (1989) reported that central office politics interferes with teacher selection. The current study confirmed this problem and extended the findings. Six specific problems associated with central office are sometimes encountered by principals regardless of school context. These problems are that central office occasionally puts pressure on a principal to select a teacher based on race. Also, at times, central office controls who interviews for vacancies. Principals also reported that central office sometimes sends the "best" teacher candidates to their friends, and puts pressure to take a teacher who otherwise would not be chosen. Additionally, central office occasionally denies requests for teachers and withholds negative information about teacher candidates. The implications of these findings are that on the one hand reform efforts are emphasizing site-based management, and research (Place & Kowalski, 1993; Kowalski, McDaniel, Place, & Reitzug, 1992) indicates that teacher selection decisions should be made locally. However, in reality, the district office is constraining principals' actions during the teacher selection process, which makes the process even more difficult.
While it is widely agreed that it is the principal's responsibility to ensure that only competent teachers are in contact with students (Frase, 1992; Anderson, 1992), the negative central office involvement that sometimes occurs during the teacher selection process can make all principals' jobs harder. This also further complicates the process of discovering what principals of effective schools do to acquire the best teachers possible for their schools. While it is understandable that some schools are faced with small applicant pools due to the school's location or the student body's characteristics, it is not understandable or tolerable for central office, even on an occasional basis, to negatively impact the selection process.

Conclusions

One conclusion drawn from the present study is that teacher selection is a complex process due to the number of teacher qualities sought, procedures utilized, and problems encountered. It appears many principals approach teacher selection as a multi-faceted process because they do not depend on one or two teacher qualities or utilize one or two selection procedures during the process. Rather, principals depend on multiple selection criteria and procedures. For example, principals of effective schools look at the total teacher, including both professional and personal qualities, when selecting a teacher.

Another conclusion, however, is that just because teacher qualities are sought, no deduction can be made that total or even accurate insight regarding the qualities sought
can be assured by the procedures utilized. For example, a teacher who changes instructional techniques based on students' requirements is sought by principals of effective schools. However, to accurately assess this quality would probably require multiple observations of a teacher, which was not reported as a frequently used procedure by elementary school principals.

One may conclude that elementary principals of schools in all contexts believe getting input from others who have worked with a teacher candidate is important. For example, calling previous principals and examining past evaluations to investigate a teacher's background (Murnane, et al., 1991) is a procedure utilized by principals of effective and typical elementary schools. This may be a way of finding teachers who possess desired qualities and avoiding those teachers who would be less than effective.

A final conclusion may be that principals of low-SES schools perceive their schools are less competitive for top teaching talent because of the problems they encounter, such as the reputation of the student body and the location of the school. Actually, factors in a low-SES neighborhood, like high crime rates, may lead teachers to believe that a certain school is a dangerous place to teach. Therefore, factors in a school, such as low parent involvement or challenging discipline situations, along with some neighborhood characteristics contribute to problems encountered by principals during teacher selection.
Recommendations

Based upon analyses of data as well as the findings and conclusions reached through the current study, four recommendations for future research and four policy implications will be presented next. First, because there is a need to know whether teacher selection practices ultimately lead to greater student achievement, consideration should be given by educational researchers to initiate further research to determine the effectiveness of teacher selection on teacher performance and school performance. Any practices that can be identified could possibly be duplicated in other settings. An extension of this research should also address whether selection practices determine the effectiveness of teaching and student performance or whether teachers are socialized into effective teachers.

Second, consideration should be given by educational researchers to refining the survey instrument used in the current study for the assessment of teacher selection qualities, procedures, and problems. Due to the strict definitions used for effectiveness, community type, and socioeconomic status, the sample size used in the present study was relatively small. When a sample size is small, there is a risk of not finding differences between groups when differences do occur. This is referred to as a Type II error. Thus, with a larger sample size, this risk is lessened. A larger sample size should be used via a regional or multi-state study to possibly uncover differences between study groups not found in the current study.
Third, in addition to increasing the sample size, a companion study should be conducted. Because findings from one context cannot be extrapolated to another, more research is needed to determine if there is a correlation between the teacher selection practices of elementary and secondary school principals. Elementary and secondary schools are very different organizations, and in an effort to address the equity issue of school effectiveness, research should be done to determine whether teacher selection practices differ between these school types. Also, if there are differences between elementary and secondary schools, the differences should be thoroughly explored in order to have a meaningful impact with regard to school effectiveness and school reform.

Fourth, educational researchers could contribute extensively to the school effects knowledge base by conducting additional research regarding the gender, race and possibly the years of teaching experience of school principals regarding teacher selection practices. It is plausible that these findings can be extended to learn more about cultural leadership issues and perception issues. This type of research could potentially impact policies and procedures regarding teacher selection practices. A considerable amount of information could be gleaned regarding, for example, leadership styles. Focus groups could be beneficial in exploring this area of teacher selection.

Regarding recommendations for policy, district offices and graduate programs for educational administration should include a course on teacher selection practices. The
findings from the current study, as well as previous research, could offer considerable benefit to principals as they experience the process. Included in the course of study should be information regarding teacher qualities sought by principals of effective elementary schools. These basic ten qualities would provide an appropriate framework for helping principals select teachers. The qualities include: a) the ability to change instruction to meet student needs based on a genuine concern for children; b) the desire to work outside of schools hours; c) the ability to communicate well; d) the desire to pursue professional growth; e) the ability to relate to students regardless of personal socioeconomic status background; f) the ability to discipline students and have good classroom management skills; g) the ability to be creative and flexible; h) the ability to get along well with others; i) the experiences and teaching background which will enhance the learning and achievement of students; and j) enthusiasm. Additionally, present and future principals who find themselves in a school where the students represent a low-SES population should especially seek teachers who have high expectations for students and believe that all students can learn. This might be challenging due to a smaller applicant pool at low-SES schools, however a conscious effort should be made to acquire teachers with the aforementioned beliefs.

A second policy recommendation is that present and future principals should be apprised of the procedures utilized by principals of effective elementary schools when
selecting a teacher. The recommended procedures include carefully perusing personnel files to investigate appropriate certification, attendance, and performance evaluations. Contacting past principals and supervisors by telephone to inquire about a candidate, and informally recruiting teachers using the present faculty, as well as closely observing student teachers as potential faculty members are also recommended. Finally, when interviewing a candidate, having a relaxed talk and asking hypothetical questions is beneficial. This will facilitate a relaxed climate and the possible posing of personal questions deemed important to the principal.

Third, regarding policy recommendations, is that colleges and universities should be apprised of the findings of the current study in order to make modifications in teacher preparation programs to enhance the success of student teachers during the selection process. For example, schools in low-SES settings reportedly encounter the problems of too few applicants, the reputation of the students as being at-risk and behavior problems, and the often undesirable inner-city location of the school. If colleges of education exposed these perceived problems to future teachers, and prepared student teachers with techniques to work successfully in these schools, many new teachers might actually want to pursue a teaching career with children in low-SES schools. In fact, principals of effective low-SES schools may seek younger, more idealistic teachers (Teddle, Stringfield, Wimpleberg, & Kirby, 1987). Education colleges could make these matches.
A fourth policy recommendation is that district offices should not interfere with the teacher selection process. The current study revealed that some perceived problems encountered during teacher selection were associated with the occasional involvement of central office. Specifically, central office personnel should not show favoritism by sending the "best" teachers to their friends, nor place pressure on a principal to select a teacher s/he otherwise would not choose. Central office should not withhold negative information or deny a principal's request for a teacher without considerable justification.

Summary

This chapter presented a general summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further research and policy implications regarding the teacher selection process. Because teacher selection is one of the most important tasks conducted by administrators, a better understanding of the qualities, procedures, and problems associated with teacher selection can serve to improve the quality of instruction and ultimately student achievement within our schools. The current study has added to this body of research, and if the aforementioned findings and recommendations are utilized, the potential for preparing our nation's children for the next century is great.
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## APPENDIX A

### DIAGRAM OF STUDY PHASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>To identify all elementary schools in the state by community type and SES. To classify schools as &quot;effective&quot;/ &quot;typical&quot; To construct a sampling matrix</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>To select a sample of schools and visit for data collection. To screen for &quot;effectiveness&quot; using the SCS and VTBI To interview the principal and two teachers</td>
<td>12-1=11 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>To develop a questionnaire based on interview data by conducting content analysis, developing an item pool, and establishing face and content validity To pilot test the questionnaire To determine internal consistency reliability using Cronbach's alpha</td>
<td>21-2=19 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>To utilize questionnaire in quantitative data collection To determine internal consistency reliability using Cronbach's alpha To establish construct validity using factor analysis which yielded 3 subscales (qualities, procedures, and problems) with 2 factors per subscale To calculate means and standard deviations To utilize MANOVA and item by item analysis to answer the research questions</td>
<td>127-20=107 (84%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW GUIDE

Educational research has established that effective schools are places with strong instructional leadership and effective classroom instruction. One way principals facilitate effective classroom instruction is by teacher selection. The present study is investigating teacher selection practices in effective elementary schools in both rural and metropolitan as well as in low and middle-socioeconomic schools. This is the first phase of the study, which explores the qualities principals look for, the procedures they utilize, and the problems they encounter during teacher selection. A subsequent phase of the current study will investigate whether there are differences between selection practices in schools that are in different socioeconomic and community type settings.

I appreciate your agreeing to an interview. I am going to ask you some questions regarding teacher selection, or in other words how you go about filling teacher vacancies. What you have to say is very valuable, and there are no right or wrong answers. I want to know about your experiences and opinions.

1. Teacher Qualities
   A. What qualities are you looking for in a teacher?
   B. Do you look for the same qualities when you are considering different types of applicants, such as a) new college graduate, b) delayed entrant, c) re-entrant, d) transfer?
   (If no), Please tell me the differences according to each type.
   a) new college graduate
   b) delayed entrant
   c) re-entrant
   d) transfer

2. Teacher Selection Procedures
   A. Looking at your teacher roster, please tell me what you did when each one was selected. Try to be as specific as possible.
   B. Do you use the same procedures when you are considering different types of applicants, such as those previously stated?
   (If no), Please tell me what you do differently for each type of candidate.
   a) new college graduate
   b) delayed entrant
   c) re-entrant
   d) transfer
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3. Teacher Selection Problems
   A. Are there any problems that occur during teacher selection?
   B. What is the most difficult aspect of teacher selection?
   C. Is there anything you like about teacher selection?
   D. Is there anything you dislike about teacher selection?
   E. Do you have any concerns regarding teacher selection?
   F. What would you recommend to other principals or schools about teacher selection?
   G. If you had the power to change things about teacher selection here, what would you make different?

4. Overcoming/ Sustaining Teacher Selection Problems
   A. What do you do about the problems you encounter in teacher selection?

5. Background Information
   Parish of school: Name of school:
   Community Type: Rural Metropolitan
   Percentage of students receiving free lunch:
   School Type: MMidSES MLowSES RMidSES RLowSES
   Grade structure of school:
   Size of school (# of students):
   Percentage of non-white students:
   Size of school system:

   Name of interviewee:

   Date of Birth:

   Gender:

   Race:

   Years in current position:

   Total years as a school principal:

   Educational background and degrees:

   Total years spent as a full-time teacher:
Educational research has established that effective schools are places with strong instructional leadership and effective classroom instruction. One way principals facilitate effective classroom instruction is by teacher selection. The present study is investigating teacher selection practices in effective elementary schools in both rural and metropolitan as well as in low and middle-socioeconomic schools. This is the first phase of the study, which explores the qualities principals look for, the procedures they utilize, and the problems they encounter during teacher selection. A subsequent phase of the current study will investigate whether there are differences between selection practices in schools that are in different socioeconomic and community type settings.

I appreciate your agreeing to an interview. I am going to ask you some questions regarding teacher selection, or in other words how you became a teacher at this school. What you have to say is very valuable, and there are no right or wrong answers. I want to know about your experiences and opinions.

1. Teacher Qualities
   A. What qualities do you believe your principal looks for in a teacher?
   B. What qualities do you have as a teacher?
   C. Do you believe your principal looks for the same qualities in different types of applicants, such as a) new college graduate, b) delayed entrant, c) re-entrant, d) transfer?
      (If no), Please tell me the differences according to each type.
      a) new college graduate
      b) delayed entrant
      c) re-entrant
      d) transfer
   D. When you came to this school, were you a new college graduate, delayed entrant, re-entrant, or a transfer?

2. Teacher Selection Procedures
   A. Please tell me exactly how you became a teacher at this school. Try to be as specific as possible as you tell me what happened.

3. Teacher Selection Problems
   A. Do you think there are any problems that occur in teacher selection at this school? If yes, what are they?
   B. If you could, would you change things about teacher selection here? If yes, what would you change?

4. Overcoming/ Sustaining Teacher Selection Problems
   A. How do you think the problems encountered in teacher selection are overcome at this school?
5. Background Information
   Name of school:

   Name of interviewee:

   Date of Birth:

   Gender:

   Race:

   Years in current position:

   Total years as a teacher:

   Educational background and degrees:
### APPENDIX D

**RESIDUAL MEAN SCORES PROFILE OF 127 PHASE IV SCHOOLS**

Students on Free Lunch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sch. No.</th>
<th>School Status</th>
<th>Comm. Type</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>Residual '94-95 Scores</th>
<th>Residual '95-96 Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>40.19</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>46.06</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>37.89</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>54.95</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>79.42</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>57.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>68.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>76.33</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>80.11</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>70.28</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>89.78</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>05.61</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- **Eff.** = Effective
- **Typ.** = Typical
- **MM** = Metropolitan, Middle SES
- **ML** = Metropolitan, Low SES
- **RM** = Rural, Middle SES
- **RL** = Rural, Low SES
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(Table A1 cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sch. No.</th>
<th>School Status</th>
<th>Comm. Type</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>Residual '94-'95 Scores</th>
<th>Residual '95-'96 Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>70.48</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>86.38</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>74.87</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>37.99</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>54.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>33.87</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>18.97</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>67.28</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>93.10</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>32.73</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>75.68</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>48.24</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- **Eff.** = Effective
- **Typ.** = Typical
- **MM** = Metropolitan, Middle SES
- **ML** = Metropolitan, Low SES
- **RM** = Rural, Middle SES
- **RL** = Rural, Low SES
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(Table A1 cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sch. No.</th>
<th>School Status</th>
<th>Comm. Type</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>Residual '94-'95 Scores</th>
<th>Residual '95-96 Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>90.87</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>18.88</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>84.16</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>86.13</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>42.46</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>036</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>037</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>62.32</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>93.92</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>039</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>27.83</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>43.16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>17.40</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Eff. = Effective  
Typ. = Typical  
MM = Metropolitan, Middle SES  
ML = Metropolitan, Low SES  
RM = Rural, Middle SES  
RL = Rural, Low SES
(Table A1 cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sch. No.</th>
<th>School Status</th>
<th>Comm. Type</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>Residual '94-'95 Scores</th>
<th>Residual '95-'96 Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>043</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>68.72</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>044</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>52.84</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>62.99</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>48.56</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>39.85</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>24.42</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>049</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>34.48</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>79.29</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>45.33</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>052</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>92.05</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>33.60</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>054</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>41.50</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>055</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>056</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- **Eff.** = Effective
- **Typ.** = Typical
- **MM** = Metropolitan, Middle SES
- **ML** = Metropolitan, Low SES
- **RM** = Rural, Middle SES
- **RL** = Rural, Low SES
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(Table A1 cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sch. No.</th>
<th>School Status</th>
<th>Comm. Type</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>Residual '94-'95 Scores</th>
<th>Residual '95-96 Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>057</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>80.01</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>058</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>65.61</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>059</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>38.27</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>26.12</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>061</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>68.15</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>062</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>50.80</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>063</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>064</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>32.29</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>065</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>18.97</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>32.22</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>067</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>47.48</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>068</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>90.11</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>069</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>53.67</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>83.89</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  
Eff. = Effective  
Typ. = Typical  
MM = Metropolitan, Middle SES  
ML = Metropolitan, Low SES  
RM = Rural, Middle SES  
RL = Rural, Low SES
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sch. No.</th>
<th>School Status</th>
<th>Comm. Type</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>Residual '94-'95 Scores</th>
<th>Residual '95-'96 Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>071</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>35.93</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>072</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>66.91</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>073</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>28.37</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>074</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>59.15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>075</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>42.26</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>076</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>66.87</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>077</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>62.43</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>078</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>79.73</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>079</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>58.03</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>080</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>081</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>73.71</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>082</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>55.68</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>083</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>57.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>084</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>49.87</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Eff. = Effective  
Typ. = Typical  
MM = Metropolitan, Middle SES  
ML = Metropolitan, Low SES  
RM = Rural, Middle SES  
RL = Rural, Low SES
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sch. No.</th>
<th>School Status</th>
<th>Comm. Type</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>Residual '94-'95 Scores</th>
<th>Residual '95-96 Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>085</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>47.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>086</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>59.93</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>087</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>088</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>49.51</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>089</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>56.57</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>37.72</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>091</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>90.15</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>092</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>48.71</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>093</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>57.72</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>094</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>73.73</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>095</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>83.69</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>096</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>79.48</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>097</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>80.97</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>098</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>78.75</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Eff. = Effective  
Typ. = Typical  
MM = Metropolitan, Middle SES  
ML = Metropolitan, Low SES  
RM = Rural, Middle SES  
RL = Rural, Low SES
(Table A1 cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sch. No.</th>
<th>School Status</th>
<th>Comm. Type</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>Residual '94-95 Scores</th>
<th>Residual '95-96 Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>099</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>32.49</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>50.66</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>82.39</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>60.22</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>93.92</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>57.66</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>67.32</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>79.30</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>22.83</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>50.63</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>53.39</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>85.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Eff. = Effective
- Typ. = Typical
- MM = Metropolitan, Middle SES
- ML = Metropolitan, Low SES
- RM = Rural, Middle SES
- RL = Rural, Low SES
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sch. No.</th>
<th>School Status</th>
<th>Comm. Type</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
<th>Residual '94-'95 Scores</th>
<th>Residual '95-'96 Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>35.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>39.80</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>27.24</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>97.22</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>83.57</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>51.63</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>94.57</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Eff.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>75.26</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>45.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>58.43</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>52.88</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>92.78</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>87.32</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Typ.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Eff. = Effective
- Typ. = Typical
- MM = Metropolitan, Middle SES
- ML = Metropolitan, Low SES
- RM = Rural, Middle SES
- RL = Rural, Low SES
APPENDIX E

Table A2 TEACHER SELECTION SURVEY

QUALITIES DESIRED in a Candidate for a Teaching Position

During teacher selection, principals look for many different qualities in prospective faculty members. Some think a candidate's age is very important. Others think a candidate's sense of humor is very important. Please read the following items, and circle one response per item.

How important do you think these qualities are when you are selecting a teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALITIES</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A candidate's:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. college GPA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. NTE scores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. years of experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. variety of teaching experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. communication skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. interests outside the education field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. friendliness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. sense of humor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. religious convictions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. personal background/experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. socioeconomic status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. marital status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. parental status (has children)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = item was retained on revised survey (38 items)
(Table A2 cont.)

**QUALITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. *A candidate who:*

- a. attends training sessions 1 2 3 4*
- b. acquires an advanced degree or additional certification 1 2 3 4
- c. shares materials/ ideas 1 2 3 4*
- d. "fits in" with what we believe 1 2 3 4
- e. adds diversity to my school 1 2 3 4
- f. entered teaching later in life 1 2 3 4* (versus their early 20's)
- g. puts in extra preparation time before and after school 1 2 3 4*
- h. works outside of school (home visits, fund raisers, PTA) 1 2 3 4*
- i. writes grants for special projects 1 2 3 4*
- j. spends own money for instruction 1 2 3 4
- k. has "roots" in our community 1 2 3 4
- l. can teach all types of children 1 2 3 4*
- m. changes instructional techniques based on students' requirements 1 2 3 4*
- n. has classroom management skills 1 2 3 4
- o. can use technology for instruction in the classroom 1 2 3 4

* = item was retained on revised survey (38 items)
(Table A2 cont.)

**PROCEDURES USED IN SELECTING a Candidate for a Teaching Position**

Some principals think resumes are very important in helping them select teacher candidates, and others think phone calls to previous employers are very important. Some principals get input from their faculty members, and others make teacher selection decisions by themselves. Please read the following items and circle one response per item.

When you select a teacher, how often do you use the following procedures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCEDURES</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I consider a teacher candidate's:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. attendance record (personnel file)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. employment record (personnel file)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. evaluations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. I am contacted about openings by: |       |           |         |        |
| a. teachers in the district who want to transfer to my school | 1     | 2         | 3       | 4      |
| b. substitute teachers who want a permanent position | 1     | 2         | 3       | 4      |
| c. student teachers who want a permanent position | 1     | 2         | 3       | 4      |

| 3. When conducting an interview, I ask a candidate to discuss: |       |           |         |        |
| a. why they went into teaching | 1     | 2         | 3       | 4      |
| b. why they want to come to my school | 1     | 2         | 3       | 4      |
| c. what they like/ don't like about teaching | 1     | 2         | 3       | 4      |
| d. their actions in hypothetical situations | 1     | 2         | 3       | 4*     |
| e. their strengths and weaknesses | 1     | 2         | 3       | 4      |

* = item was retained on revised survey (38 items)
(Table A2 cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCEDURES</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. When conducting an interview, I:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. score or rank the candidates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ask a member of my faculty, what</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s/he might know about the candidate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. interview a candidate more than once</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ask a standard series of questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. use a committee to make</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the final selection decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. ask about private information such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marital stability, child care, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. tell the candidate the difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associated with the position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. believe luck plays a part in my decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5. When I am seeking a teacher for a position. |       |           |         |        |
| I contact a candidate's: |       |           |         |        |
| a. supervising teacher if they have |       |           |         |        |
|   just completed student teaching | 1     | 2         | 3       | 4      |
| b. previous principal (s) if they have |       |           |         |        |
|   taught previously | 1     | 2         | 3       | 4*     |
| c. relatives | 1     | 2         | 3       | 4      |
| d. references | 1     | 2         | 3       | 4*     |

| 6. When I am seeking a teacher for a position. |       |           |         |        |
| a. I consider student teachers | 1     | 2         | 3       | 4      |
| b. I consider substitute teachers | 1     | 2         | 3       | 4      |
| c. I have a candidate come observe at my |       |           |         |        |
|   school and talk with my faculty | 1     | 2         | 3       | 4      |
| d. I go and observe the candidate at the |       |           |         |        |
|   school where s/he is currently teaching | 1     | 2         | 3       | 4      |

Please fill in the blank:

7. When you conduct an interview for a teaching position, how much time do you usually spend with each candidate? ________________________________

8. How many candidates do you usually interview for a teaching position at your school?
PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH SELECTION for a Teaching Position

Some principals think the location of their school is an obstacle during teacher selection, and others think that teacher salaries is a problem. Some principals think time constraints and too few applicants are problems. Please read the following items, and circle one response per item.

When you select a teacher, how often do you encounter these problems?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROBLEMS</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Other principals trying to &quot;pass on&quot; bad teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teachers applying just to have a job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Finding certified/qualified teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The location of my school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The reputation of my student population</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Having no input (consolidation, transfer policies)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Central Office sending the &quot;best&quot; to their friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Pressure from Central Office to take a teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Too many applicants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Too few applicants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. A shortage of black teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. A shortage of male teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Being required to select based on race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. The state assessment process required for beginning teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Central Office denying my request for a teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Privacy laws restricting criminal record access</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = item was retained on revised survey (38 items)
(Table A2 cont.)

**PROBLEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>q. Central Office withholding negative information about a candidate</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r. Having no control over who is sent to interview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = item was retained on revised survey (38 items)

**Personal Data**  *Please complete the following information about yourself:*

- Age: ______
- Gender: Male  Female
- Ethnicity: White  Black  Hispanic  Oriental  Other: _______________
- Total years of teaching experience: __________
- Total years as a principal: __________
- Total years as principal of your present school: __________
- Number of teachers you have hired in the past three years: _______
- Level of education: Bachelor's  Master's  Master's +30  Specialist  Doctorate

*In the space provided below, please add any other information about teacher selection that you believe is important.*

*Thank You!*
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