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ABSTRACT

One result of the national appeal for systemic school reform is the implementation of shared governance initiatives that involve administrators, teachers, and parents in substantive educational decision-making, including teacher selection decisions. This investigation examined roles of organizational representatives in teacher selection and examined if screening decisions differed by role. Specifically, the study examined the effects of three variables related to state characteristics, organizational representative characteristics, and school district characteristics: (1) site based decision-making as a legislative mandate; (2) interviewer role; and (3) district academic performance. 168 elementary school administrators, teachers, and parents from high and low academically performing school districts in mandated and non-mandated reform states reacted to the resume of a hypothetical teacher candidate.

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine the effect of evaluator roles, site-based reform state, and school district performance on two dependent variables, composite score of a hypothetical candidate and probability of extending an offer to interview to a hypothetical candidate.
Significant effects were found for a main effect associated with organizational representative on the dependent measures, Pillai's Trace = .066, $F(2, 156) = 2.653, p = .033, \eta^2 = .033$. As follow-up tests to MANOVA, a 3 x 2 x 2 ANOVA was tested on each dependent variable at the .05 $\alpha$ level. Mean composite scores for organizational representatives were significantly different, $F(2, 156) = 4.841, p = .009, \eta^2 = .058$, while organizational representative mean scores regarding the probability of extending an offer to interview were nonsignificant, $F(2, 156) = 1.606, p = .204, \eta^2 = .020$. No significant interactions were found. Post hoc analyses demonstrated that administrators and parents differed from teachers.

Results of this study confirm partially, the notion that different organizational representatives will by virtue of role, contribute differing viewpoints to teacher selection decisions. However, supported by notions of role theory and social comparison, participants in the selection process may possess different role expectations for teacher candidates and may subsequently use different criteria in evaluating candidates for teaching positions.
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"Wise selection is the best means of improving the system, and the greatest lack of economy exists whenever teachers have been poorly chosen, or are inadequately adapted to their profession." (Graces, 1932, p.191). As evidenced by the date of Graces' statement, the notion of educational improvement accomplished through teacher selection is not new to American education. The importance of teacher selection, as it relates to the quality of instruction, is documented well throughout previous and contemporary educational research.

In fact, educational reform efforts of the past two decades have focused on the need to change the educational system on behalf of student achievement and of teacher quality. Specifically, scholars assert that before pervasive school reform can be sustained, "the profession needs to recruit men and women with the intellect, the imagination, and the daring necessary to renew an institution already effete in 1940" (DiPasquale, 1970, p. 3). Put simply, educational administrators must recruit and select capable personnel to increase instructional effectiveness.
Nationally, teachers are challenged to exhibit professional behavior to improve systemically, instructional effectiveness (Holmes Group, 1986; Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986). By definition, professionals exercise large degrees of autonomy, demonstrate mastery of a body of knowledge that meaningfully informs practice, contribute to the development of an instructional knowledge base, and look to themselves, peers, and clients for affirmation and assessment (Sagor, 1996). Proponents equate improvement in the quality of public education with outcomes of professionalization such as increased teacher status, autonomy and responsibility, and increased teacher salaries.

Perceptions of teacher professionalism and the reality of teacher practices are worlds apart. Teachers practice within the confines of curriculum and methodological mandates, conform to government-proscribed assessments, and submit to administrative evaluation for personal/professional affirmation as well as contract renewal. Attempting to balance the numerous tenets imposed by diverse stakeholders, teachers compromise seriously their ability to make autonomous decisions to either advance or reform the system in which they work.

Contemporary organizational, educational, and psychological theorists (Cascio, 1995; Sarason, 1995) contend that top-down structures are “out of step with the competitive realities that many organizations face” (Cascio, 1995, p.
To succeed as a dynamic open system, schools must possess the human capital to respond quickly to shifting external conditions. In such a dynamic environment, articulating a vision for which the organization stands and, subsequently translating the vision into action is paramount.

To achieve organizational vision, workplace democracy is emphasized. Workers and managers are called on to act alike, creating a phenomenon that requires good interpersonal skills, continuous learning, and an organizational culture that supports and encourages both workers and managers (Cascio, 1995). Empowered individuals define such supportive organizations.

Sarason extends the notion of workplace democracy to the political principle, a foundation of our legal and political systems. Said simply, the political principle demands that “when decisions are made affecting you or your possessions, you should have a role, a voice in the process of decision-making” (Sarason, 1995, p.21). Educators supportive of the political principle, insist the governance structure of schools must change to improve the public school experience of children and teachers (House, 1995; Sarason, 1995).

Furthermore, some believe the process of increasing teacher and parent involvement in school governance comes only by governmental restructuring. In fact, parents dissatisfied with their roles as teacher aides, advisors, and fundraisers in centralized educational structures have brought about initiatives to expand their influence and their control over educational policy (House, 1995).
Specifically, public dissatisfaction with the schools' perceived resistance to change has brought about legislative reform mandates requiring parental and community involvement in educational policies and educational practices (Kannapel, Moore, Coe, & Aagaard, 1995).

Hence, one result of the national appeal for systemic school reform is widespread application of shared governance initiatives that involve administrators, teachers, and parents in substantive educational decision-making. Shared governance reforms intended as vehicles to decentralize decision-making authority, address directly issues of teacher accountability and issues of teacher and parent empowerment. Forms of shared governance are purported to afford local school personnel opportunities to articulate an organizational vision and opportunities to determine how they will improve educational quality.

Site-based management is one governance reform advanced as a means for achieving school improvement. Acknowledged as the unit of change, the school through its site-based council is sanctioned to make curricular, instructional, personnel, staff development, and budgeting decisions within local school board parameters (Phillips, 1996). Proponents contend site-based management will improve schools because it: enables members to exert significant influence over school policy, improves relationships between teachers, parents, and administrators, increases commitment to the school, creates informed teachers, distends incentives that attract and retain quality
teachers, benefits management decisions, enhances employee morale and
motivation, stimulates instructional improvements, and improves the academic
achievement of students (Caldwell & Wood, 1992; Hansen & Marburger, 1989;

Nevertheless, the evidence collected to date on site-based management at
best, is mixed. Participants reported exerting significant influence rarely on
matters of budget, personnel, or programming. Council members claimed they
seldom address salient policy issues, and their engagement tended to be
tangential and entailed rubber-stamping decisions.

Most importantly, the contribution of site-based management, as it relates
to student achievement, is uncertain. Some analyses suggest the implementation
of site based management increases a sense of teacher empowerment and of
stakeholder involvement, with virtually no evidence that site based management
translates into improved student performance (Summers & Johnson, 1995).
Redistribution of legitimate authority suggests a positive influence on the ability
of teachers to create an optimum climate for instructional reform without
influencing the ability of teachers to increase student achievement.

Still, educational reform efforts continue to escalate, and teachers and
parents continue to participate in numerous variations — some legislatively
mandated— of shared governance. However, “the acquisition of administrative
authority does not translate automatically into the capacity to make informed
administrative decisions" (Winter, McCabe & Newton, 1998, p.276). Findings from a study of school councils in Kentucky (David, 1994) indicated that parents and teachers enter service on school site councils unprepared for the leadership and administrative duties expected of them, especially in the realm of personnel-related tasks (Winter et al., 1998).

In view of professionalization, school improvement initiatives, and increased participation on site based management teams; who teaches in school, what knowledge and professional potential they bring to the experience, and how they relate with other faculty, are important concerns to teachers and parents. Classroom teachers understand the systemic problems in public schools and provide valuable insight toward creating solutions. (Wall & Rinehart, 1998). The inclusion of teachers and parents in the interviewing process is an attempt to address concerns stemming from criticisms of more traditional top-down management interview procedures.

Typically, personnel issues mandated to site based councils include screening applicants and selecting a principal when a vacancy occurs, consulting with the principal in filling staff vacancies, and determining the number of persons to be employed in each job classification (David, 1994; Kannapel et al., 1995; Molnar, 1999). According to one researcher, a history of hiring abuses such as nepotism and patronage served as the Kentucky legislature’s primary purpose for moving hiring decisions to the school level (Kannapel, 1995). Given
consideration for various representatives' viewpoints, shared decision making in personnel matters is thought to produce better decisions than those made by individual administrators.

**Problem Statement**

Because administrators, teachers, and parents participating on site base councils are called upon to make applicant screening decisions, it is logical to seek an understanding of the screening process and variables that may actuate screening decisions. Given the potentially different reactions of organizational actors to teacher candidates, this study was designed to evaluate the effect of organizational representative role and the effect of state mandated teacher and parental involvement on teacher screening decisions.

Moreover, the recent history of educational reform has proven that meaningful shared decision-making has been hard to achieve (House, 1995; Malen et al., 1990). Consequently, researchers and educators have asked the question, do local school councils make better decisions than would be made in the absence of site-based decision making (SBDM)? (Kannapel et al., p.16). This study proposed a disparate question, namely, do non-administrative members of SBDM councils make different decisions than those made by administrators?

Selection is a process comprised of three phases: preselection, selection, and postselection. Preselection delimits the applicant pool based on credentials provided by the applicant such as cover letters, personal references, resumes,
academic credentials, work experience and test scores (Dipboye, 1992; Castetter & Young, 2000). Applicants who survive the preselection process advance to the selection phase where they are subjected further to job predictors such as interviews or job simulations. Lastly, post-selection represents the phase of the process in which a judgment is made regarding the applicant's appointment or non-appointment to the position.

This study focuses on decisions made at the pre-selection or screening phase of the selection process. As stated previously, during pre-selection administrators screen applicant qualifications using paper credentials provided by the applicant. One form of applicant credential, the resume, will be used to operationalize a hypothetical teacher candidate.

The importance of screening applicant resumes during the selection process is noted throughout selection research. Dipboye (1992) noted that the evaluation of paper credentials during pre-selection have a substantial relationship to post-selection evaluations. Particularly significant to this study is the realization that in many organizations the decision to interview or not to interview an applicant is based solely on paper credentials.

Specifically, the study examined the effects of three variables related to state characteristics, organizational representative characteristics, and school district characteristics: (1) site based decision-making as a state-wide legislative mandate; (2) interviewer role; and (3) district academic performance. Randomly
selected elementary school administrators, teachers, and parents from both high and low academically performing school districts in both mandated and non-mandated reform states reacted to the resume of a hypothetical teacher candidate. Organizational representatives reported their reactions to the hypothetical candidate by evaluating the candidate’s professional skills and by indicating the probability that the candidate would be extended an opportunity to interview for the position.

**Null Hypotheses**

H1: Candidate ratings submitted by parents, teachers, and administrators will not differ according to the organizational representative role of the evaluator.

H2: Organizational representatives from a mandated site-based decision making state will rate the hypothetical candidate the same as organizational representatives from a non mandated site-based decision making state.

H3: Organizational representatives from high performing school districts will rate the hypothetical candidate the same as organizational representatives from low performing school districts.
H4: Candidate ratings will not be influenced by any specific combination of site-based decision making state, organizational representative role, and school district performance.

Issues of organizational press (accountability, unfunded mandates, public criticism, funding and program inequities), similarity of applicant to evaluator, and organizational representative role may influence the reaction of an organizational representative to the paper credentials of a hypothetical candidate. Unraveling information about school district characteristics and interviewer roles provides insight into parent and teacher involvement in shared decision making processes.

Definitions

The following terms are defined to advance the reader’s understanding of the study.

1. High academic performance – a school district scoring above the median on the State Local Report Card.

2. Low Academic Performance – a school district scoring below the median on the State Local Report Card

3. Macroanalysis – selection research that focuses on the outcome of the interview in terms of reliability, validity, fairness, and utility.
4. Microanalysis – selection research that focuses on factors that affect the decision-making process in the interview.

5. Role congruence – the role match of a teacher screening or selecting another teacher candidate.

6. Role contiguous – the role of an administrator screening or selecting a teacher candidate.

7. Role vested – the role of a parent screening or selecting a teacher candidate.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

"All organizations are concerned with the ‘human capital’ that they are capable of attracting and retaining" (Schmitt & Chan, 1998, p.2). Organizational competitiveness, success, and survival are products of human capabilities. Human resource managers are challenged to poise present and future organizational needs with applicant attributes embedded in knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAO).

Management practitioners judge applicants using diverse selection measures, including resumes and cover letters, application blanks (weighted and unweighted), biographical information, reference reports, handwriting analysis, literacy tests, work sample tests, integrity tests, job knowledge tests, job tryouts, peer ratings, training and experience behavior consistency methods, and assessment centers (Heneman, Heneman, & Judge, 1997; Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). However, given the numerous selection tools available, the use of and reliance on the interview is widespread. Selection research indicates that the interview is the most commonly employed selection technique (Dipboye, 1992; Eder & Harris, 1999; Heneman, Heneman, & Judge, 1997; Schmitt & Chan, 1998).
The decision to interview a job candidate or not to interview a job candidate is based on paper credentials. Additionally, these paper credentials create candidate first impressions that influence subsequent interviews (Dipboye, 1992). Research regarding the screening phase of selection explains processes relevant to interviews. However, little research exists about this phase of the selection process. Because research concerning interview screening is scant, this literature review examines research about the interview to understand decisions made at the screening phase of the selection process.

For the purposes of this manuscript, the literature review will focus on the interview addressing specifically its reliability and validity, its inherent cognitive and behavioral processes, its underlying constructs, its various formats, and its traditional as well as alternative purposes. Next, a summary of research detailing applicant reaction to various aspects and formats of the interview will be presented. Finally, a review of teacher and parent selection literature, site based management in education, and teacher participation in interviewing within a site based reform environment will be reported.

**Selection Research from a Historical Perspective**

Earliest investigations of the selection interview were reported by researchers and psychologists alike as techniques for estimating intelligence and judging character (Binet, 1911). Walter Dill Scott noted first, the use of the
interview as an industrial application. As early as 1915, Scott published findings on the ability of the employment interview to distinguish between successful and unsuccessful candidates.

In this seminal study, six business managers were instructed to rank 36 sales candidates with regard to their predicted success as sales managers. These business managers established virtually no agreement among themselves in ranking the applicants after an employment interview. Moreover, in approximately 77% of the cases, the managers could not agree if the applicant should be ranked in the top or bottom half of the group (Scott cited in Eder & Harris, 1989, p. 8).

Scott’s initial finding that the interviewers’ ability to discern successful job candidates as disputable was reiterated in follow-up macroanalytic studies that focused on the reliability and validity of the selection interview. In these studies an interviewer assigned each job applicant a composite score that represented the interviewer’s evaluation of the applicant’s qualifications. Each composite score was correlated subsequently with the composite scores of all other evaluators, with the average correlation of the matrix resulting in the reliability coefficient (Young, 1985, p. 5).

Likewise, validity was assessed by correlating composite interview scores with job performance measures. Typically, concurrent or predictive validity paradigms were used to compute validity coefficients. Concurrent validity
assesses job performance simultaneously with interview composite scores while predictive validity assesses job performance after the applicant has been hired and after a reasonable time of employment (Young, p. 5)

**Reliability and Validity: A Macroanalytic Approach**

One important macroanalytic study cited as influential in undermining the confidence in the employment interview, was Hollingsworth’s (1922) study. Experienced sales managers were instructed to interview 57 applicants utilizing any procedure they chose and to rank the applicants following the interviews. Ranking results evidenced immense variability, although there was some agreement on the best and on the worst candidates.

Negative findings spawned from this early research cast substantial doubt on the utility of the interview as a selection procedure. Further, as studies were replicated, the resultant validity estimates varied widely even when like jobs and like methods were studied (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998; Wagner, 1949). Given the questionable contribution of the interview toward a full evaluation of an U.S. Army officer, Rundquist (1947) discovered that when the interview was stripped of all functions that could be evaluated better by other methods, social interaction remained the single factor evaluated best by the interview.

In the first comprehensive review of the employment interview as a selection device, Wagner (1949) expressed despair at the poor quality of selection research, noting that only 25 of the 106 published studies were experiments,
while the remaining studies constituted a “hodgepodge of contradicting opinion” (Wagner, 1949, p.17). Specifically, Wagner found that the reliability of the interview to evaluate overall ability ranged from -0.20 to -0.85 and of the empirical results reported, the overall validities ranged from 0.21 to 0.87. Wagner concluded that the reliability and validity of the interview may be highly situation and interviewer specific.

Interview reliability, it was suggested, could be enhanced if standardized forms were used to elicit and record interview data (Wagner, p. 42). During this time period, the notion of standardized interviews originated and was promoted in management literature as a strategy for improving interview reliability. Wagner resolved that objective testing procedures were a better means of evaluating applicants than the interview, and that standardized interviews were more valuable than unstandardized interviews.

Moreover, the information processing capacity of the interviewer was questioned. Given the pessimistic reliability and validity findings, Wagner suggested that for predictive purposes, the information obtained from an interview should be statistically combined with other data because the interviewer may be incapable of effectively weighting the data combinations. Wagner envisioned the effective interview as a tool that accurately predicts
ability or potential job success, appraises isolated facts into an overall judgment, representing a substitution for the multiple regression technique (Wagner, 1949, p. 23).

**Emergence of a Microanalytic Approach**

Mayfield (1964) reported that the research conducted during the 45 years since Wagner's comprehensive study on the selection interview had produced little substantial information. Studies conducted continued to demonstrate persistently a lack of validity for the interview process and were difficult to generalize due to a lack of comparability across studies and among interviews. As a rule, Mayfield encountered selection interview research conducted specifically to determine interview validity within the parameters of a particular situation.

Nonetheless, Mayfield noted two trends in the literature. First, researchers were beginning to microanalyze the interview by dividing it into units of study and by conducting controlled experiments on one or two variables at a time. Thus, the focus of microanalytic research was on factors influencing interviewer judgments.

Second, investigators were proposing the study of decision making as a way to increase selection interview reliability. Decision-making processes, as
they occurred in the selection interview, were introduced as the focus of study instead of interview results. Research manipulating the decision-making focus was designed to explore variables affecting interview decisions.

Based on empirical findings, Mayfield proposed that interviewers consistent in their approach to interviewees were inconsistent in their interpretations of interview data. Additional findings indicated interviewer attitudes biased their judgments, and these judgments were derived early in the unstructured interview process. Further, researchers such as Webster (1959) and Springbett (1958) demonstrated that question form influenced answers, and that negative information appeared to influence interviewers more than positive information.

Echoing the sentiments of Wagner and Mayfield, Ulrich & Trumbo (1965) cited pessimistic reviews about selection interview potential. Likewise, these findings suggested complex information exchanges and decision-making processes within the interview. Because of the complexity of interview dynamics and the interview's apparent void in functional validity, Ulrich & Trumbo recommended that future research distinguish between the predictive validity obtained from the interview as compared to the predictive validity obtained from other sources.

A major contribution to the research of the interview as a social and information processing event was prompted by Webster and his colleagues at
McGill University. Webster derived seven principal findings from his microanalytic research that later served as a basis for future social and cognitive process investigations. Findings included the following: interviewers develop a stereotype of a good candidate and seek to match interviewees accordingly; biases are established by interviewers early in the interview; unfavorable information is most influential on interviewers; interviewers seek data to support or deny hypotheses and, when satisfied, turn their attention elsewhere; empathy relationships are specific to individual interviewers; a judge's decision is different when fed information piece by piece rather than simultaneously; experienced interviewers rank applicants in the same order as inexperienced interviewers.

Microanalytic/Macroanalytic Research

Critical of microanalysis, Wright (1969) described microanalytic research as going so far in dismembering the interview that it may have approached a level of patent sterility (Wright, 1969, p 409). Wright centered his research around interview content and its relationship to validity and situational variables that exerted influence on the effectiveness of the interview. Again, the structured interview found favor with this era of researchers, and Wright urged for more integrated macroanalytic research in this promising area.

Research conducted between the publication of Wright (1964) and Schmitt (1976) was predominantly microanalytic and experimental, focusing on factors
that affected the decision-making process in the interview. Results reflected both disillusionment with reliability and with earlier validity data as well as with the desire to understand the interview process itself (Schmitt, 1976, p. 79). Investigators studied the cognitive processes of information acquisition, encoding, storage, and memory retrieval as a means to delineate various information processing errors that undermine interview validity.

Schmitt challenged the generalizability of artificial and microanalytic findings to real employment situations and remained suspect of the implied importance relative to the validity of interview decisions. Purporting that the research suffered from a lack of integration, Schmitt recommended that future investigators concentrate on identifying variables most consistently evaluated by the employment interview.

Unique to Schmitt's literature review and, perhaps, an impetus for his urging of an integrated study of the interview, was a first reference to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission as an authority to enforce Title VII and to bring suit against organizations in U.S. District Courts. Understanding the interview had developed as a considerable matter because of widespread use of EEOC Guidelines regarding employment procedures. The extant legal climate of the United States compelled employers to accept full responsibility for establishing the selection process as job related.
An Integrated Approach to Selection Research

Arvey & Campion's (1982) study declared first evidence that, with certain improvements in the conduct of interviews, both reliability and validity could be improved. The authors reported “recent research has not been as pessimistic about the validity and reliability as in prior years” (Arvey & Campion, 1982, p. 291). Further, the study established panel or board interviews as superior techniques due to their enhanced reliability and validity measures.

Arvey and Campion found that a number of applicant characteristics influenced interviewer perception and the resulting hire/reject decision. Similarly, a number of interviewer and situational factors believed to persuade perceptual and judgmental processes were evidenced (Arvey & Campion, 1982). Methodologically, the research summary contributed to interview improvement as paper and pencil paradigms yielded different and less valid results from those collected from actual interviews.

Biases and interviewer confirming behaviors existed at the pre-interview and interview phase of the selection process. A consistent theme of interest found in the research reviewed by Arvey and Campion regarded the employment interview as a vehicle for discrimination against women and minority group candidates. Correspondingly, research was conducted investigating the effects of variables interacting with protected class individuals on interview decision-making.
Harris (1989) determined from his review that research conducted in the 1980's on structured interviewing provided a positive conclusion about the employment interview as a selection procedure (Eder & Harris, p. 16). Regardless of the type of interview used, the employment interview appeared to be predictive of job performance, however, structured interviews proved to be more valid than unstructured interviews (Harris, 1989, p.695). Harris concluded that relative to other selection devices, the selection interview may possess adequate validity.

In terms of demographic studies, another contradiction of earlier findings applied to applicant sex and subsequent interview evaluation. Earlier studies found that females often received lower ratings than males in the interview setting. Harris reported that in general, females failed to receive lower ratings in the employment interview, and in several cases, females received higher ratings than males (Campion, M, Pursell, & Brown, 1988; Graves & Powell, 1988; Raza & Carpenter, 1987).

**Underlying Constructs of the Interview**

Prior to the 1960's, intelligence was widely acknowledged as the construct measured by the interview (Mayfield, 1964). However, Ulrich & Trumbo (1965) maintained that the constructs measured by the selection interview were interpersonal skills and motivation, not intelligence. The authors advocated that
interviewers limit their attention to the study of personal relations and motivation as these constructs evidenced the greatest degree of validity.

Specifically, Ulrich & Trumbo recommended that "the interviewer should seek information on two questions: "What is the applicant's motivation to work?" and "Will he adjust to the social contexts of his job?" (Ulrich & Trumbo, 1965, p. 113). Schmitt (1976) echoed these conclusions advancing the idea that the constructs of interpersonal skills and motivations are perhaps best evaluated by the interview. In a related concern, Schmitt recommended an evaluation of selection interview (selection, recruitment, and education) purposes in light of the constructs it reliably and validly measured.

Interestingly, Harris hypothesized that different interview formats (unstructured, structured, behavior description interviews, situational interviews) may measure different constructs. Harris speculated that interviews such as the BDI and SI may measure practical or social intelligence (Harris, p. 107). Conversely, Campion attributed high correlations between comprehensive structured interviews (CSI) and standard cognitive ability (Campion, 1988).

**Differing Interview Techniques**

As early as 1949, Wagner reported the use of standardized interviews as a means to improve the reliability and the validity of the interview. Campion, Pursell, and Brown (1988) noted that interview structure was operationalized based on question content – questions established from job analysis or uniform
questions asked of all applicants, anchored rating scales for scoring responses, a panel of interviewers, and consistent administration. Structures linking job analysis with interview content and use of panel interviews were promoted as encouraging means of improving interview reliability and validity (Arvey & Campion, 1982).

Two types of structured interviews often cited in selection research are the Behavior Description Interview (BDI) and the Situational or Simulation Interview (SI). The BDI (Janz, Hellervik, & Gilmore, 1982) focuses on past behavior as a predictor of future behavior and is comprised of a series of situational questions that survey typical rather than maximal past performance. Situational Interviews (Latham, 1989) are based on goal setting-theory and elicit the applicant's future behavior, given a particular set of circumstances.

Empirical findings overwhelmingly suggested that the use of structured interviews (BDI or SI) are more valid than unstructured interviews (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Harris, 1989; McDaniel, Whetzel, Schmidt, & Mauer, 1994). To increase the reliability and validity of the interview, the use of multiple raters was recommended (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Mayfield, 1964; Ulrich & Trumbo, 1965). Group, board, or panel interviews consist of multiple interviewers who sit collectively in one place at one time, with the applicant sitting before them.

Panel interviews have been found to be superior to other forms of the structured interview for several reasons. The panel elicits better recall of
information, reduces idiosyncratic biases, provides an opportunity for panel members to challenge each others’ opinions, and fosters greater acceptance of hiring decisions by others in the organization (Eder & Harris, 1998). Finally, panel interviews are considered more reliable than non-panel structures because multiple independent ratings are collected and averaged as a composite rating.

A Current Look at the Interview in Selection Research

Meta-analyses have been conducted to further establish the reliability and validity of the interview. Hucutt & Arthur (1994) assessed interview validity compared with that of ability tests, regrouping Hunter & Hunter’s (1984) meta-analysis according to these levels of structure. Interview validities increased as structure increased, with the top two levels of structure comparable to validities found by Hunter & Hunter for ability tests.

Validity studies comparing interview techniques, primarily future oriented (SI) and past-oriented (BDI) have been conducted recently by Campion et al. (1994). Campion reported higher validities for past-oriented (.51) than future-oriented interviews (.39). When job performance ratings were regressed against ratings from both future and past orientations, past questions showed incremental validity over future questions, but not vice versa (Borman, Hanson & Hedge, 1997, p. 315).

Research continues with regard to cognitive and behavioral processes in the interview and interview-applicant interaction. Pre-interview impressions,
impression management, visual cues, and individual differences of interviewers, are a few current variables of interest (Borman et al., 1997). Lastly, applicant reactions to selection procedures have contributed to the ongoing study of interviewer-applicant interactions (Powell, 1991; Rynes, Bretz, & Gerhart, 1991; Stevens & Kristoff, 1995).

Examining the constructs underlying the various interview formats persists in generating interest among selection interview researchers. Sue-Chan (1994) found in her study with undergraduate nursing students, that neither the situational nor the patterned interview correlated significantly with measures of cognitive or tacit knowledge, but both interview formats correlated significantly with a measure of self-efficacy. Additionally, the situational interview showed incremental validity beyond cognitive ability, using grade point average as the criterion (Borman et al, 1997).

Huffcutt, Roth, & McDaniel (1996) reported that employment interviews tend to reflect cognitive ability (p.468). However, a surprising finding in the Huffcutt study and one that contradicts previous findings, was the extent of cognitive ability as reflected in interview evaluations, decreased as the level of structure increased. Antithetically, Latham & Skarlicki (1995) found the situational interview predicted organizational citizenship behavior and showed promise as a device for predicting extra-role behavior.
Borman (1997) characterized research regarding the true purpose of the interview as a heated debate inasmuch as investigations in this area are attempting to distance the interview from a psychometric measure to a measure of interpersonal processes (Herriot, 1993). For example, Adams (1994) argued for the interview as a useful tool for assessing applicant-organizational fit. Yet, from an organizational perspective, Eder & Harris, (1999) acknowledge the unstructured interview as an effective vehicle for purposes of assessing applicant organizational fit, applicant attraction, and employee socialization.

**Applicant Reaction to the Selection Interview**

Schmitt (1976) noted a “paucity of research” on the impact of the interview on the interviewee declaring that such a gap should be an area of concern for employers attempting to attract high quality applicants. A quarter of a century later, researchers continue to investigate and interpret applicant responses to the ubiquitous selection interview. Rynes sums up effectively the state of interview research as follows: “We know more about applicant’s reactions to relatively little used selection procedures than we do about the one that is virtually universal [selection interview]” (Rynes, 1993, p. 268).

Developing a better understanding of applicant reactions is important for the following reasons. First, applicant reactions are believed to influence organizational attractiveness and can affect directly the pursuit of or acceptance
of job offers (Smither, Reilly, Millsap, Pearlman, & Stoffey, 1993). Second, legal challenges of selection devices regarded as invasive, face invalid, or potentially discriminatory are linked to applicant reactions.

Negative reactions of applicants to what they are asked to say or to do to secure a job range from withdrawal from the application process to the creation of a very different agenda than before the incident (Rynes, 1993). Applicant reactions are unequivocally tied to one research finding: applicants favor procedures with a perceived strong relationship to job content (Cascio & Phillips, 1979; Rynes, 1993; Smither, et al., 1991). Such procedures are viewed as necessary, fair, and face-valid.

Greenberg and Tyler's (1987) Justice Theory posits that perceived job relatedness influences perceptions of selection fairness which affects overall organizational attractiveness. To be just, selection procedures must exhibit procedural and outcome fairness. In other words, applicants must perceive an acceptable measure of correctness in the selection process and the selection decision.

Rynes and Connerley (1993) asserted that applicants determine selection procedure likes and dislikes by employing three criteria. Applicants are concerned with the likelihood of an accurate evaluation, are concerned with the need of the employer to acquire the information, and are concerned with their
personal perceived ability to do well on the procedure. These criteria support the notion that applicants evaluate selection devices based on perceived legitimacy more than self-interest basis.

As administered in the field, the interview demonstrates some acceptability problems (Rynes, 1993). Women and minorities are asked offensive and or discriminatory questions (Rynes, Bretz, & Gerhart, 1991). Additionally, unstructured interviews receive negative applicant evaluations as they indicate a lack of preparation or lack of interviewer interest in the applicant (Rynes & Miller, 1983).

More specifically, behavior description interviews (BDI) have received mixed reviews. Some regard the BDI as a good form of in-depth assessment, while others view the interview as boring and malleable. Students who feel disadvantaged when compared with interviewees possessing real work-based encounters, however, dislike the BDI. (Rynes, 1993).

Schmitt and Coyle (1976) discovered that job applicants were sensitive to interpersonal capabilities and mannerisms of the interviewer. Judgments concerning applicant impressions were affected significantly by the extent to which the interviewer disseminated information. Finally, Schmitt and Coyle found that the overall impression formed of the interviewer by the applicant was an important factor in the applicant's ultimate employment decision.
College recruitment studies reported recruiter interviewing practices (Powell, 1991; Rynes, Bretz, & Gerhart, 1991; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976) influenced job pursuit intentions and job choice decisions. One selection practice, the simulated-based interview, was established as a selection procedure likely to achieve organizational attraction, while unstructured interviews generated the most unfavorable reactions. Moreover, participants rated simulated interviews significantly higher than all unstructured interviews in terms of perceived content validity (Rynes & Connerly, 1993; Steiner & Gilliland, 1996).

Generally, applicants view the employment interview as fair and appropriate (Smither, et al. 1993). Returning to organizational justice theory, Steiner and Gilliland (1996) found the interview was perceived more favorably than other selection methods because it provided an opportunity for applicants to demonstrate their abilities and personal warmth. Consideration of applicant privacy concerns, lead Kravitz, Stinson, and Chavez (1996) to conclude that with regard to personal privacy, interviews were perceived among selection procedures as the least invasive.

Heneman, Heneman and Judge (1997) characterize the staffing function as three interdependent processes: recruitment, selection, and employment. As the major predictor of selection, the interview and its underlying concepts have been discussed in terms of reliability and validity and in terms of variables that bias selection decisions. Understanding previous interview research, applicant
reaction to the interview and varying interview techniques assists school
administrators in increasing the utility of the interview and in making certain
that applicant reactions to this selection test are perceived as fair. Before
reviewing teacher selection research, the fairness of selection tests must be
addressed more thoroughly and from a legal perspective.

**Legal History of Selection**

Because selection interviews are the interaction between interviewers and
interviewees and because the interview may generate variables that contaminate
selection decisions, an overview of legal issues related to employment selection is
now presented. The legal history of employment selection focuses on unfair
testing procedures and discrimination in employment practices and spans only a
40-year period. Landmark court cases, government directives, and scholarly
research provided the focal point around which these challenges were decided

*Myart v. Motorola* (1963), a racial discrimination case heard by the Illinois
Fair Employment Practices Commission, was the earliest claim of employment
discrimination. Leon Myart, a black man with previous job related experience,
was refused a job as a television phaser at a Motorola plant because of his score
on a 5-minute intelligence test. Ruling in favor of Myart, the examiner ordered
the intelligence test banned and mandated that every new test developed in its place take into account environmental factors that contribute to cultural deprivation (Arvey & Faley, 1992, p. 88).

Additionally, the examiner determined that such unfair testing procedures prohibited equal employment opportunities because the test, itself, acted as a barrier against the culturally deprived. While the Illinois Supreme Court overturned the case for lack of evidence, the challenge set precedence to hear employment discrimination challenges through the justice system. At the same time Myart was being argued, Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to protect individuals of race, color, national origin, and religion from various forms of discrimination including employment (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act).

To enforce the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) was established. The EEOC published a set of general, but vague, guidelines on employment testing procedures and required that tests used for selection purposes, be valid. Four years later, the EEOC published the 1970 Testing Guidelines that specifically defined employment tests, discrimination, differential validity and research standards.

A theoretical extension of the literal interpretations of the 1970 Testing Guidelines was the focal point of Griggs v Duke Power Company (1971). Consequences rather than intent of employment practices were argued as
discriminatory based on the Civil Rights Act. In this case, the Supreme Court ruled that tests used in organizations must be job valid and must measure the person for the job, not the person in the abstract (Arvey & Faley, p. 93).

The Griggs ruling clarified for public and private sector employers the reach of the Civil Rights Act. Said simply, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act prohibited seemingly neutral employment practices that yielded unfair selection as well as overt discriminatory behavior. In deciding whether discrimination may have occurred, the court evaluated the consequences of an employment practice and placed with the employer the “burden of showing that any given requirement must have a manifest relationship to the employment in question.” (Arvey & Faley, p. 92).

To help standardize employment testing and selection procedures and to assist employers in complying with Federal laws, the 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures were adopted. Uniform Guidelines encouraged organizations to ascertain that selection procedures had no adverse impact on protected class citizens by examining the organization’s total selection process. Adverse impact as a concept was quantified in the Uniform Guidelines as a selection rate for protected class persons less than 80% of the selection rate for non-protected class persons.
Protected class applicants who suffered the consequences of an Equal Employment Opportunity violation established a prima facie case of discrimination using either of two doctrines: disparate treatment or disparate impact (also called adverse impact). Disparate treatment represents the intentional discrimination against a protected class individual and is proved by direct evidence such as an open admission of discrimination or by indirect evidence, a written policy of an employer that advocates discrimination.

Disparate impact, on the other hand, is the establishment of a seemingly neutral employment practice that in reality proves a significant adverse impact on members of a protected group (Arvey & Faley, p. 72).

*United States v Hazelwood School District* (1976) was one such case that demonstrated disparate impact for black teacher applicants. This case specifically called into question the vague criteria used in the teacher interview process citing the only general guidance given to principals was to hire the "most competent" person available, and such intangibles as "personality, disposition, appearance, poise, voice, articulation, and ability to deal with people" counted heavily (433 U.S. 299). Additionally, the court ordered a proper comparison between the racial composition of Hazelwood's teaching staff and the racial composition of the qualified public school teacher population in the relevant labor market, but required the statistical data to consist of records after Title VII became law.
Hazelwood demonstrates the court's interpretation and evaluation of statistical evidence used to establish disparate impact, namely applicant flow statistics and applicant stock statistics. Flow statistics represent the selection rate for protected class persons as compared to the selection rate for persons not classified as protected class. Stock statistics, conversely, analyze the existing work force and assert that the percentage of protected class employees should be similar to the percentage of qualified protected class persons found in the relevant labor market.

Lately, the notion of utilizing statistics to establish disparate impact has been refuted. In *Aderand v Pena* (1995) the Supreme Court ruled that the 5th and 14th amendments protect persons, not groups. Accordingly, the Court ruled that all government action based on race should be subjected to detailed judicial inquiry to ensure all persons rights to equal protection of the laws.

The Adarand decision ordered racial classifications analyzed under strict scrutiny and determined such classifications constitutional only if they are narrowly tailored measures that further compelling governmental interests. Proof of disparate impact may serve as evidence of racial discrimination, but the court ruled that such evidence alone is insufficient even where the 14th Amendment subjects state action to strict scrutiny.

More recently, Daniel and Timken (1999) illustrate the complexities of applying the disparate impact doctrine within higher education. For example,
judgments such as *Hopwood v. University of Texas* (1996) and *Bakke v. University of California Davis* (1978) demonstrate conflicting court opinions regarding the use of race as a college admission criterion. Conflicting opinions about the nature of affirmative action and the disparate treatment or disparate impact surrounding affirmative action, indicate obstacles in demonstrating disparate impact in public sector higher education.

Additional acts of legislation increased the numbers of protected classes, strengthened the government’s mandate against employment discrimination, and maintained fair employment selection processes to afford all individuals an equal opportunity for employment. Consequently, employers must demonstrate the necessity of a bona fide occupational qualification (BFOQ), an employment qualification “reasonably necessary” for the normal operation of the organization in order to require job qualifications otherwise considered illegal.

In addition to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, three major legislative acts impact the selection process: Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990.

Prohibiting discrimination against any person 40 years of age and older with respect to terms and conditions of employment or compensation is the mandate of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) of 1967.
Further, ADEA prohibits classifying or segregating employees or applicants on the basis of age. Passage of ADEA added to the list of protected classes, individuals over the age of forty.

Lastly, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act prohibited discrimination against persons who possess, have possessed, or are believed to possess a physical or mental impairment that limits substantially one or more major life activities. The Rehabilitation Act requires employers to provide accommodations for employees with disabilities so they may perform jobs they might otherwise be unable to perform (Avery & Faley, p. 63). Examples of such accommodations include job redesign, retraining, job transfer and removal of impediments to access.

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act applies only to disabled individuals who are otherwise qualified. According to Section 504, an otherwise qualified individual is one who, with or without, reasonable accommodation, can perform the essential functions of the employment position that such an individual holds or desires. In terms of selection processes, employers must understand that any mental or physical condition that substantially limits an individual's ability to gain employment, yet does not perceptively affect the individual's ability to perform the job is likely to be actionable under the Act (Arvey & Faley, p. 65).

Provisions of the Rehabilitation Act were expanded in the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. The Act bans discrimination against individuals with
disabilities in application procedures, hiring, advancement, discharge, employee compensation, and job training facets of employment and requires employers substantiate essential job functions in a written job description. Further, ADA prohibits pre-employment inquiries regarding specific disabilities.

Recently, Garrett v Board of Trustees of the University of Alabama (2001) transfers ADA provisions and remedies for ADA violations from the federal to state level. In Garrett, the Court determined that the ADA exceeds Congress' authority to abolish the State's 11th Amendment immunity. Further, the Court issued an opinion that absent a systemic pattern of discrimination by the States that violates the 14th Amendment, ADA enforcement and remedies to violations are a state's rights issue. In short, the ruling prohibits individuals from suing a State for money damages in federal court under the ADA.

To ensure a legal selection process, school administrators must understand the significant role the state and federal government assume in the employment process. Additionally, school administrators must demonstrate a working knowledge of the laws that govern all employees, including teachers. An presentation of teacher selection literature is now fitting.

Review of Teacher Selection Literature

Supported by the U.S. Office of Education, Bolton (1969) investigated the effects of information formats on teacher selection decisions. Teacher interviews were manipulated by format (audio, visual, and written), amount of information
processing instruction provided to decision-makers, quantity of written documents presented to the interviewer, and the degree of information masking. Results of the investigation indicated that the optimal interview format with regard to time, discrimination, consistency, and certainty would consist of: instructions to the principal regarding information processing, a single summary document, and an interview comprised of both visual and audio stimuli (Bolton, 1969, p. 312).

Since the early investigations of Bolton, teacher selection has essentially been defined by the research of I.P. Young. Young (1985) proposed that factors identified by microanalytic research operate as suppressor variables contributing to unwarranted variance shared between the suppressor and the predictor. By removing unwarranted variance from the predictor, the validity of the teaching performance predictor is increased. Figure 2.1 graphically represents Young’s Model of Teacher Selection.
Figure 2.1: Young’s Model of Teacher Selection

A = Performance Predictors
B = Performance Measures
C = Unrelated Variables that Influence Selection Decisions

A\cap B = Relationship between an actual criterion measure and a specific predictor of teacher performance. (Macroanalytic research)

B\cap C = Relationship between variables unrelated to teaching performance and selection decisions made by administrators. (Microanalytic research)

Selection decisions made by school administrators have been investigated as dependent variables at both the screening and the interviewing stage of the selection process. Variables unrelated to teaching performance but hypothesized to influence selection decisions served as independent variables in microanalytic teacher selection research (Young & Ryerson, 1986). Typically, characteristics of administrators, of teacher candidates, and of employment settings have been manipulated in microanalytic research and assessed subsequently from administrative selection decisions at the screening and interviewing stage of the selection process.
Research results have exposed variables that influence both screening and interviewing decisions made by educational administrators. Decisions made at the screening stage of the selection process are influenced by chronological age of applicants (Young, 1982; Young & Prince, 1999; Young, Rinehart, & Baits, 1997; Young & Schmidt, 1988), focal positions under consideration (Young, Rinehart, & Baits, 1997; Young & Voss, 1986), mode of applicant stimuli (Young & Pounder, 1985), quality of teacher stimuli (Young & McMurray, 1986), and absence or presence of a physical disability (Young & Prince, 1999). Selection decisions made because of interview data are influenced by the structure of the interview (Young, 1983), and the interpersonal performance style of the candidates (Young, 1984).

Interpersonal style and nonverbal communication influence both the candidate and the interviewer. In simulated interviews, Young (1984) found that administrators were least impressed with teacher applicants who avoided role-playing while being most impressed with those candidates willing to engage in impression management. Young and Beier (1977) found that applicants convey more positive impressions through positive nonverbal behaviors and that these effects are greater than those derived from verbal behaviors.

From the perspective of teacher as decision-maker, research has shown that applicant reaction to interviews are influenced by the content of the interview message with regard to job choice theory (Young, Place, Rinehart, Jury,
& Baits, 1997; Young, Rinehart, and Place, 1989) to job attributes (Young, Rinehart, & Heneman, 1993), and to the perceived personal warmth of the interviewer (Young & Heneman, 1986).

**SBDM, Teacher Selection Decisions, and Kentucky Educational Reform Act**

As stated previously, in some areas of the country, legislative action mandates teacher and parent participation in school governance through the formation of policy-making bodies such as school based site councils. The Kentucky Educational Reform Act of 1990 (KERA) required all schools in the Commonwealth to adopt a school based decision making (SBDM) implementation policy by July 1, 1996. Underlying the authority shift was the premise that those closest to students are best equipped to make decisions about how to help students succeed in school, and that parents had to become intricately involved in day-to-day operations of school (Kannappel et al., 1994).

Key to the Kentucky Education Reform Act is the creation of school based councils composed of two (2) parents, elected by the parent members of the parent-teacher organization; three (3) teachers, elected by a majority of teachers at the school; and the principal or administrator, who acts as chair. Responsibilities of the school council include: determining within the limits of available funds, the number of persons to be employed in each job classification, select a principal when a vacancy occurs, and consult with the principal in filling
staff vacancies (KERA, 1990). Moreover, KERA directed local boards to create policy to address ways in which parents, citizens, and community members could participate in site based decision making.

Longitudinal case studies report personnel issues as one of the most volatile areas of SBDM (Appalachia Educational Lab, 1992) as council involvement in selection processes vary, depending upon the principal’s interpretation of “filling staff vacancies in consultation with the SBDM Council.” Throughout the Commonwealth, councils report inconsistent participation in screening applicants, interviewing applicants, and subsequently acting on principal recommendations. Nevertheless, council involvement in personnel selection typically includes screening the list of applicants supplied by the school principal, panel interviewing, rank-ordering candidates after interviews, and making a candidate recommendation to the principal (Appalachia Educational Lab, 1992; Kannappel, 1994; Lindle & Shrock, 1993).

**Teacher Involvement on SBDM Councils**

John Dewey proposed that “every teacher should have a way in which to participate in the formation of the controlling aims, methods and materials of the school of which he is a part” (Dewey, 1946, p. 63). Incorporating Dewey’s notion of participation into present day practice, the underlying assumption of shared

---

1 To address the issue of how much consultation a principal is required to engage with the council, House Bill 321 (4/15/98) was passed, requiring each school to adopt a policy regarding council consultation in the selection of personnel.
decision making between teachers and administrators is that such collaboration “will increase teacher creativity, improve student achievement, and facilitate better decision making on curricular and pedagogical matters” (Sperry, Daniel, Huefner, Gee, 1998). Teacher positions on site based decision-making councils are warranted because the technical expertise teachers possess about schooling uniquely qualify them to make decisions about the organization and educational services (Rinehart, 1998; Swanson, 1989).

Shared governance descriptive studies indicate that teachers involved in staff selection report positive attitudes about their experiences reviewing applications, developing interview questions, interviewing applicants, and interacting with other teachers and administrators (Phillips, 1996; White, 1992). Further, they report positive outcomes. Teachers say their input is valued because their recommendations are followed often.

Specifically, teachers say their interviews emphasize questions on teaching skills and philosophy rather than on classroom management skills. Moreover, teachers reported feeling responsible for new teachers and feeling more likely to support novice teachers when they played a role in their hiring (Smith & Piele, 1998). As such, empirical and quasi-experimental studies of teacher participation on school based councils focus on the following dependent variables: teacher perceptions of empowerment, relationships among teachers on
site based councils, job satisfaction and role stress, teacher receptiveness to school based management, quality of decisions made, and student achievement.

Wall and Rinehart (1994) studied teacher's perceptions of their own decision-making when policies were in place requiring involvement on a site based council. Specifically, the study investigated the perceptions of five dimensions of empowerment (decision making, status, professional growth, self-efficacy, autonomy, and impact) by high school teachers in schools at various stages of council formation. Teachers on high school councils that had been operational for three years were compared to proximal high schools without SBDM councils.

MANOVA results indicated that teachers in both groups were neutrally anchored (Likert-type) in their perceptions of empowerment, indicating indecisiveness about their involvement in shared decision-making. However, the site council group was statistically different from the control group. As a result, this study did not support the theory that site-based governance structures automatically predict involvement and empowerment in decision making (instructional or administrative—which includes teacher selection).

Another perspective explored with regard to the teacher serving on a school based decision-making council, was that of relationships among the team. Weiss, Cambone, and Wyeth (1992) found that while training was needed in content areas that decision making bodies face, training was needed in the
decision-making process and in helping teachers take stands in front of their peers (Weiss et al., 1992, p. 360). Likewise, teachers serving on SBDM councils demonstrated a need to acquire skills in understanding how and why opponents make judgments and to acquire negotiation abilities.

Educational leadership is both managerial and technical. However, teachers are discriminating about how and when they choose to be involved in school decision-making (Mohrman, Jr., Cooke & Mohrman, 1978; Taylor & Tashakkori, 1997). Repeatedly, teachers report a desire to be involved in school decision-making, especially with respect to issues directly affecting their immediate teaching responsibilities (Bacharach, Bauer & Shedd, 1988).

Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman, (1978) conducted an early study exploring fit between actual and desired patterns of participation in decisional domains. Specifically, the researchers analyzed how participation correlated with certain affective states of organizational members. In this study, satisfaction and role stress correlated only with teacher participation in technical decisions.

Technical decisions were defined as those decisions deemed central to teaching or to instructional processes. Behavioral examples of the technical domain include: selecting instructional texts, resolving learning problems of individual students, determining appropriate instructional methods and
techniques, establishing general instructional policies, and establishing classroom disciplinary policies. Ironically, these same teachers reported a sense of greater deprivation regarding managerial decisions.

Managerial decision areas were comprised of the following: hiring professional personnel, planning school budgets, determining professional assignments, resolving employee grievances, planning new buildings and facilities, resolving problems with community groups, and determining professional salaries (Mohrman, Jr., Cooke & Mohrman, 1978). Though teacher satisfaction related strongly to participation in technical decisions, teachers reported greater deprivation regarding managerial decisions indicating teachers may need genuine managerial influence to gain autonomy in instructional decision-making (Mohrman et al., 1978). Managerial influence may be a prerequisite to technical influence, a persuasive argument for shared decision making especially in hiring professional personnel.

Many educational reformers purported that if teachers were given an opportunity to make administrative decisions, they would embrace enthusiastically the task. Phillips (1996), tested the receptiveness of teachers in one school district (N=92) to the idea of school based decision-making. Schools examined were operating under a shared governance model that addressed goals, curriculum, budget, and staffing.
One of the six research questions that guided the study, was “Do teachers have an active role in recruiting and selecting staff members?” (Phillips, 1996, p.6) Faculty members surveyed and later interviewed were participating already in shared decision making. Although 50% of the faculty connoted that they would like to be involved in recruiting and selecting teachers, 66% of the faculty wanted to be involved in the recruiting and selecting of administrators.

An analysis of variance was conducted on teacher demographic variables to determine if these variables varied according to survey responses. Variables included: gender, number of years teaching, member of Principal Advisory Committee, number of years at the high school, extent of participation, and department membership. Years of teaching experience and department membership were statistically significant in relation to survey responses (perceptions of SBDM). Teachers with eleven or more years of teaching experience were determined to possess the highest degree of willingness to participate in curriculum development, budget, and staff selection.

Following research about teacher receptiveness and shared decision-making; Taylor and Tashakkori (1997) challenged the assumption that teachers want to participate in deciding issues beyond the scope of the classroom. Taylor and Tashakkori hypothesized that a teacher’s relative desire for involvement may have implications for the resultant quality of decisions made. Participation
Two continuums of involvement in decision-making were proposed: 1) desire for involvement and 2) actual amount of involvement in decision-making. Combining the two continuums into a typology, the authors identified four types of teachers given their levels of participation and desire for participation: empowered (high involvement-high desire), involved (high involvement-low desire), disenfranchised (low involvement-high desire), and disengaged (low involvement-low desire). Additionally, the effectiveness of decision-making was dependent on both actual and desired engagement.

The results indicated that teachers perceive fewer opportunities for participation than they would like. For most of the teachers surveyed, the desire to participate was high. Specifically, empowered (high desire, high participation) and disenfranchised (high desire, low participation) teachers reported higher than mean desire to participate in the selection of teachers.

Teachers in the low desire groups were selective about the areas in which they participated. Overall, the perceptions of the low desire - high involvement teachers about school climate and social psychological attributes nearly mirrored the perceptions of the high desire – high participation groups. However,
teachers in the low desire groups were far less attracted to involvement in matters of policy and practice and of management (which included the hiring of personnel) than were their colleagues in the high desire groups.

Marks and Louis (1997) supported the notion that teacher empowerment is a theoretical construct evident in four distinct policy domains, namely: school operations and management, students' school experiences, teachers' work life, and control over classroom instruction. The operations and management dimension included planning the building budget, determining the school schedule, determining professional and teaching assignments, establishing the school curriculum, hiring new professional personnel, and determining the content of in-service programs. Unique to this investigation were the dependent variables of professional community, collective responsibility for student learning, and authentic pedagogy.

Among restructuring schools, substantial variation existed between and within schools regarding the extent that teachers experienced empowerment in the school operations and management domain. School operations and management accounted for 35.2% of the variance occurring between schools and 11.3% of the variance within schools as it related to collective responsibility for student learning and 11.6% of the variance between schools and 5.6% of the
variance within schools related to authentic pedagogy. Teacher roles and level of empowerment in policies such as hiring and budgeting proved varied and ambiguous.

**Parent Involvement on SBDM Councils**

While parental involvement is common to educational reform in this county, research reviewing parent involvement on site based councils or on other forms of shared governance is scant. Generally, advocates of shared governance present parental involvement as an educational partnership responsible for instructional improvement. Specifically, conceptual works justify the parental role in the educational enterprise as a means to hear parent voice, to re-establish stakeholder roles, to utilize parents' intimate knowledge about their children for improved instruction, and to improve schools through shared decision-making (Kannappel et al., 1995; Molnar, 1999; Swanson, 1989).

Furthermore, case studies examining site based councils describe various assets of parental involvement to the decision making process. Regarding parents, Seymour Sarason (1995) noted parents have knowledge of their children that is not available to anyone else, have a vested stake in the formal education experiences of their child, and are teachers themselves. Pragmatically, parents account for educational quality as they supply monies for their own district's funding.
Contrasted with theory, studies examining the experiences of parents in educational decision-making are disconcerting. One matter agreed upon in theory and practice is that parents, teachers, and administrators must recognize clearly articulated roles for each constituency within a school site-based council (Dunning, 1995). However, numerous case studies report difficulties arising from questions of authority and role (Betz, 1992; Dixon, 1992; Kannappel et al., 1995; Molnar, 1999).

As stated earlier, the redistribution of power to parents does not guarantee improved education. In fact, parents interviewed for one study were far from clear about why and in what ways their possession of power would improve the quality of education (Sarason, 1995, p. 29). Viewed from another angle, parents are not enthusiastic about the type of parental involvement required by legislated reforms (Public Agenda, 1999).

For example, many legislated reform efforts require parents, teachers, and administrators acting as one council to hire school personnel. A qualitative study conducted by Molnar (1999, p. 17) discovered parents and teachers came to an understanding that hiring school personnel was not a role for parents. Parents reported feeling unprepared to interview and hire teachers or administrators.

Additionally, David’s longitudinal study of the implementation of Kentucky’s Educational Reform Act proved personnel issues most difficult for
councils. Surveys and interviews revealed most conflicts regarding personnel related to vacancies, transfers, supplemental salaries, new positions, and itinerant staff. Complicating matters further were districts operating under collective bargaining agreements and the fact that personnel matters requiring council action were commonly unanticipated. (David, 1995, p. 709).

Finally, if we consider parental participation as a response to challenges concerning the distribution of power in formulating policy and practice, we find nothing other than governmental recognition achieved (Sarason, 1995; House, 1995). School reform initiatives resembling shared decision making fail because parents as stakeholders have not been involved meaningfully or intelligently (Dixon, 1992; House, 1995). Legislated parental involvement in school decision-making has failed to bring about a serious discussion of parents as differentiated assets, as a kind of venture capital that could be profitable to schools (Sarason, 1995, p. 50).

**Site Based Management Models and Teacher Selection**

Wohlstetter and Odden (1992) detail three models of site based management: community control, administrative decentralization, and principal control. Community control shifts power from professional educators and board of education members to parent and community groups that direct accountability outward toward the community. Administrative decentralization
features teacher control by delegating decision making down the ranks of the professional hierarchy to building level educators, while principal control exists with principals consulting with staff, parents, and community members.

Lindle and Shrock (1993) proposed a model for school based decision-making councils that addressed the hiring process within the context of the Kentucky Education Reform Act. Concerned with site based council activities in screening, interviewing, and judging processes of teacher selection, this model encouraged Council participation in each step of the hiring process. Additionally, the principal control model was supported as one that "enhanc[ed] the principal’s decision-making role by using the Council as a source of support and information in the hiring process" (Lindle & Shrock, 1993, p. 76).

Preceding the screening process, Lindle and Schrock recommended that council members become cognizant of district screening criteria and determine the acceptability of these criteria or determine if new standards need established in their stead. Additionally, the authors recommend that no fewer than five and no more than 15 applicants per position be submitted to council. Post-screening determinations included: the principal and council deciding on a rank-ordered list of candidates, deciding the number of candidates to interview, and deciding the manner in which to conduct interviews.

The interviewing phase of hiring requires interview preparation and a structured panel format. Decisions concerning representation of community
constituents on the panel, size of the panel, and questions to be asked of the candidate must be agreed upon before interviewing commences. Specifically, questions must address member constituency interests, must evaluate a candidate's knowledge of specific content area, and must assess the applicant's awareness of current educational trends.

Selecting a candidate constitutes the last stage of this model's hiring process. Council members are advised to give honest recommendations to the principal, who takes the recommendation under advisement in making the hiring decision. After the interview process is complete, rating candidates from top to bottom is suggested.

Reform mandated site based panels differ from other interview configurations with respect to panel membership. The composition of the panel is both external and internal to the organization, with certain members representing and lobbying for (parents, community) constituencies within the district. Authority granted educator and non-educator school-based council members is equally weighted; which may give rise to a more political than academic experience for the applicant.

**Selection Interview Process and Interviewer Roles**

A sequential stage selection process governs organizational entry for teacher candidates (Young & McMurry, 1986). The first phase of the process commences as candidates in the applicant pool are evaluated on the basis of
paper credentials (resumes, reference letters, applications, and transcripts).

Applicants who advance the screening stage enter into the second phase of the selection process and are interviewed for the position under consideration.

To obtain a teaching position, candidates must succeed at both stages of the selection process. Typically, applicant success at both screening and interview stages depends on judgments made by educational administrators. However, as educational reform efforts intensify, administrators, teachers, and parents are increasingly responsible for making evaluative decisions at the screening and at the interview phases of the selection process.

Screening decisions are made on the basis of paper credentials for the purpose of delimiting the applicant pool and for the purpose of determining who should be extended invitations for subsequent interviews. Interestingly, Young and Pounder (1985) reported that decisions made on the basis of paper credential assessments are quite different from decisions made on the basis of interview assessments. In fact, the researchers found decisions made at the screening stage are influenced by factors distinct from those at the interview stage (Gorman, Clover, & Doherty, 1978).

For example, research suggests that gender exhibits relatively little impact at the screening stage of the teacher selection process (Reis, Young, & Jury, 1999; Stallard, 1990), while age significantly influences decisions at the paper screening stage (Johnson, 1976; Young & Allison, 1982; Young, Rinehart & Baits, 1997).
Additionally, Young and Prince (1999) reported that teacher candidates with certain disabilities received considerable acceptance at the paper screening stage of the teacher selection process, regardless of their age. Conversely, candidate characteristics such as age, gender, race, attractiveness, verbal and nonverbal behavior, and interpersonal performance style are factors found to bias selection decisions (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Young, 1984; Young & Allison, 1982; Young & Voss, 1986).

Throughout selection research, the question of who makes screening decisions and interview judgments has been a point of study. Repeatedly, human resource literature debates the generalizability of laboratory studies and the validity of results when professional roles are assigned to students (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Barr & Hitt, 1986; Gordon, Slade, & Schmitt, 1986; Harris, 1988; Ployhart & Ryan, 1998; Powell, 1991). Comparing students and managers as interviewers, Barr and Hitt (1986) found that students and managers made different selection decisions and used different information in making their evaluations. Additionally, Singer and Sewell (1989) reported that selection performance evaluations and hire decisions concerning the same applicants were completely different for the manager and student samples in their study.

Clearly, the literature implies that the role of the individual making screening and interview judgments may influence the processes employed in decision-making and may influence the screening or interview decision itself.
Scholars of social psychology posited that when self and role characteristics are congruent, a convincing performance is expected, but when self and role characteristics are incongruent, the accomplishment is likely to be invalid and unconvincing (Sarbin, 1964). Thus, self-role congruence implies explicitly that the roles of the members on school site base councils not only influence the outcomes of selection process decisions, but may affect also the quality of the decision as well.

Congruent, contiguous, and vested self-role profiles are exemplified in teachers, principals, and parents respectively albeit teacher and principal roles could be confounded with parent roles. Teacher participation in the teacher selection process represents a pure form of self-role congruence on a site-base management team. Building administrators require minimal teaching experience and graduate education beyond the teaching degree, creating an organizational representative with a self-role contiguous profile.

However, if parents are not credentialed teachers or credentialed administrators, their service on site-base school councils produces self-role incongruence. Parents possess a legitimate vested interest in the education of their children and in the strength of education in their community. In fact, to gain membership on site base councils in Kentucky, parents must be elected by the parent - teacher organization of the school and must not be district
employees, district board members, or relatives of district employees (KERA, 1990). As such, role incongruence is built into the participative governance system.

According to self-role congruence theory, we are apt to believe that the selection decisions of teachers and of administrators will be effective due to role congruence, while the role incongruence of parents may compromise decision quality. Hence, the unique roles of parent, teacher, and administrator serving on site base councils may influence both the processes and the outcomes of screening and of interviewing decisions. In as much as the quality of selection decisions impacts school district performance measures, the question of decision source begs further investigation.

Additionally, Kahn's work (1964) on role theory supports the notion that a person's behavior on a given task, at a given time and place, is influenced by the following continuing relations: with others involved in that task, with others present in that place, and with others not present, but relevant to the setting and or task. Using this theory the following analogy is developed. Parents, teachers and administrators assume roles in teacher selection, completing their task of screening or interviewing applicants to achieve a concluding behavior, a selection decision, within a setting known as the site based council.

Further, it is understood that role behavior can be determined by forces and pressures that originate outside the organization in which the behavior
occurs. Behavior on a task is influenced because each individual is cognizant of the expectations that others have about how to behave on certain tasks in a given time and place. For this reason, the study of roles and the effects of interpersonal relations as they relate to organizational behavior is important.

Unfortunately, teacher selection research has confirmed unequivocally, role congruence fails to guarantee effective screening decisions. Young and Schmidt (1988) found that screening decisions made by public school administrators were influenced by factors that have little to do with an applicant's potential teaching performance. To illustrate, Young, Baits, and Rinehart (1997) demonstrated that educational decision-makers associated arbitrarily, age with physical activity level at the screening phase of the selection process, impacting negatively the older individual applying for a teaching position requiring increased levels of physical activity.

Teacher selection decisions render practical and legal implications for education. Resumes and other paper credentials constitute a “test” under federal guidelines, and the information gleaned from these credentials are presupposed to judge an applicant's competence and job qualifications (1607.13 Uniform Guidelines). Hence, members of site base selection teams are required to make selection decisions embedded in factors directly influencing teaching performance.
Yet, unless performance-based selection methods are utilized, factors presumed to affect teaching performance are inferred from information contained in paper credentials and demonstrated through personal interaction opportunities such as the interview. Typically, the teacher selection process focuses on proxy measures that purport to identify candidates with intelligence, instructional expertise, dedication to the profession, sensitivity to children, communication skills, and student management abilities (Pounder, 1989). Despite the fact that the reliability and validity of these predictors are reportedly weak, they continue to hold a dominant standing in administrative notions of teacher effectiveness.

**Legal Implications of SBDM**

Exclusion from participation is a subtle form of suppression. It gives individuals no opportunity to reflect and decide upon what is good for them. Others who are supposed to be wiser and who in any case have more power decide the question for them and also decide the methods and means by which subjects may arrive at the enjoyment of what is good for them (Dewey, 1946, p. 59).

According to Dewey, all individuals affected by social institutions must have a share in managing them, an ideal that shaped the theoretical underpinnings of participative decision-making. Nearly every major school restructuring initiative advocates incorporating some form of site based decision-
making and parental involvement in decision-making (Kannappel, 1995). In fact, Daniel (2000) spotlights the Educate America Act (1994) as a law that requires every school to engage parents in partnerships that support "academic work of children at home and shared educational decision-making at school."

Because of perceived inadequacies in our educational systems, parents clamor for substantive participation and power in educational decision-making. Historically, parents attempted to influence educational decisions through advisory committees, community action, and court challenges (House, 1995). For example, congressional and judicial acts such as the Compulsory Education Act, 1954 Supreme Court Desegregation decision, and the Education for Handicapped Children Act (1975) were acts lobbied aggressively by parents and became laws that required parental involvement (Daniel, 2000; Sarason, 1995).

Interestingly, forms of institutionalized shared governance resulted largely from mandated or legislated acts, and not from school personnel efforts. Indeed, lack of educator support for parental participation has been cited as a barrier to educational improvement (Dixon, 1992). Moreover, even when federal funds serve as an incentive for establishing strong parent-school partnerships, this legislation has not reconceptualized connections between parents and school officials (Daniel, 2000, p.4).

Educators' lack of support for parental involvement in instructional decision making is more complex than issues of professional territorialism and
egotism. Essentially, the constitutional obligation to provide and maintain public education rests with each state's legislature and as agents of the state, administrators and teachers are instruments of instruction charged with transmitting knowledge and societal values to students (Sperry, Daniel, Huefner & Gee, 1998, p. 15). Individual school boards then, extend this charge by determining a school district's curriculum and policy.

Shared governance in the form of site based decision making may elevate the power of unelected officials over elected officials and certified administrators. SBDM litigation holds that legislators may be in error of delegating powers to non-elected persons that heretofore have been granted explicitly to the local board of education (Sperry et al., 1998). Highlighted in Fumarolo v Chicago BOE (1990), local school councils were in violation of the state constitution, as they were vested with essential government powers and persons with such powers must be elected by all eligible voters and not those just representing an isolated constituency (Sperry et al., p. 48).

Advancements

The present study purports three advancements in educational research: (1) investigation of selection screening practices in defined high performing and low performing school districts; (2) examination of teacher and parent screening decisions relative to the role of organizational representatives; and (3) exploration of teacher and parent screening decisions as moderated potentially
by legislative mandates. Empirical research that examines teacher performance in school districts categorized as low performing or high performing organizations by objective and uniform measures is scant. Given the prominence of accountability in educational research and in educational practice, it makes sense to investigate teacher selection practices in districts that vary by performance.

Ohio and Kentucky's Local Report Cards are measures that satisfy both a quality and quantity component of school performance. The Local Report Card communicates to all stakeholders, a composite score for the district's academic achievement on state mandated proficiency tests, as well as the district's student attendance rate and the district's student graduation rate. Because level of organizational performance was determined for every school in both states using uniform standards, examining selection practices in high performing and low performing districts may be revealing. This notion is supported by the idea that "predictors used to select teachers in one school district may not be valid for selecting teachers in another school district because the teaching behaviors expected from teachers vary from district to district" (Young & Ryerson, 1986, p. 10).

As discussed previously, mandated educational reforms have brought about an increase in parent and teacher involvement in school governance. One aspect of school governance that incorporates the involvement of administrators,
teachers, and parents is the screening and interviewing phases of teacher
selection. Existing research acknowledges the perceptions and feelings of
teachers participating in teacher selection decisions, the willingness of teachers to
participate in teacher selection decisions, and the difficulties and rewards
inherent in teacher selection practices. To date, research has failed to examine
the role of the parent in teacher screening or teacher selection decisions. If, under
the aegis of school reform, parents and teachers are compelled to participate in
personnel selection practices, then scholars and practitioners are obligated to
study the expectations, values, and perceptions, that organizational
representatives convey when making selection decisions.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

A random sample was selected from the population of public elementary school principals, elementary school teachers, and elementary school PTO Officers from Kentucky and Ohio. To secure a sufficient number of participants from schools in high and low performance categories, each state’s population was stratified as schools performing above the median and schools performing below the median, using data from each state’s Local Report Card achievement ratings. Using lists provided by the Kentucky Department of Education, the Ohio Department of Education, and a sample purchased from a commercial marketing firm, organizational representatives were then selected randomly from districts above and below the local report card median.

Sample size was determined using Cohen’s (1988, pp. 396-400) power analysis procedures for fixed main and interaction effects in factorial designs. Based on a desired Cohen convention medium effect size ($\Omega^2 = .25$), defined level of significance ($\alpha = .05$), and the convention of power (power = .80), the sample size designated was 168 with 14 observations per cell. Because existing studies
report typical response rates of approximately 60 per cent (Young & Allison, 1982; Young & Schmidt, 1988; Young & Voss, 1986) the minimum number of subjects to sample equaled \( N = 269 \) to insure adequate cell size for data analysis.

To insure sample independence and to control for district effect, only a single organizational representative was selected per school district. For example, only a PTO officer, a teacher or an administrator was assigned to a single school district. While perceptions of organizational representatives were the focus of this study, school districts rather than organizational representatives served as the unit of analysis because organizational representatives, level of organizational performance, and status of legislated reform are all properties of the school district.

All participants received in the mail survey packets that contained a cover letter, applicant resume, candidate evaluation form, biographical information form, and a postcard to return if the evaluator was interested in study results. A second mailing, a postcard, served as a reminder to nonrespondents, while the third communication was an email to a focal position in the nonrespondent’s school who had easy access to target personnel. Mailings four and five were mailed to nonrespondents and consisted of the same packets as the initial request, except for a different cover letter.
Independent Variables

Role of organizational representative, existence of legislated site based
decision-making, and school district performance were the independent
variables manipulated in this investigation. Organizational representatives
consisted of three levels: parent, teacher, and administrator. Site based decision-
making states comprised two levels, site based (KY) and non site based (OH),
while school performance consisted of schools above and below the state median
local report card rating.

Among proposals advanced to improve the United States' educational
system is the restructuring of authority at the school building level to allow
teachers and parents greater influence in running schools. Opinions of
administrators and school board presidents across the country regarding teacher
and parent participation in the running of schools vary by the size and type of
school district (Feistritzer, 1992). Teacher selection processes, one managerial
component of school operation, and who selects teachers for schools varies
across states as well.

For example, Kentucky parents and teachers are legislatively mandated to
serve on site based decision-making councils and participate in the teacher
selection process while Ohio experts consider "[t]he superintendent or
designated administrator best qualified to select teachers" (Ohio School Boards
Association, 1996, p. 50). Parents, as role-vested contributors to the teacher
selection process, were operationalized as Parent-Teacher Association (PTA/PTO) officers from the population of elementary Parent Teacher Associations/Organizations in Kentucky and Ohio. PTO subjects ensured formal role responsibilities. Teachers represented role-congruent contributors to the selection process and teacher data was purchased from Market Data Retrieval while information about principals, role-contiguous contributors, was obtained from the Ohio Department of Education and Kentucky Department of Education web sites.

Kentucky and Ohio schools receive accountability ratings based on state academic, graduation, and attendance performance standards. Both state's distributions of accountability scores were univariately normally distributed therefore, for the purpose of this study, the total number of standards met per school district was tabulated to derive one measure of central tendency, the median. School district performance was dichotomized then as above or below the state's median Local Report Card rating.

Performance above and below the median was used in this study rather than one standard deviation above or below the mean because of the limited number of school districts with local report card data in Kentucky (172) as compared to Ohio (606). The one standard deviation restriction of performance scores proved prohibitive in terms of number of Kentucky districts available for the random assignment of organizational representatives to an above or below...
performance district. It is recognized, however, that dichotomizing performance by one standard deviation above or below the mean would have provided a stronger manipulation of this independent variable.

**Dependent Variables**

Two dependent variables were investigated in this study namely, organizational representative reaction to the hypothetical applicant and organizational representative evaluation of the hypothetical applicant’s professional skills. Evaluator reaction indicated the extent to which the applicant would advance in the selection process and was operationalized as a single item response to a measure asking the evaluator’s opinion regarding the probability of extending the candidate an offer to interview. Respondents evaluated the likelihood of extending an offer to interview on 10-point Likert type scale, with a higher rating indicating a more favorable response.

Evaluation of the hypothetical applicant’s professional skills was operationalized as a composite score derived from the following six measures: knowledge of curriculum, ability to transmit knowledge, contribution to overall school program, ability to maintain a disciplined classroom, ability to create a friendly classroom environment, and professional growth potential. Respondents rated the hypothetical candidate using six separate 4-point Likert
type scales ranging from 1 to 4, with a higher rating indicating a more favorable response. Total ratings on the composite score could range from a low of 6 to a high of 24.

Procedure

Credentials for hypothetical teacher candidates, an introductory letter, a candidate evaluation form, an evaluator biographical information form, and a stamped-preaddressed envelope were mailed to participants assigned to one of twelve treatment groups. An individually addressed introductory letter (Appendix A) explained the purpose of the study, solicited participation, provided specific instructions, and assured confidentiality. All organizational representatives received the same introductory letter that instructed them to read and review candidate credentials and to evaluate the candidate in terms of their professional qualities and in terms of the likelihood of extending an offer to interview to the candidate.

Additionally, each participant received a self-addressed postcard for participants to request study results. Participants were instructed to return by mail, the postcard anytime after completing the candidate evaluation or it could be returned with the candidate evaluation. Sending the request for study results as a separate mailing insured a subject's confidentiality, a matter considered in gaining human subjects approval.
The candidate evaluation form (Appendix C) asked participants to rate the hypothetical candidate on six separate criteria: knowledge of curriculum, ability to transmit knowledge, contribution to overall school program, ability to maintain a disciplined classroom, ability to create a friendly classroom environment, and professional growth potential. Further, participants completed a biographical questionnaire (Appendix D), which included questions regarding personal and district demographics, the use of resumes in the participant's district, and the participant's experience in their particular organizational role and in teacher selection decisions. Lastly, the hypothetical candidate resume (Appendix B) modeled after those used in previous teacher selection investigations (Baits, 1990; Place, 1988) included information regarding personal data, educational background, professional experiences, extracurricular and community activities, professional certification, professional memberships, and future ambitions.

Random assignment of subjects to treatment conditions was determined first by stratifying the population of school districts within a state as above or below the Local Report Card median assessment. A list was compiled of all districts in each treatment once school districts were divided as above median and below median performers. From three separate lists of parent, teacher and
administrator names for each state, an organizational representative was assigned to a district (i.e. district 1, parent; district 2 teacher; district 3 principal; district 4, parent; and so on).

Paper-people research has been criticized by scholars in the private sector (Gorman, Glover & Doherty, 1978), however, its employment in education is justified. For administrators, the screening of an applicant consists primarily of reviewing paper credentials such as the application, letters of reference, and the resume so the paper-people investigation represents a realistic simulation of the selection process. Dipboye (1992) related as one reason for conducting paper-people research the fact that most decisions to interview or not, are based on paper credentials only, a reality in the public education arena.

This investigation examined roles of organizational representatives in teacher selection and examined if screening decisions differed by role. Both of these foci were couched within the context of academically high and low performing districts in a legislated site based decision-making state and a non-legislated site based decision-making state. A multivariate analysis of variance was employed to analyze the data. Results of this analysis are reported subsequently.
The following null hypotheses were subjected to empirical tests.

H₁: Candidate ratings provided by parents, teachers, and administrators will not differ according to organizational role of the representative.

H₂: Candidate ratings provided by participants will not differ according to the existence of a state mandate for site-based decision making.

H₃: Candidate ratings provided by participants will not vary according to school district performance.

H₄: Candidate ratings provided by participants will not differ according to any specific combination of site-based decision making state and organizational representative role.

H₅: Candidate ratings provided by participants will not differ according to any specific combination of organizational representative role and school district performance.

H₆: Candidate ratings provided by participants will not differ according to any specific combination of site-based decision making state and school district performance.
H7: Candidate ratings will not be influenced by the combined effects of organizational representative role, educational reform status of the state, and school district performance rating.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

A stratified random sample of 620 parents, teachers, and administrators from Ohio and Kentucky were selected as potential participants for this study. Market Data Retrieval, a firm that supplies educational marketing services, provided the random samples for teachers. Using data supplied by state department of education web sites, principals and parents were selected at random from their respective Kentucky and Ohio populations.

Survey responses, candidate evaluation forms and evaluator biographical information forms, were completed and returned by 306 participants. This number represents a 52% return rate. Incomplete candidate evaluation forms and candidate evaluation forms completed with disregard to directions were not used (N = 41).

School districts in both states were stratified by performance (above and below the median), and participants within each stratum were then selected at random for treatment conditions. To obtain a completely balanced design for statistical analyses, only 14 responses per treatment condition were selected at
random netting a final sample of 168. Descriptive data for parent, teacher and administrator participants, extent of participation in screening resumes, and school district type are reported in Table 4.1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>43.95</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in Role</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Screening Decisions</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Screening</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Participated in Screening</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator Screening</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Screening</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher &amp; Admin Screening</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Resumes to Screen</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Use of Resumes to Screen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Participants' Descriptive Statistics  
Note. Dashes indicate the statistic was not calculated.
A chi-square test of independence was performed to determine if statistically significant differences existed in return rates across treatments. Using the average usable response rate of 46% across roles, performance, and states, expected values of 35 and 13 were calculated for Ohio and Kentucky respectively. The overall chi square, $17.88$, df $= 11$, $p < .05$, indicates that of the usable responses, there was no significant treatment by response interaction. Results of the chi-square test are noted in Table 4.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POH+</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POH-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKY+</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKY-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOH+</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOH-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKY+</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKY-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOH+</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOH-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKY+</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKY-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $X^2$ ...... 17.88

Table 4.2: Chi Square/One Dimensional Test
Note: p value at .05, df 11 = 19.68
As a test of external validity, participants were requested to indicate their school district's use of resumes during the applicant screening process. Of 168 respondents, only one participant noted that resumes were not used to evaluate applicant credentials. In contrast, 99.9% of the subjects indicated use of resumes for screening, substantiating the relevance of a paper person investigation based on a resume.

Before submitting data for inferential analysis, assumptions of multivariate normal distribution and equal variance-covariance matrices were tested. Because a direct test for multivariate normality does not exist, each dependent variable was tested for univariate normality using kurtosis and skewness statistics. Kurtosis and skew results suggest a relatively normal distribution, (kurtosis = .787 and skewness = -.710 and kurtosis = .685 and skewness = -.869) for composite scores and probability of extending an interview, respectively.

A two-step test for homogeneity of variance-covariance across dependent variables was conducted. First, univariate homogeneity of variance across groups was assessed using Levene's test. Levene test results were nonsignificant ($F=1.452, p = .155$ and $F = .897, p = .545$) satisfying the univariate homogeneity of variance assumption.
Next, the Box test was employed to assess the dependent variables by testing the equality of the entire variance-covariance matrices between the groups. Significant differences, $p < .01$, were evidenced across the covariance matrix of dependent variables. However, given the sensitivity of this test and the robustness of MANOVA to a violation of equal variance-covariance (if group sizes are equal), the significance level was deemed acceptable.

Participants evaluated a hypothetical candidate based on two dependent variables: (1) a composite score based on ratings from the candidate evaluation form, and (2) probability of extending the applicant an interview. The first dependent variable consisted of an applicant composite score computed as an evaluator's sum of ratings on six criterion variables: curricular knowledge, ability to transmit knowledge, overall school contribution, classroom discipline, personal warmth, and potential for professional growth (Young & Allison, 1982; Young & Joseph, 1989; Young & Pounder, 1985; Young & Prince, 1999). Each criterion was rated on a four point Likert-type scale with higher ratings denoting a more positive response than lower ratings. Mean ratings and standard deviations for the criterion variables are listed in Table 4.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Knowledge</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Transmit Knowledge</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall School Contribution</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Discipline</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Warmth</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for Professional Growth</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 168

Table 4.3: Summary Statistics for Composite Scores

Internal consistency of composite scores was assessed calculating a coefficient alpha. A coefficient alpha of .89 was computed, a value comparable to other studies that employed the same criteria to evaluate a hypothetical job candidate (Baits, 1990; Place, 1988; Young & McMurray, 1986; Young & Voss, 1986). This coefficient is well within the acceptable ranges of reliability suggested by Nunnally (1967).

Cell means and standard deviations were computed for each of the twelve treatments for the composite score dependent variable. Table 4.4 contains a summary of cell means and standard deviations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kentucky (c1)</th>
<th>Parent (a1)</th>
<th>Teacher (a2)</th>
<th>Administrator (a3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Median (b1)</td>
<td>M = 2.83</td>
<td>M = 2.99</td>
<td>M = 2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = .398</td>
<td>SD = .411</td>
<td>SD = .534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>n = 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Median (b2)</td>
<td>M = 2.93</td>
<td>M = 3.06</td>
<td>M = 2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = .591</td>
<td>SD = .703</td>
<td>SD = .330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>n = 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio (c2)</td>
<td>Parent (a1)</td>
<td>Teacher (a2)</td>
<td>Administrator (a3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Median (b1)</td>
<td>M = 2.74</td>
<td>M = 2.94</td>
<td>M = 2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = .553</td>
<td>SD = .675</td>
<td>SD = .549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>n = 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Median (b2)</td>
<td>M = 2.76</td>
<td>M = 3.38</td>
<td>M = 2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = .522</td>
<td>SD = .395</td>
<td>SD = .768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>n = 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Summary of Cell Means and Standard Deviations Using Composite as Dependent Variable

Note:
A: Organizational Representative (1-parent; 2-teacher; 3-administrator)
B: School District Performance (1-above the median; 2-below the median)
C: Status of Mandated Reform (1-reform state - KY; 2-nonreform state - OH)
N =168
The second dependent variable, a single item measure, reported the probability of an evaluator extending the hypothetical candidate an offer to interview. This score was calculated using the evaluators' rating on a ten-point Likert-type scale, where 10 indicated the highest probability of an offer to interview and 1 indicated the lowest probability of an offer to interview. Cell summary statistics for this dependent variable are included in Table 4.5.

Using a procedure purported by Wanous and Reichers (1996, 1997) reliability for the single item measure (probability of extending the applicant an offer to interview) was assessed. This procedure estimates minimum reliability for a single item measure and involves solving for an unknown using the correction for attenuation formula. Given this procedure, the minimum reliability obtained for this data was .82.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kentucky (c1)</th>
<th>Parent (a1)</th>
<th>Teacher (a2)</th>
<th>Administrator (a3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Median</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b1)</td>
<td>M = 6.86</td>
<td>M = 7.79</td>
<td>M = 7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 1.41</td>
<td>SD = 1.37</td>
<td>SD = 1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>n = 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Median</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b2)</td>
<td>M = 8.00</td>
<td>M = 7.43</td>
<td>M = 7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 1.80</td>
<td>SD = 2.24</td>
<td>SD = 1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>n = 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio (c2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Median</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b1)</td>
<td>M = 6.43</td>
<td>M = 6.79</td>
<td>M = 6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 2.41</td>
<td>SD = 2.67</td>
<td>SD = 2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>n = 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Median</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b2)</td>
<td>M = 6.86</td>
<td>M = 8.64</td>
<td>M = 7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 1.99</td>
<td>SD = 1.15</td>
<td>SD = 2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td>n = 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Summary of Cell Means and Standard Deviations with Interview Offer as Dependent Variable

A: Organizational Representative (1-parent; 2-teacher; 3-administrator)
B: School District Performance (1-above the median; 2-below the median)
C: Status of Mandated Reform (1-reform state; 2-nonreform state)
N =168
Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine the effect of evaluator roles (parent, teacher, and administrator), site-based decision making reform or non-reform state (Kentucky and Ohio), and school district performance (above and below state proficiency median) on two dependent variables, composite score of a hypothetical candidate and probability of extending an offer to interview to a hypothetical candidate. Each null hypothesis was tested using a specified alpha (α = .05). Significant effects were found for a main effect associated with organizational representative on the dependent measures, Pillai's Trace = .066, F (2, 156) = 2.653, p = .033, \( \eta^2 = .033 \). Table 4.6 contains the results of the multivariate analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pillai's Trace*</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>F Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org. Representative (A)</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>2.653</td>
<td>.033*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Performance (B)</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>2.476</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform State Status (C)</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>2.048</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxC</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BxC</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxBxC</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Table 4.6: Multivariate Analysis of Variances Results

Additionally, a boxplot graphical representation displaying the extent and character of differences associated with organizational role on the two dependent variables is illustrated in Figure 4.1. The top and bottom of each box represents a data distribution of the 25th and 75th percentiles, respectively while the space inside each box represents the middle 50th percent of data values. Lines in the middle of each box represent the median score on that variable.
As follow-up tests to the MANOVA, a 3 (parent, teacher, administrator) x 2 (site based reform state, non reform state) x 2 (above median performance, below median performance) analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on each dependent variable (composite score and probability of extending the candidate an offer to interview). Each ANOVA was tested at the .05 $\alpha$ level. Mean composite scores for organizational representatives were significantly different, $F (2, 156) = 4.841, p = .009, \eta^2 = .058$, while organizational representative mean scores regarding the probability of extending an offer to
interview were nonsignificant, $F (2, 156) = 1.606, p = .204, \eta^2 = .020$. No significant interactions were found. Tables 4.7 and 4.8 include the results of the univariate analyses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org. Representative (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.470</td>
<td>4.841*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Performance (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>2.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform State Status (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.134E-05</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BxC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.064E-02</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxBxC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Table 4.7: Univariate Test Results for Composite Score
### Table 4.8: Univariate Test Results for Probability of Interview Offer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org. Representative (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.256</td>
<td>1.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Performance (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.339</td>
<td>4.964*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform State Status (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.482</td>
<td>1.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.911</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BxC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.720</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxBxC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.756</td>
<td>2.247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Post hoc analyses consisted of conducting pairwise comparisons for the purpose of localizing the organizational representative that affected most strongly, composite scores. Two mean score comparisons were significant at the .05 α level, namely administrators and parents differed from teachers. Specifically, administrator and parent composite ratings of the applicant were lower than the teachers' mean rating of the same applicant. However, administrators and parents demonstrated comparable composite scores. Post hoc analyses results are illustrated in Table 4.9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>(I) ROLE</th>
<th>(J) ROLE</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSITE</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>-0.0104</td>
<td>0.10415</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.2857*</td>
<td>0.10415</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
<td>0.10415</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.2753*</td>
<td>0.10415</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>0.2857*</td>
<td>0.10415</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2753*</td>
<td>0.10415</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEW</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>0.1071</td>
<td>0.37302</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.5179</td>
<td>0.37302</td>
<td>0.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>-0.1071</td>
<td>0.37302</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.6250</td>
<td>0.37302</td>
<td>0.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>0.5179</td>
<td>0.37302</td>
<td>0.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6250</td>
<td>0.37302</td>
<td>0.288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 4.9: Post Hoc Analyses – Multiple Comparisons
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION, FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS

Success of educational organizations depends on human resources, and teachers represent a significant human resource that affects considerably pupil performance within the classroom. As such, selecting capable teachers is one of the most important administrative tasks performed generally by the school principal (Castetter & Young, 2000). Yet, based on the premise that those closest to students are best equipped to make decisions about how to help students succeed in school, many state lawmakers have mandated teacher and parent participation in school governance, including teacher selection, through the formation of policy-making bodies such as school based site councils.

Teacher selection decisions are complex decisions. School administrators and other individuals elected to participate in the selection of teachers, must adhere to legislation prohibiting discriminatory employment practices, must evaluate accurately the qualifications of an applicant, must assess critically organizational goals, and must discern the applicant's qualifications as a good or poor fit for existing and future organizational needs. Poor selection decisions impact negatively students, applicants, and organizational effectiveness.
To obtain a teaching position, an applicant must succeed at both the pre­
interview stage and the interview stage of the selection process. Moreover, 
applicant success depends on the judgments made by educational 
representatives participating in the teacher selection process. Research (Gordon, 
Slade & Schmitt, 1986; Barr & Hitt, 1986; Singer & Sewell, 1989) has shown that 
the role of the individual making screening and interviewing judgments may 
influence the screening or interviewing outcome.

Specifically, these studies illustrated that selection decisions made by 
differing organizational representatives or by students role playing as 
managerial representatives were different from those of professionals and were 
reached using different information. Further, Barr and Hitt (1986) found 
managers and students used dissimilar amounts of information to make 
evaluations. Students used more information than managers to make screening 
decisions in a mock selection process.

According to role theory, when self and role characteristics are congruent, 
a convincing performance is expected, but when self and role characteristics are 
incongruent, the performance is likely to be unconvincing (Sarbin, 1964). Thus, 
role congruence implies that the organizational representative role of a site-based 
council member may influence the outcome or the performance of that 
representative’s input into a selection decision. Based on role theory and on 
parent and teacher inclusion in teacher selection decisions, organizational role of
a selection team participant was investigated as a variable that may potentially influence screening decisions. That is, screening decisions of parents, teachers and administrators were examined in this study.

Additionally, teacher screening decisions were investigated in districts categorized as either low performing or high performing organizations. Level of organizational performance was determined for every school in both states using uniform standards that included a quality and quantity component of performance. Further, the evaluation of one predictor, the hypothetical candidate resume, tested the notion that desired behaviors expected from teachers vary from district to district (Young & Ryerson, 1986).

Finally, drawing from the research of Wall and Rinehart (1998), status of a state's mandated school governance process was investigated as a factor contributing to screening outcomes. Wall and Rinehart found a significant difference in teachers' sense of empowerment between schools with no experience in site-based participation and those schools with some experience on site-based councils. Acknowledging the underlying assumption that shared decision making improves student achievement and facilitates better decision making (Sperry, Daniel, Huefner, Gee, 1998), selection decisions of organizational representatives from a legislated site-based reform state (Kentucky) and a non-legislated site-based reform state (Ohio) was warranted to test for main effects and interactions of legislative action on screening decisions.
Conventionally, selection research has been conducted using macroanalytic and microanalytic research approaches. Macroanalytic research focused largely on the validity of selection results, while microanalytic research investigated the decision-making processes used in selection. A microanalytic research approach was employed in this study to gain an understanding of selection decisions made by organizational representatives who varied three ways (parent, teacher, administrator) in conditions that varied by district performance and mandated site-based reform.

Discussion

Early selection research was dominated by a macroanalytic focus and the results of these studies indicated repeatedly that the selection interview was a poor predictor of job performance. In the writings of researchers such as Wagner (1949), not only were study results cited as being substandard but so was selection research in general. Wagner concluded that interview reliability and validity were situation specific and as a result, could not be generalized to different populations. Additionally, Wagner called for the investigation of traits known to be predictive of job performance and for the standardization of interview formats to improve its reliability.

Macroanalytic research continued to dominate private sector selection studies until 1966 when Mayfield and Carlson published their research. Mayfield and Carlson concluded that factors unrelated to job performance
influenced significantly selection decisions made by employers. Coupled with the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the extant legal climate of the United States, researchers and employers alike began to investigate predictors related to successful job performance and to establish job related selection procedures.

Understanding factors influencing selection decisions but unrelated to job performance was viewed as a method to improve the reliability and validity of the selection interview as a performance indicator. As explained by Young (1985), factors identified by microanalytic research could operate as suppressor variables that contribute to unwarranted variance. By removing unwarranted variance from the performance predictor, the validity of that performance predictor could be increased.

For the past two decades, research conducted in the area of selection has followed a microanalytic approach. From this approach, interviewer biases and interviewer confirming behaviors were found to exist at the pre-interview and interview phase of selection. Recent research supports consistently the conclusions of previous research, namely the selection process acts as an instrument of discrimination against protected class candidates (Arvey & Faley, 1992), a finding that continues to foster the investigation of variables interacting with protected class individuals and interview decision-making.

Teacher selection research has employed decisions made by school administrators as dependent variables at the screening and the interviewing
stage of selection while variables unrelated to teaching performance but hypothesized to influence selection decisions serve as independent variables. Results from this stream of research, have informed researchers and practitioners that decisions made at the screening stage of the selection process are quite different from decisions made at the interviewing stage of the selection process. Moreover, decisions made at the screening phase are influenced by applicant chronological age, focal positions, and absence or presence of a physical disability.

Recognition of the aforementioned selection biases is founded on research investigating decision making behaviors of practicing school administrators (Young, Jury & Reis, 1997; Young & Prince, 1999; Young, Rinehart & Baits, 1997; Young & Schmidt, 1988), professionals deemed by some state's controlling bodies as the only qualified organizational representative to perform teacher selection. It is quite probable that these same biases are evident in the decision-making behaviors of parents and teachers, the other members of site-based councils. Nevertheless, council member involvement in teacher selection typically includes screening applicants, interviewing, rank-ordering candidates after interviews, and making a candidate recommendation to the principal (Appalachia Educational Lab, 1992; Kannappel, et al, 1994; Lindle and Shrock, 1993).
Advocates of shared governance justify teacher and parent involvement in decision-making because teachers are regarded as professionals with technical schooling expertise and parents are regarded as stakeholders with knowledge about rearing school-aged children. Within the present selection context, it is important to recall previous research conclusions that the (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Barr & Hitt, 1986; Gordon, Slade, & Schmitt, 1986; Harris, 1988; Ployhart & Ryan, 1998; Powell, 1991) hire decisions of professional and non-professional evaluators concerning the same applicants were entirely different. Considering the legal requirements of employment selection outlined in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and the 1978 Uniform Guidelines and considering past litigation concerning the elevated authority of site-based members, inclusion of parents and teachers as non-administrative professionals (educational) may reveal the precarious nature of such representation.

Because of legal and practical implications associated with educational administrative professionals and non-administrative educational professionals making selection decisions, the present study was conducted to examine if differences existed between organizational representatives and their evaluative ratings of a hypothetical candidate. Independent variables that were studied included organizational representative role, district performance, and status as a site based reform state. Dependent variables consisted of a composite score
obtained from the organizational representative’s ratings of the candidate presented on the resume and the probability that the evaluator would offer the hypothetical candidate an interview for a teaching position.

Findings/Analysis

Null hypotheses subjected to statistical tests in this study were as follows:
(a) candidate ratings provided by parents, teachers, and administrators will not differ according to organizational role of the representative; (b) candidate ratings provided by participants will not differ according to the existence of a state mandate for site-based decision making; (c) candidate ratings provided by participants will not vary according to school district performance, and (d) candidate ratings provided by participants will not differ according to any specific combination of site-based decision making state, organizational representative role, and school district performance. Results of the multivariate analysis of variance indicated the acceptance of six null hypotheses and the rejection of one null hypothesis.

Specifically, the following nulls were not rejected: a main effect associated with site-based decision making reform state status; a main effect associated with district performance; an interaction effect associated with organizational representative by reform state status; an interaction effect associated with reform state status by district performance; an interaction effect associated with organizational representative by district performance, and an interaction effect
associated with organizational representative by reform state status by district performance. The null hypothesis rejected in this investigation was the main effect associated with organizational representative. Stated simply, the vector of scores containing both dependent variables, composite score and probability of an interview offer, was different from zero across organizational representative roles.

To investigate further this significant multivariate main effect, each dependent variable was tested using univariate analysis of variance. Significant univariate statistical results were found only for the main effect of organizational representative, \( p = .009 \), on the composite rating of the hypothetical candidate.

Post hoc analyses indicate that selection decisions made by teachers differ from selection decisions made by administrators and by parents. The mean composite rating the hypothetical candidate received by teachers was significantly higher than mean composite ratings the candidate received by parents and administrators.

Implications

Findings from this investigation have practical and theoretical implications. Practically speaking, the results of this study support the supposition that some organizational representatives by virtue of role, contribute differing viewpoints to teacher selection decisions. Theoretically speaking, one might surmise that based on role and role set, participants in the screening phase
of the selection process may possess different role expectations for teacher candidates and may subsequently use different amounts and types of criteria (Barr & Hitt, 1986) in evaluating candidates for teaching positions.

Specifically, Barr & Hitt noted differences between professional and non-professional decision makers as non-professionals used more information than professionals to process information about potential job candidates. Additionally, while processing information about these same potential job candidates, professionals and non-professionals employed only six of thirty-two common criteria. These findings suggested that professionals and non-professionals used different amounts of information and different types of criteria to process information during the selection process.

Use of varying types and varying amounts of information by organizational representatives, may explain further the screening decision differences between parents, teachers, and administrators. As stated previously, teacher decisions differed significantly from those of parents and administrators, partially supporting the findings of Barr & Hitt. However, unexplained by the differences in professional and non-professional selection decisions is this study’s finding that parents (non-administrative professionals) and administrators (administrative professionals) evaluated candidates similarly.

The theory of social comparison may explain teacher differences in candidate evaluations. Leon Festinger (1954) described the theory of social
comparison as an individual's drive to obtain an accurate appraisal of one's own ability. According to Deutsch and Krauss (1965), Festinger assumed a superiority of objective information for appraisal purposes because objective, nonsocial means of evaluation are, in Festinger's opinion, more accurate and less easily influenced (p. 62).

However, when objective measures of appraisal are unavailable, people evaluate their abilities by comparisons with abilities of others. The drive to evaluate one's abilities may lead to behavioral change because making a behavioral change may position an individual closer to the abilities of others who are available for comparison. Festinger proposed that individuals manipulate behavior to reduce dissimilarity between themselves and others by changing individual behavior to become more similar to the others, by changing the behavior of the others to become more similar to oneself, or by changing the source of the referent other. One specific manner in which an individual may act to reduce dissimilarity is to avoid situations in which others are dissimilar (Deutsch & Krauss, 1965, p. 63).

When evaluating a candidate for a teaching position, teachers may compare abilities of a candidate to abilities of self. Teachers focus on information within the candidate's resume that suggests similarity or dissimilarity to
themselves. Conversely, administrators and parents who do not work as teachers and who use individuals from their respective roles for social comparison, may evaluate the candidate using an entirely different set of criteria.

Interestingly, in each treatment condition teachers rated the hypothetical candidate higher than parents and administrators on the composite rating. Positive teacher ratings of job candidates may portray teachers as risk takers or risk avoiders in their decision-making. One implication of teachers evaluating candidates more positively on composite ratings than parents and administrators, is the political conflict that could ensue should parents and administrators decide to deny an offer to interview a candidate based on composite ratings, while teachers appraised the candidate with high composite ratings and desired to offer the candidate an interview.

Realistically, school leaders who involve teachers in teacher selection decisions must recognize the possibility of differing professional evaluations and respect the circumstances of varying role expectations. Because site-based management is implemented to capitalize on site-based participant expertise and is implemented to improve decision quality (Malen, Ogawa & Kranz, 1990), participants must address the possibility of administrative professional and non-administrative professional differences within the context of screening decisions and must articulate an approach that will be adopted to handle such differences.
Otherwise, teacher participation in the selection process may be trivialized as a superficial method of collecting teacher input thus negating the benefit of their participation.

Finally, the results of this study demonstrate a need to explore further the interaction between changes in school structure and school culture. Using organizational representatives to administer tasks mandated by site-based structural reform efforts, begs educational leaders to reconcile matters of site-based participation with the district's policy paradigm. Various organizational representatives contribute, by virtue of role, differing viewpoints with regard to teacher selection decisions. Using diverse viewpoints to change the culture of the school while working within the boundaries of structural reform is a goal towards dynamic and substantive educational reform.

Future Research Suggestions

The present study takes an initial step toward investigating the screening decisions of parents, teachers and administrators from high achieving and low achieving school districts in site-based reform and non-reform states. Previous research (Marks & Louis, p. 267, 1997) regarding empowerment and participatory decision-making indicated that not all forms of empowerment affect equally teachers and classrooms. For this reason, examination of teacher selection decisions rendered by organizational representatives serving on shared governance councils that are tied directly to curriculum and instruction reform
instead of those focused entirely on decentralized budgeting and personnel, may provide further insight into the use of organizational representatives in selection decisions and its influence on student achievement.

Secondly, it is essential to assess applicant reaction to a selection evaluation conducted by parents, teachers and administrators. A systematic investigation of applicant reaction to organizational representatives participating in teacher selection decisions at the screening or interviewing phase of the process, may inform educators about the reaction to the participative nature of the process. Researchers need to determine if representatives participating in selection decisions serve as a conveyance of fairness or as a producer of an unnecessarily stressful environment for job candidates.

Thirdly, studies that investigate role expectations of the representatives comprising site-based councils are necessary. This is especially true because site-based councils serve as vehicles that link organizational members and organizational nonmembers together. As leaders of open systems that maintain by an input – transform – output process, school administrators need to be cognizant of parent, teacher and administrator role expectations for teachers.

Finally, this investigation focused mainly on selection decisions as person-job fit. Person-job fit was controlled in this study, however, both person-job fit and person-organization fit could have been in operation. Given this age of
accountability and new role demands of teachers (i.e., professional collaborator, team worker, instructional developer, community liaison), research needs to be conducted to vary person-organization fit.

Education systems are held accountable for their organizational performance and the nature of teaching is changing to meet such demands.

Limitations

This study, like all others, has limitations. Elementary parents, teachers and administrators were selected as target groups for this study to offset any possibility of confounding secondary school disciplines with marketability and for controlling of supply and demand for particular teaching positions. Therefore, results of this study should not be generalized to any level other than the elementary level of instruction.

The hypothetical nature of the candidate is an additional limitation to the study. Organizational representatives evaluating the candidate knew the candidate was not real and knew the candidate was not applying for an actual position. Because of the simulated selection experience, evaluators may have responded differently to the hypothetical candidate's resume than to an actual candidate (Ployhart & Ryan, 1998).
Study design should be viewed as a limitation. Organizational representatives evaluated only a single hypothetical candidate. Generally, in an actual screening situation, resume evaluation would be sequential, which may produce different candidate perceptions (Jury, 1993).

Finally, parent non-response in the non site-based reform state serves as a caution against generalizing these results beyond those who participated. While a Chi-Square calculation demonstrated no significant treatment by response interaction, parent responses from Ohio schools must be generalized with caution. Those parents who did not elect to participate, but were given the opportunity, may have refused simply to participate in the study or may have refused to participate because of their discomfort being placed even hypothetically, in a role of teacher selection.

Conclusion

Extant demands of school reform and shared governance structures created the need to study the selection decisions made by a school district’s organizational representatives and the need to examine the function role theory may assume in explaining screening decisions. Addressing selection decisions of organizational stakeholders and examining the notion of role theory in selection research contributes to a microanalytic perspective. Resumes constitute a test under EEOC Uniform Guidelines (1978) and understanding the influence an evaluator’s role plays on a screening decision using this predictor is crucial.
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Decisions at the screening phase must be examined to identify discriminatory biases and to identify factors unrelated to job performance but nonetheless, influencing selection decisions. The screening phase of selection is particularly important because it delimits the applicant pool and has a demonstrated influence on interview decisions (Dipboye, 1992).

Screening decisions influenced by the role expectations of an organizational representative may give rise to legal action, applicant perception of unfairness, and a less than optimal selection decision. As parents and teachers acquire greater authority in administrative decision-making, it is imperative that educational leaders understand how each stakeholder performs a respective role and understand how role expectations ground performance. Uninformed parent and teacher involvement in school decision-making will prohibit educational organizations from utilizing parents and teachers as effective differentiated assets and will ultimately hamper a school district’s ability to realize the universal performance goal, increased student achievement.
APPENDIX A

Cover Letters Sent to Participants
Kimberley Miller-Smith  
300 Washington Street  
Canal Winchester, OH 43110  
December 1, 2001

Participant Name  
Inside Address

Dear Colleague:

I am requesting your assistance with an independently funded research project. As a practicing educator, I am interested in the selection of teachers. To explore this important topic, I have initiated a project without the aid of any funding. Consequently, your help will advance current knowledge about a most important aspect of the education of students. I assure you that completing the requested information for this study will not take much time.

Enclosed you will find a resume, a candidate evaluation form, an evaluator information form, and an addressed-stamped envelope. Please read the supporting documents, and based upon their content, evaluate the hypothetical candidate as if you were selecting applicants for a position in your school. Return the candidate evaluation form and the evaluator information form in the stamped envelope provided. Please complete every question on the candidate evaluation form and understand that the candidate is not real. Further, your responses will be confidential. If you would like a copy of the results of this study, please write your mailing address on the post card provided. I thank you in advance for your assistance and willingness to provide input into this investigation.

Sincerely,

Kimberley Miller-Smith
Dear Colleague:

Hello. Several weeks ago I sent some information to you about a teacher selection study. As of yet, I have not received your response. I need your help to complete the data collection process of this independently funded research project. Completing the requested information will not take much time and interviewing or screening experience is NOT necessary.

Enclosed you will find a resume, a candidate evaluation form, an evaluator information form, and an addressed-stamped envelope. Please read the resume, and based upon its content, evaluate the hypothetical candidate as if you were selecting applicants for an interview with your school. Return the candidate evaluation form and the evaluator information form in the stamped envelope provided. *Please complete every question on the candidate evaluation form and understand that the candidate is not real.* Further, your responses will be confidential.

If you have any questions or concerns, you can email me at miller-smith.1@osu.edu. I thank you in advance for your willingness to participate in this investigation.

Sincerely,

Kimberley Miller-Smith
Dear Colleague:

Hello. Several weeks ago, I sent some information to you about a teacher selection study. As of yet, I have not received your response. I need your help to complete the data collection process of this independently funded research project. Completing the requested information will not take much time and interviewing or screening experience is NOT necessary.

If you have any questions or concerns or if you need another packet mailed to you, please contact me at (614) 833-2157 or email me at miller-smith.1@osu.edu. Thank you for your assistance.

Kimberley Miller-Smith
APPENDIX B

Candidate Resume
P.J. Williams

Objective
To obtain an elementary teaching position and to foster the academic and social growth of primary age children.

Education
B.S., Elementary Education
State University
Lake, State

Professional experience
Springfield School District
Second Grade Teacher
- Teacher in self-contained classroom
- Proficient in Math Their Way, Whole Language Instruction, Computer Skills, and Behavior Reinforcement

Johnstown Public Schools
Student Teaching – Third Grade
- Coordinated all aspects of the academic curriculum
- Planned and taught thematic units on creative writing, reptiles, and the use of computers
- Reinforced learning activities for special education students

Extracurricular activities
Organized children's theater workshop
"Just Say No" club sponsor
PTA Building Representative

Certification
Elementary (K-8) Certificate

Professional memberships
Association for Childhood Education
National Association for the Education of Young Children

Community activities
Parks and Recreation Volunteer – Supervisor of Summer Programming

Future Ambitions
To become a recognized professional—this will allow for involvement with curriculum development, educational policy, and school improvement.

REFERENCES AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST
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APPENDIX C

Candidate Evaluation Form
CANDIDATE EVALUATION

After reviewing the candidate resume, please rate this candidate by checking the appropriate measure as if you were screening resumes to fill a position in your school.

A. Candidate’s knowledge of the curricular area.
   □ Poor □ Fair □ Good □ Excellent

B. Candidate’s ability to transmit knowledge.
   □ Poor □ Fair □ Good □ Excellent

C. Candidate’s likelihood to contribute to overall school environment.
   □ Poor □ Fair □ Good □ Excellent

D. Candidate’s ability to maintain a disciplined teaching environment.
   □ Poor □ Fair □ Good □ Excellent

E. Candidate’s ability to create a friendly classroom environment.
   □ Poor □ Fair □ Good □ Excellent

F. Candidate’s potential for professional growth.
   □ Poor □ Fair □ Good □ Excellent

G. The chances of this candidate being interviewed are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Biographical Questionnaire
INFORMATION ABOUT THE EVALUATOR

Please answer every question.

1. Have you ever participated in screening resumes at your school?
   □ Yes    □ No

2. If you answered "Yes" to question #1, have you participated in screening
   □ Teachers    □ Administrators    □ Both

3. Number of times you have served on a screening committee ____________

4. How many years of experience do you have in your current role?__________

5. Date of Birth: __________________________________________________________________

6. Does your school district use resumes to screen applicants for interviews?
   □ Yes    □ No

7. Gender of evaluator:
   □ Male    □ Female

8. Race of evaluator:
   □ Caucasian    □ Black    □ Hispanic    □ Asian    □ Other

9. Type of school district:
   □ Rural    □ Suburban    □ Urban
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