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ABSTRACT

This study examined the resume selection process for special education administrators in the State of Washington. The purpose of this study was to increase understanding of the variables of age, gender and the type of professional preparation in the selection process of Special Education Administrator in the state of Washington. Specifically, the resume study compared Chief Hiring Officer's or Superintendents, evaluations of 29-year-old candidates and 49-year-old candidates. It compared the males versus females. The study also compared the type of professional preparation, specifically a special education teacher versus a school psychologist.
Seven null hypotheses were developed to test the effects of age, gender, and the type of professional preparation, and the interaction of these variables, in the screening of potential special education administrator candidates. The data obtained in this study were subjected to a 3 way ANOVA. The resulting F statistic was not significant at the 0.05 level and the null hypotheses could not be rejected.

The study also obtained information on the incumbent. Information regarding the current status of the position as implemented in the state of Washington is presented. The relationship between the resume selection study and the incumbent study are examined and discussed in terms of representativeness.
Employee selection is of critical importance in the field of education. There are few fields other than education where an individual can have such a great impact on the lives and futures of so many human beings. For this reason great care should be taken in the selection of those individuals who will teach, and those who will administer education programs.

Bolton (1969) described teacher selection decisions as among the most important decisions made by educational administrators. Yet, in the same article, he described these decisions as frequently being intuitive and arbitrary. If it is possible to generalize from his study, not only is the selection of a teacher an important decision to be made by an administrator, but the actual selection of an administrator can be of equal or greater importance.
There are many qualified, competent candidates for almost any position in education and there is little excuse for hiring incompetents. Clearly, research which can lend insight into the hiring of quality educational personnel has an implication for improving the quality of education.

The areas of special education administration and supervision have grown rapidly since the inception of Public Law 94-142 (The Education of All Handicapped Children Act - EHA, 1975). This landmark federal law has made it essential that special education administrative personnel take on a more extensive role in working with handicapped students and the staff who assist them.

For the purposes of this study, exceptional students are the handicapped as identified within EHA and as defined by the laws of the various states and territories. In addition, the positions of Special Education Administrator, Special Education Director and Special Education Supervisor are considered to be essentially synonymous, since personnel who function in these capacities assume such similar functions as budgeting, finance, supervising staff, and developing placement guidelines for eligible children. All of these, and more, are administrative in nature.
A summary review of the literature regarding special education administration and supervision

One of the first courses in special education administration was offered at Teacher's College, Columbia University, around 1906-1907 (Connor, 1963). According to Connor, most administrative services for special education were conducted by regular education administrators. Ayer and Barr (1928) reported on the employment of special education administrators and found at the time 16 major cities employed 29 supervisors and 6 directors. Specific and detailed information about the field from 1930 to 1950 does not appear to exist.

By the 1950's some movement towards the development of training programs for special education administrators was beginning. Cain (1953) reported that supervision of teaching in special education was becoming of interest to educators. Cain noted that new research in the areas of special education, such as administration, supervision and teaching was being noticed, however he could find nothing in the literature that was specifically related to the preparation or selection of special education administrators.

In a study of graduate training in special education, Gallagher (1959) found four areas of concentration beyond that of basic courses:

(1) a knowledge of skills and the supervision of elementary and secondary schools,
(2) an understanding of the practice of American educational administration
(3) legal bases of school administration, and
(4) school finance and business management.

Gallagher (1959), in his study, was unable to find any coursework that had specificity to special education administration. It could be concluded that the concept of "faculty psychology" prevailed, that is, if one was trained in the generic area of school administration one should have the skills to deal with any area of education administration, without specific training in the specialty area. A review of the literature indicates that the role is atheoretical (Connor, 1963). Preparation programs for the position exist, but lack uniformity of instruction (Connor, 1966; Jones & Wilkerson, 1975; Karagianis & Nesbit, 1980; Nevin, 1979).

If there was ever a position that is ill defined and contradictory, the position of Special Education Administrator raises the concept to new levels of obscurity. The literature suggest that the individual who is practicing in the field should possess:

• an Ed. D. (Connor, 1966), or
• simply a Ph. D. (Marro & Kohl, 1977), or
• simply a M. A. (Forgnone & Collings, 1975; Stile, Abernathy & Pettibone, 1986), or
• be a general education administrator with some special education inservice experience (Prillaman & Richardson, 1985).

Prillaman and Richardson (1985) reported in their review of state certification requirements that the Special Education Administrator should:

• hold no specialized certification (4 states and the District of Columbia); or
• hold only a general education administration certificate (20 states); or
• hold Special Education Administration Certification (26 states).
Stile, Abernathy & Pettibone (1986) report in their review of the state certification conditions that, depending on the state, the Special Education Administrator should have:

- only a general administration credential and authorization in special education (also depending on the state, it may not be required to have special education course work to hold the authorization), or
- have special education course work required for the general administration credential, or
- have a separate Special Education Administrator Credential, or
- have formal training leading to a special education degree, or
- have course work in special education.

No state required a specialized degree in Special Education Administration at either the Master's or Doctoral Level. With reference to experience, the person filling the position should have:

- a minimum of three years teaching experience (Forgone & Collings, 1975), or
- certification as a teacher in special education (Forgone & Collings, 1975), or
- a minimum of three years experience teaching and/or supervisory experience (Forgone & Collings, 1975), or
- be a school psychologist (Marro & Kohl, 1972), or
- be a teacher of the mentally retarded (Marro & Kohl, 1972), or
- be a principal (Marro & Kohl, 1972), or
- hold some other public school teaching position (Marro & Kohl, 1972).

Additionally, the person filling the position:

- should view the position within the local district as their final educational goal (Marro & Kohl, 1972), or
- they should view a position in special education at the state level as their final educational goal (Newman, 1970), or
- they should view a position as a District Superintendent as their final educational goal (Marro & Kohl, 1972), or
- they should view a position in special education in a college or university as their final educational attainment (Marro & Kohl, 1972).
For those individuals involved in the actual selection of the Special Education Administrator, the literature is as "clear as mud," because the person to be hired to fill the Director position should:

- definitely be a specialist (Connor, 1963; Cline, 1981; Howe, 1981), or
- definitely be a generalist (Podensky, Price, Smith & Marsh II, 1984).

The literature is limited with respect to defining the nature of the status, influence and direct participation in policy and budget determination the Special Education Administrator should be afforded. Further there is no available literature regarding the nature, and the importance of the relationship to central administration and the school board.

The literature provides little information on salary comparison for Special Education Administrators. A study by the National Education Association (1970) indicated that the salary of the special education administrator was less than that of an elementary and secondary principal.

When filling the position, the title given can be:

- Director of Special Education, or
- Coordinator of Special Education, or
- Director of Pupil Services, or
- Director of Pupil Personnel Services, or
- Director of Special Services, or
- Assistant Superintendent for Special Education Services, or
- any of several other titles (Marro & Kohl, 1972).

No matter the title, within any public school environment the individual placed in the director position will be required to function in some role. There is a body of literature that exists, regarding the director position,
that can best be summarized, from a qualitative study available on the
director position, in the following way:

The special education supervisor experiences even greater role
conflict. In addition to lacking a clear role description and line
authority, the special education supervisor, '...maintains an
uncertain relationship with general education.' (Hebert &
Miller, 1985)

From the preceding it is evident that in the nearly 100 years of the
existence of Special Education Director position there is not a clear under­
standing of who should fill the role, what the qualifications are, what the role
is, or even what it should be. Yet across the United States, the position is
clearly in place in every state, is offered to candidates, and it is filled.
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL FOUNDATION OF THE STUDY

Most school Districts in the United States use an employee selection process which includes five factors:

1. an application form;
2. a resume;
3. credential information (including transcripts, proof of certification, and other factual information);
4. professional references; and
5. an interview.

An examination of the research addressing the validity of these five factors for predicting future job success provides some discouraging findings. As an example, the application and resume provide biographical data (or "biodata") about the candidate. If this information is organized in a consistent manner, it has been shown to have some predictive validity.

Ashner (1972) noted, with respect to these data, that when compared with other predictors such as intelligence, aptitude, interests, and personality, biographical items have a superior validity in predicting job success.

A review of the literature by Owens (1976) revealed that the average predictive validities for biodata to be $r=.35$ for sales success, $r=.48$ for clerical performance, and $r=.48$ for creativity indices. Reilly and Chao (1982) reviewed
58 studies and found $r = .35$ to be the mean validity values on all criteria across the occupations reviewed.

Davis (1984) examined student groupings done on the basis of biodata. Seven years before the Davis study students had been statistically grouped after completing a standardized biodata form. Davis found that seven years later the groups were significantly different from one another on 12 factors of post-college behavior. These factors included such areas as job satisfaction, transition from college, personal adjustment and marital adjustment.

In addition to biodata, transcripts are used to screen applicants. Calhoon and Reddy (1968) reviewed 15 studies addressing the predictive validity of college performance for future occupational success. Of these studies four showed some correlation (around the $r = .30$ level), four showed slight correlation (around the $r = .10$ level) and seven showed "...no correlation." The authors concluded that it might be time to discontinue efforts seeking connections between college performance and later career success. A recent study of the literature (Reilly & Chao, 1982) reached the same conclusion.

Similarly, reference letters or reference rating forms have been found to have poor predictive validity as screening devices in employee selection. Reilly and Chao (1982) averaged ten validity coefficients and obtained a mean predictive validity of $r = .14$ for the studies that they reviewed. A literature review by Muchinsky (1979) noted that reference reports were characterized by low interrater reliability and low criterion-related validity. He concluded that
reference letters or reference forms were not particularly valuable as selection devices. McIntyre (1974) reached the same conclusion. In the same manner, research on a scaled reference form showed it to have little consistency as a screening device for employee selection (McIntyre, 1974; Reilly and Chao, 1982).

The interview is by far the most widely used method in personnel selection (Arvey, 1979). However, as early as 1949 literature reviews addressing the interview have indicated that it has poor predictive validity regarding future employee performance (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Mayfield, 1964; McIntyre, 1974; Wagner, 1949; Wright, 1969). Research on the interview and its lack of predictive validity has resulted in researchers examining the methodology of interview research.

**Methodologies of employee selection research**

Research examining the validity of the selection interview was termed by Webster (1964) as the Macroanalytic Approach. According to the "macro" approach, for instance, records of employees interviewed were scored by the interviewers. Later, ratings of employees' job performances were made, and a correlation of these two data sources were made. As noted earlier, the correlations were quite low in most instances.

Webster (1964) and Mayfield and Carlson (1966) criticized the macro approach as being too global. They suggested that elements in the decision
making process for employee selection can be broken into separate components. Each of these components could then be explored in isolation. This approach was called the Microanalytic Approach.

Using the microanalytic approach, factors which might contribute to errors in decision making can be examined. The ultimate goal is that of developing employee selection procedures with high predictive validity, these being achieved when error producing factors are identified, eliminated or controlled. To identify these factors several different experimental procedures have been used.

Microanalytic research has usually followed one of three approaches: (1) field studies; (2) role playing; and (3) resume studies. Field studies, such as those done in assessment centers by the Bell System (Bray & Grant, 1966), are conducted in the actual employment setting. The advantage of field studies is that they are conducted under real conditions. The disadvantage of field studies is that they have little experimental control and thus may have results which are contaminated by confounding or "nuisance" variables. As a result, they may have reduced internal validity and greater external.

Typically, role playing involves subjects playing the role of interviewer or interviewee within an artificial setting. Young (1983) used this technique to compare decision making in interviews conducted by a panel of interviewers as compared to those done by individual interviewers. The advantage of this approach is that the researcher can control and manipulate
variables in an organized fashion. The disadvantage is that the results may have low generalizability due to the clinical nature of the setting. In contrast to field studies, these may have greater internal validity and reduced external validity.

Resume studies, such as those done by Bredeson (1981), Young & Allison (1982), and Voss (1983), are conducted by sending the resume of a hypothetical candidate to a random sample of practicing administrators for evaluation. The resumes are identical except for the factors that are being manipulated. The advantages of this method are that it is relatively inexpensive, easy to implement, and easy to control experimentally. The disadvantage of this method is that it is a "clinical procedure", and the results could have low generalizability.

Voss (1983) suggested that significant differences in school administrators' ratings of hypothetical candidates might be due to inferences which the raters were making about the candidate. If Voss was correct in his suggestion, then such inferences could be made about almost any factors which might be included on resumes. An area of social psychology called "Attribution Theory" attempts to analyze and explain such inferences and how these inferences are made.
**Attribution theory**

Attribution theory was developed through the investigations of Fritz Heider (1958) seeking to determine how people develop a perception of other people given several facts or behaviors, and have been labeled Attribution Research. Krech, Livson, Wilson and Parducci (1981) defined a theory of attribution as follows:

A theory of person perception that involves how people use and misuse information about behavior to make inferences about the cause, personal or environmental, of that behavior.

Heider's research dealt with "...surface matter, the events that occur in everyday life on a conscious level" (p.15). He claimed attribution is an activity in which everyone participates, with some being more sensitive and skilled than others. He labeled this approach as "common sense" or "naive psychology":

To sum up: According to naive psychology people have an awareness of their surroundings and the events in it (the life space), they attain this awareness through perception and other processes, they cause changes in the environment, they are able to (can) and try to cause these changes, They have wishes (want) and sentiments, they stand in unit relations to other entities (belonging), and they are accountable according to certain standards (ought). All these characteristics determine what role the other person plays in our own life space and how we react to him (p.17).

Heider was in accord with Gestalt Psychology in believing that humans consistently attempt to order, organize and understand their environment.
Then a person uses this knowledge to predict events and hence gain control over the surroundings. Thus when someone perceives an event, that individual generally is not satisfied with a superficial registration of the stimulus. Instead, in an effort for a deeper understanding of the environment, the individual will typically try to attribute the event to an underlying causation.

Human beings who are skilled (either intuitively or by practice) in making accurate attributions for events in their lives are able to understand and predict the actions of others in their environment. This enables them to make good decisions, anticipating or reacting to other people in their social situation (Fishbein & Azjen, 1975).

Heider summarized attribution theory as a composite of four steps:

1. the true causal process;
2. the perceptual process;
3. the attribution process, and;
4. the consequences of attribution.

In the true causal process every behavior is made up of four aspects. The first, termed "dispositional properties," is the unchanging underlying conditions of the world. The laws of nature such as the attraction of opposite sexes would be an example of dispositional properties. A second aspect is the person involved. Combined with these are personal intervening circumstances (or motives) and intervening circumstances (or motives) and environmental intervening circumstances caused by the social or natural environ-
ment surrounding this event. The outcome is an observable behavior, termed a "distal stimulus" by Heider.

For example a boy asks girl to go to a concert with him. The observed action may be caused by:

(1) the attraction between the sexes,
(2) the boy is an avid music fan,
(3) the boy had already seen all of the other attractions currently in the area,
(4) a famous group was in town.

The observed action was a culmination of these and other factors.

Second is the perceptual process. The distal stimulus (behavior) of step one is transmitted to the observer through a process called mediation. The mediation may be physical (light or sound waves) or mental (perception of word meanings or voice inflections). The mediated image is termed the proximal stimulus as it is received by the observer. The proximal stimulus is interpreted by the observer who then creates a mental image of the original behavior. The importance of this process is that what the observer has now is not the original behavior, but rather, the observer's image of that behavior, which has been modified by possible misperceptions.

The attribution process is the third step. It is in this step that the observer assigns "cause 'x' " as an explanation of "event 'y'." Heider stated that individuals have, "a mastery of the causal network of the environment," and that most people become skilled in making attributions at an early age.
Heider offered an example citing why people become skilled in attribution:

If I find sand on my desk, I shall want to find out the underlying reason for this circumstance. I make this inquiry not because of idle curiosity, but because only if I refer this relatively insignificant offshoot event to an underlying core event will I attain a stable environment and have the possibility of controlling it.

Lastly, one must consider the consequences of attribution. An obvious but important part of attribution theory is that the attributions that an observer makes significantly affect that observer's behavior. If a parent sees a child break a glass, the parent will react, but the reactions of the parent will be quite different depending on whether the parent attributes this action to an accident or to a deliberate act of the child.

Within Heider's work one of the principle themes that developed was the concept of internal attributions versus external attributions. Heider defined internal attributions as explanations of behavior based on the actor's dispositions and abilities, while he defined external attributions as explanations based on situational variables influencing the actor. Heider theorized that perceivers tend to make internal attributions more readily than external attributions.

Heider's initial work in attribution theory was empirically tested and expanded by Jones and Davis (1965) and Jones and McGillis (1976). Their studies investigated the conditions under which observers tend to make internal attributions versus external attributions evolved as the theory of
correspondent inferences. Research by Jones and his colleagues suggested that internal attributions and dispositional inferences are likely to be stronger when the actor's behavior is out of role, low in desirability, or somehow violates normative expectations (Jones, Davis & Gergen 1961; Jones and Harris, 1967).

Jones and McGillis' (1976) work further developed the previous research themes in their correspondence inference theory. These investigations introduced new concepts which described the way perceivers infer attitudes of actors based on their past experiences with similar individuals, or similar categories of persons. While the work of Jones and his colleagues presented a rational explanation of the causal inference process, little attention was paid to the non-rational needs, emotions, and motives of the perceiver which might influence the attributions.

A seemingly more sophisticated analysis of attribution theory was made by Kelley (1967). He relied on the principal of covariation between causes and effects in the attributional process. His research suggested that behavior was likely to be attributed to an actor's disposition if the behavior was low in distinctiveness (occurred in many settings or with many people), and low in consensus (was more unique to the individual than typical of other people in the same setting).

Another important concept introduced by Kelley was that of causal schemata. Kelley posited that knowledge from previous experiences regard-
ing causal relationships may be stored in such a way as to be quickly and readily called up to make attributions.

This store of knowledge was referred to as the causal schemata and could be stimulated by numerous types of cues. Consistent with Jones and his colleagues, Kelley paid more attention to the logical rational processes which might affect attribution than to the motives or emotions of the perceiver which could influence the attributional process. Consequently, the investigations of perceiver biases in the attribution process might best be approached by examining, from a cognitive-attributional perspective, research related to stereotyping theory.

**Stereotyping theory**

Historically stereotyping has been explained as an acculturation process. Hamilton (1979) cited a growing body of research in which stereotyping is explained as a result of normal cognitive processes. These cognitive processes tend to produce differential perceptions of groups and differential explanations of individuals based on group membership.

Essentially, stereotyping begins with a categorization process. While categorization aids the perceiver in simplifying highly complex stimuli, it can result in the perceiver distorting perceptions of actual behavior. A number of studies investigating the effect of "ingroup bias" or "favoritism" have been conducted. These studies revealed that individuals tend to contribute more
positive perceptions and attributions to a group to which they belong than to a group to which they do not belong. These perceptions and attributions tend to be based solely on group categorization than on actual information supplied (Doise et al., 1972; Howard & Rothbart, 1978).

The research of Wilder and Allen (1978) discovered that categorization is likely to influence what is consequently learned and reinforced about group members. Related studies suggested that categorization of individuals based on the salient social groupings can influence the processing and retention of information acquired about those individuals (Tajfel, Sheikh, & Gardner, 1964; Taylor, Fiske, Etcoff, & Ruderman, 1978). Research conducted by Wilder (1978) revealed that differential causal attributions of individual behavior resulted solely from group categorization.

While individuals may be categorized as members of many different groupings, research has suggested that perceivers are differentially attentive to certain stimuli. The power and distinctiveness of a stimulus cue seem to be critical factors affecting the categorization process (Langer, Taylor, Fiske and Chanowitz, 1976; Taylor, Fiske, Close, Anderson & Ruderman, 1977). Consequently, such readily identifiable characteristics as age and gender often provide stimulus cues on which a categorization is made.

Stereotyping is influenced by the attentiveness of observers to attributes which are correlated with specific group membership (e.g., elderly as feeble; women as passive, etc.). Although little research exists which inves-
tigates the way that these cognitive correlations develop, these processes have been suggested as a possible source of bias by some investigators (Chapman & Chapman, 1967; Jenkins and Ward, 1965). Given that the correlational process may be biased in terms of the perceiver's differential attention to specific attributes, the process is further complicated by differential retrieval of such information (Tversky & Kahneman, 1973).

While the research cited above suggests ways that cognitive biases may result in the formation of stereotypic conceptions, other research has explored ways that cognitive biases may result from stereotypic concept formation. These stereotypic conceptions occur in the attribution process. For instance, behavior which fulfills a stereotypic expectation will be attributed to the actor's internal dispositions or abilities, while behavior which contradicts the stereotypic expectation will be attributed to external or situational variables influencing the actor's behavior. Thus, stereotypes result in attributional bias which, in turn, further reinforces and maintains certain stereotypes (Deaux, 1976; Taylor & Jaggi, 1974).

Attributional bias can occur in the attribution process through the utilization of stereotypic schemas. Stereotypic schemas contribute to attributional bias through an individual's encoding of selective behavior or through an individual's selective retrieval of stored information about behavior (Cohen, 1977; Duncan, 1976). While most emphasis in attributional bias had been primarily on effects resulting from the encoding process (Duncan, 1976;
Zadney & Gerard, 1974), there is evidence to suggest that attribution bias also occurs in the retrieval process (Dutta, Kanungo, & Frinbergs, 1972; Kanungo & Dutta, 1966).

Research on stereotyping theory and personnel selection

Many of the cognitive-attributional processes involved in stereotyping have been investigated in the context of personnel selection studies. The McGill studies conducted by Webster (1959) and his colleagues indicated that interviewers develop stereotypes of the "ideal" candidate and seek to match the interviewee with that stereotype (Bolster & Springbett, 1961; Hakel, Holman, & Dunnette, 1970; Sydiaha, 1961). Mayfield and Carlson (1966) further revealed that interviewers possess a stereotype "common" to all interviewers as well as a "specific" stereotype unique to each interviewer. London and Hakel (1974) presented data suggesting that these stereotypes are diminished or altered as the evaluation of a candidate progresses.

Additional selection research has indicated that interviewers are differentially attentive to certain information in the selection process, and also differentially weight candidate information (Dobmeyer, 1970; Hollman, 1972; Rowe, 1963; Valenzi and Andrews, 1973).

Tucker and Row (1979) indicated that the decision to hire a candidate was based on the "...causal interpretations of past outcomes," implying the possible influence of the attribution of internal dispositions or abilities versus
external or situational variables. Attributional biases, as the result of stereotyping, clearly have implications for personnel selection decisions, especially with respect to candidate characteristics of age and gender.

Although there has been relatively little selection research conducted in the field of Education, a body of studies focuses on the effect of candidate age in teacher selection. One of the studies dealt with the effects of candidate age (29 or 49 years old); candidate teaching experience (0, 3, or 8 years); and the position of the evaluating administrator (high school principal or superintendent) on the ratings of teacher candidates (Young and Allison, 1982). This study, using the position of physical education teacher and the position of evaluating administrator, did not affect the candidate ratings. A significant effect was found for candidate age. The younger candidate received a higher rating than did the older candidate.

These age findings were consistent with the results of an earlier study done with industrial employers of semiskilled workers. Haefner (1976) found that employers preferred 25 year old candidates compared to 55 year old candidates for semiskilled positions. A similar set of results came from a study by Rosen and Jardee (1976).

In these studies, the data suggested that the preference for younger candidates could be influenced by the physical demand of the position used in the studies (physical education teacher and semi-skilled worker). Also, age may have become a more heavily weighted basis for selection in these studies.
due to the fact that there was very little other information supplied on which an evaluation might be made.

In response to these criticisms, a subsequent study (Voss, 1983) examined the effect of candidate age (29 or 49 years old), teaching position (physical education or chemistry), and amount of reference information supplied in the resume. Results of this study revealed two significant main effects, as well as an interaction effect. The younger candidate was rated higher than the older candidate, chemistry teachers were rated higher than physical education teachers, and as candidate age increased, the ratings of older physical education teacher candidates were more negatively affected than those of the other three teacher candidates.

A variety of explanations were offered regarding the interaction effect, one being that age is perceived to be a greater limitation in effectively performing the work of a physical education teacher than in performing the work of a chemistry teacher. Another explanation of this effect might be that chemistry teachers are more scarce, so that the enhanced demand for chemistry teachers over physical education teachers would have an inhibiting effect on age bias. The amount of information provided by the resume had no significant effect on the ratings of the candidates.

In analyzing the results of his study, Voss (1983) made several recommendations for further research. He stated that although the effect of age bias for physical education positions was clearly evident, the results were not as
obvious for chemistry positions, possibly due to reported teacher shortages in that academic area. Thus, he recommended that the effect of age bias be explored for other positions in the field of Education.

**Age discrimination**

There has been a substantial increase in the number of legal cases involving age discrimination in the employment setting. Foley, Klieman, and Lengnick-Hall (1984) indicated that the actual number of suits increased from approximately 5,000 in fiscal year 1979 to over 19,000 during fiscal year 1984. Furthermore, this increase is likely to continue because the workforce at large is "graying" and because litigation in general is increasing.

As McCarthy (1983) has stated:

> Unlike other characteristics that generate charges of discrimination, age is unique in that all individuals are subject to the aging process.

School Boards have not been exempted from suits involving age discrimination (e.g. EEOC v. Franklin School District, 1980; Marshall v. Board of Education of Salt Lake City, 1977). Individuals between the ages of 40 and 70 years of age are afforded protection from discrimination in the employment setting by the Federal Age Discrimination Act in Employment (ADEA). Any individual in the United States discriminated against in the employment setting because of their age is entitled to injunctive relief, offers of employment, and liquidated damages (McCarthy, 1983).
Research on age bias, in the employment process, as well as in all facets of the field of education, has received increasing attention in recent years. Eriksen (1990) examined academic counselors, in higher education, with regard to bias of a hypothetical older adult learner (age 60) to that of a younger adult student (age 25). Her research indicated, "clear evidence of the fact that two different ages are rated in totally dissimilar ways." The older student was perceived as more likely to be attending college to pursue personal interest rather than to change careers. The older student was perceived as only somewhat likely to complete the baccalaureate degree. In both instances the younger student was rated in the opposite direction.

The previously cited Young and Allison (1982) study provided a case for prima facie evidence for discrimination in an educational employment setting. Their finding that older candidates for a physical education position were evaluated significantly lower than younger candidates, even though candidates of both ages possessed identical qualifications, could provide ground for potential litigation. Because a high rating, in a relative sense, is necessary at the screening stage of the selection process for the candidate to be considered further, their findings suggest that the interview pool of applicants would contain a disproportionately low number of older candidates.

According to provisions set forth in ADEA, individuals between 40 and 70 years of age are provided protection from discrimination on the basis of age unless age has been proven to be a bona fide occupational qualification
(BFOQ) for the specific position under consideration. For age to qualify as a BFOQ, the employer must demonstrate a business necessity for excluding all individuals between 40 and 70 years of age.

Requirements for demonstrating a business necessity and proving chronological age a BFOQ have been difficult for employers to establish. A review of the litigated cases indicates that the courts have interpreted these requirements within a very narrow context (Heneman, Schwab, Fossum, & Dyer, 1982).

With the exception of School Bus Drivers (Sposato v. Ambock, 1982) chronological age has not been found to be a BFOQ for any other position in educational organizations. Candidates meeting the protected class requirements (40 years through 70 years of age) of the ADEA and applying for positions in educational organizations are afforded protection from discrimination on the basis of age.

To exercise the right afforded by the ADEA and to challenge employment decisions made by school districts, protected class candidates must show only prima facie evidence of age discrimination. Prima Facie evidence can be shown through either disparate treatment or disparate impact. The major difference between these two doctrines rests with the intentions of the employer.

For disparate treatment to be shown, either direct or indirect evidence of an employer's intention to discriminate on the basis of age is necessary.
Examples of direct and indirect evidence for disparate treatment provided by Foley, et al. (1984) were an employer's open admission of discrimination, or an employer's written policy advocating discrimination. Intentions are not required for disparate impact but "Only a showing of the differential consequences of employer actions is necessary" (Foley, et al. 1984).

The case for potential litigation based on prima facie evidence of age discrimination in educational settings is not as difficult as may be assumed, and is highlighted by a study conducted by Johnson (1976), Utilizing an open ended survey of principals and district administrators employed by public school districts in Ohio, the study found that 86% of the principals and 83% of the superintendents preferred teacher candidates in their 20's.

Disparate impact for the older teacher candidate has been suggested by the specific research cited earlier in this paper. This research has indicated that screening decisions made by public school administrators are biased by the chronological age of teacher candidates. Because screening decisions made at the resume stage of the selection process determine which candidates will receive further consideration for employment, results from these types of studies indicate that screening decisions have a disparate impact for certain teacher candidates.
Sex discrimination

Arvey (1979) reviewed 17 employment studies investigating the effects of applicants' sex in interview evaluations. These studies consistently showed that females were generally given lower evaluations than males when these candidates had identical or similar qualifications. Evidence supported the notion that females were given lower ratings for jobs typically "masculine" in nature, whereas males were given higher ratings for jobs typically "feminine in nature (Shaw, 1972; Cohen & Bunker, 1975; Cash, Gillen & Burns, 1977). Simas and McCarrey (1979) found that "high authoritarian" personnel officers of both sexes rated male applicants more favorably than female applicants.

Ferris and Gilmore (1977) found a significant tendency for male job applicants to be given higher favorable ratings than female applicants in simulated interview settings. When female applicants were chosen over male applicants they also observed that the interviewers recommended lower starting salaries for females.

McIntyre, Moberg, and Posner (1980) examined the pattern of responses made by organizations through the use of resumes mailed to employers in their sample. Resumes of minority (identified as black and/or female) and non-minority job candidates were sent to 458 companies. The data revealed that males were consistently given "preferential treatment."
In view of the sex role expectations that are fostered during the socialization process, these findings are probably not surprising (Mischel, 1966), however, they can be grounds for evidence of prima facie evidence of sex discrimination. At the time of the writing of this manuscript it should be fairly well known that Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 expressly forbid discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion national origin or sex.

In the years subsequent to the passage of the Act the majority of attention has focused on discrimination against racial minorities. However, increasing attention has been devoted to job sex discrimination. Although the employment picture for racial minorities, especially blacks, is still less than desirable, a comparison of employment trends provided in U.S. Department of Labor reports, indicates that the future appears less promising for females in managerial and professional positions.

In the absence of any evidence suggesting that sex-linked genetic factors are responsible for a small proportion of females in managerial and professional roles, other causes must be identified. It seems reasonable, on the basis of the prior research in this area, to propose that sex-role stereotypes may contribute to this underutilization of female resources.

The negative effects of sex role stereotyping have been specifically reported for decisions involving selection, promotion, development, and evaluation of employees (Rosen & Jerdee 1974a, 1974b; Shaw, 1972). In general these studies have demonstrated that females are evaluated as "less
suitable" than males for both managerial level positions and those described as demanding.

It appears, then, that the literature provides reasonable support for the contention that the job classification and/or type of work may be partially responsible for personnel decisions discriminating against women. This notion also seems to give more credence to the operation of sex-role stereotyping in personnel selection decisions particularly in reference to managerial positions.

Statement of the problem

After nearly a century of public school programs for exceptional children, there is still no single source of comprehensive information providing a rationale, structure and process for the Administration of Special Education programs. Colleges and Universities are potentially perplexed in preparing leadership personnel for the position as they lack a basic tool of such instruction- a complete textbook on the subject.

With the passage of EHA, we have witnessed an unprecedented growth of services, in the public schools, in all categories of exceptionality. Clearly, there must exist some rationales, structures and processes that explain the functions of the Special Education Administrator.

From the preceding, it should be evident that in the nearly 100 years that the position of Special Education Director has been in existence, that there is not a clear understanding as to who should fill the role, or for that
matter what the role is, or should be. Yet, across the United States, the positions are clearly in place, in every state; the positions are offered to potential Directors, and the positions are filled.

The literature cited provided information that the five factors used in employee selection provide meager findings germane to predicting future job success. Microanalytic and macroanalytic approaches have provided a wonderful testimony to research methodologies, and replenish the research journals, but fail to provide for the exigencies of school hiring officials.

The research questions to be reviewed can be stated in the following way: As the literature on the position of Special Education Administrator provides no guidelines or standards for the position, and as the literature also provides no reliable method of employee selection to predict job success, how does a local school district go about initially screening an individual for the position? More importantly, considering this ambiguous state, are there subtle factors, biases, or actual discriminatory practices with reference to the factors of age, gender, and professional credential during the resume selections that eliminate candidates?

The State of Washington is one of the states that does not currently require a special certification or training to fill the position, districts can fill the position as they please. The resume selection process for special education administrators in the State of Washington was examined in the study reported in this document.
Within the theoretical frame provided by Heider, there could exist attributions that are used in selection process. A portion of the study was performed to determine if the resume selection was made through a system of attributions. In many situations a selection process is in effect at the resume screening level. As a result of the perusal of resumes, negative first impressions and psychological or actual rejection of the candidate may occur prior to, instead of during, the actual job interview. The present study was undertaken to examine the basis of three primary factors, (age, gender and type of professional credential) on which the reviewers might discriminate among job candidate resumes in the screening evaluation phase of the selection process.

The major intent of the study was to attempt to determine what decisions were made, and provide data on how the position of Special Education Administrator is initially screened within the State of Washington.

**Hypotheses**

In this study the following null hypotheses were subjected to empirical analysis:

1. A 29 year-old candidate will be evaluated equally to a 49 year-old candidate.

2. A school psychologist will be evaluated equally to a special education teacher.
3. A male candidate will be evaluated equally to a female candidate.

4. The effect of age on candidate evaluation is not affected by the area of preparation of the candidate.

5. The effect of age on candidate evaluation is not affected by the gender of the candidate.

6. The effect of gender of the candidate is not affected by the area of preparation of the candidate.

7. There is no specific combination of age, area of preparation, and gender that affect candidate evaluation.

Limitations of the Study

The major limitation of the study was considered to be that it was only a simulation of the selection procedure. The validity of this simulation procedure was limited to the extent that it replicated the actual process. Therefore, any attempt to generalize beyond the specifics of the study should be made with caution.

The study was directed at chief hiring officers or superintendents. The resume screening of this administrative position may actually be performed by other personnel, singly or in concert. The extent to which the inclusion of other positions, or individuals, involved in the resume screening impact the actual selection was not studied.
All items on the resume were held constant with the exception of the three variables studied. Items usually included in resumes, such as detailed job experiences, grade point averages, extensive statements of future ambitions were limited or omitted so as not to confound the variables of the study (age, gender and type of professional credential).

To an uncertain degree, the actual length of the resume may in itself have been a limitation. Within the popular literature numerous texts are available that provide information about what to include, or not to include, in the resume. If the concept of attribution theory is a base for selection decisions, the brevity of the resume in this study may decrease the pool from which attributions can be formed and create dissonance. Further, the resulting resumes may seem less realistic to the reader than those of an actual job candidate.

Finally, as a microanalytic approach, the study is fraught with all of the complaints regarding generalization. The study, as it is confined to the Sate of Washington, may not be generalizable to other states. The study is confined to a single administrative position and may not be generalizable to other administrative positions. In a frenzied need for generalization capability, strict focus on specific details may, in itself, be attributed as a limitation by others.
CHAPTER III
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This chapter will include the research design and methodology employed in the study. Specific information is provided regarding the sample population selection; the instrumentation used; pilot testing of the instruments; and the statistical techniques that were used to analyze the data.

*Population and sample selection*

The target population of this study was those individuals identified as Chief Hiring Officers, which included district superintendents, from the 296 school districts in the State of Washington. The sources of names were the directories produced by The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) of Washington, The Washington Association of School Personnel Directors, and Washington Association of School Administrators. This was done to insure as representative a sample as possible and reduce the effect of potential survey sample mortality. The instruments were mailed to "The Chief Hiring Officer or Superintendent."
**Instrumentation**

Each Chief Hiring Officer or Superintendent (subject) in the study received five pieces of information as follows:

- a) a cover letter
- b) a "bogus" candidate resume'
- c) a position description
- d) an evaluation form, and
- e) a brief summary in which the subject was asked to provide information about himself and the incumbent Special Education Director.

The resume was manipulated according to an experimental 2x2x2 factorial design. The style and format of the resume followed a design implemented by Allison (1981). Allison did not wish confound, or obscure, the variables he manipulated in his study by providing a lengthy resume. He stated that the resume he implemented in his study, "was designed to review the major selection information in a brief, readable form."

The resumes were similar, varying only in the following criteria:

- a) ages were 29 or 49 years of age
- b) sex was male or female (based on name, John v. Jane)
- c) preparation (credentials) were in school psychology or special education teaching.

As the Program Administrator's credential is listed as preferred for the position, in documentation from the Washington OSPI, this was held constant in the bogus resume. The remainder of the resume information was identical.
Varying the resume over the three different criteria produced eight different resume' combinations as follows:

1) 29 years of age, male, school psychologist
2) 49 years of age, male, school psychologist
3) 29 years of age, female, school psychologist
4) 49 years of age, female, school psychologist
5) 29 years of age, male, special education teacher
6) 49 years of age, male, special education teacher
7) 29 years of age, female, special education teacher
8) 49 years of age, female, special education teacher

The 296 Chief Hiring Officers, or superintendents, in the sample each received one of the eight different candidate resumes to evaluate. Consequently, 37 Chief Hiring Officers, or superintendents received each different combination of variables. Each subject was sent a different resume' from that of the previous subject (subjects 1 and 9 receive the same resume', etc.). In this manner subjects across the state received different resumes.

To clarify the evaluation task, and to add an element of reality, each subject received a position description detailing the expectations that are held for the candidate. A brief survey asked information about the subject (administrative experience, background information, age, and sex, etc.) and the incumbent in the Director position (background information, age, and sex, etc). The same evaluation form was sent to all subjects in the study.
Each subject was asked to evaluate the subject across the following criteria:

a) ability to transmit knowledge  
b) contribution to the overall school program  
c) ability to create an effective working environment  
d) potential for professional growth  
e) planning ability  
f) organizing ability  
g) staffing ability  
h) program development ability  
i) coordinating ability  
j) reporting ability  
k) budgeting ability  
l) overall evaluation

The evaluation form was also varied by a numerical coding system, to allow easy sorting according to which of the eight resumes accompanied it.

*Pilot testing the instrument*

To insure that the research variables were correctly perceived by the subjects, and that extraneous variables and biases were controlled, the resume was piloted prior to being sent to the respondents. Fifty graduate level students in education, from the state of Washington, who were currently employed in the field of education and had some familiarity with the Special Education Director position, were presented with one of the eight resume' forms. They were asked to read the resume' as if they were screening a candidate prior to hiring. After several minutes they were asked to return the resume and answer several key elements of the resume' (age, sex, and area of training of the applicant) on an evaluation form. Two questions were also
asked about information not provided on the resume' (race of applicant and marital status) to determine if there was adequate discrimination of the manipulated variables in the resume' context.

Statistical analysis methodology of the study

The evaluation form listed twelve criteria for the candidate's resume'. Respondent's (subjects) were asked to evaluate the candidate as poor, fair, average, good, or excellent for each criterion. The ratings were recorded as 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 and a composite score was computed. The composite mean score served as the dependent variable of this study.

Each of the three independent variables, age, sex, and training were analyzed for main effects. Then, the interactions for all possible combinations of these variables were analyzed along the 2x2x2 factorial design. These data were then analyzed by a three way analysis of variance (ANOVA).
Results of the pilot study

To insure that the research variables were correctly perceived by the subjects, and that extraneous variables and biases were controlled, the resume was piloted prior to being sent to the respondents. Fifty graduate level students in education, from the state of Washington, who were currently employed in the field of education, and had some familiarity with the Special Education Director position, were presented with one of the eight resume' forms. They were asked to read the resume' as if they were screening a candidate prior to hiring.

After several minutes of reviewing the resume, they were asked to return the resume and answer several key elements of the resume' (age, sex, and area of training of the applicant) on an evaluation form. Two questions were also asked about information not provided on the resume' (race of applicant and marital status) to determine if there was adequate discrimination of the manipulated variables in the resume' context.
An analysis of the evaluation forms indicated that four of the five areas presented met with 100% recognition. In a post-administration discussion, it was discovered one individual responded to the question regarding race incorrectly. Upon analysis of the evaluation forms it was determined that one form was in fact marked incorrectly regarding race. The race of the individual was not provided on the selected resume, this resulted in a 98% correct recognition rate on this question.

In post-administration discussion, the individual responded, that on the resume presented, the candidate was white. On further probing, the individual responded that this determination was based on the colleges and universities the candidate attended. This response was perplexing as the universities and colleges, although in Washington state, were fictitious. It was determined this response, although confounding, did not impair the overall reliability of the resume.

**Demographic data**

The state of Washington is divided into nine regions or Educational Service Districts (ESD's). A computer database was created for mailing purposes, and for the recording of data from the study, an artifact of the database was the ability to maintain information on representativeness of returns by locale and district size.

The distribution of returns indicated that each ESD was adequately represented. A reasonable extrapolation, from district enrollments and locale,
was that returns adequately represented the rural, suburban and urban areas of the state. A balanced sample was indicated by an analysis of this demographic data. School sizes ranged from small to very large, and the community type represented a balance of rural, suburban, and urban.

Results of the resume study

Only those individuals, from the 296 school districts in the state of Washington, who responded to a research instrument addressed to the "Superintendent or Chief Hiring Officer" were included in the summary of this study. The study was conducted during the months of May through June 1990. After an initial mailing on May 1, a return of 37.83% was received by June 1. At that time a second packet of materials were sent to all non-respondents. On July 1, 1990, a total of 155 school districts returned the instruments through the mail. This represented a total return of 52.36% of the research instruments.

Of the 155 returned instruments, 20 were considered incomplete. Eight instruments were returned blank. Twelve were returned partially completed. Those sections that were completed were included in the analysis. Group sizes are noted in the summary or tabled data where appropriate to understanding.

Several respondents did not complete the resume evaluation portion of the study but provided information in other areas. Those who provided comment for the reason that they were unable to complete the resume
simulation stated that, "...they were from districts that were too small," or the service was the responsibility of a regional Educational Service District and therefore they could not engage in the simulation.

Upon elimination of non-respondents and incomplete returns, a total of 135 usable instruments was obtained for the resume portion of the study. This represented a 45.6% usable instrument return rate for the resume evaluation study.

Each Chief Hiring Officer, or superintendent, was asked to evaluate a hypothetical Special Education Administrator candidate on the basis of the following criteria:

a) ability to transmit knowledge
b) contribution to the overall school program
c) ability to create an effective working environment
d) potential for professional growth
e) planning ability
f) organizing ability
g) staffing ability
h) program development ability
i) coordinating ability
j) reporting ability
k) budgeting ability
l) overall evaluation

Each respondent was asked to rate the teacher candidate, on a one-to-five Likert type scale on each item.

The independent variables of the study were: age (29 or 49 years), gender (male or female), and type of professional preparation (school psychologist or special education teacher). The 2 x 2 x 2 design of the study
created eight different combinations of variables and the following resumes were generated:

Table 1. Resumes created for the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resume Type</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Type of Professional Preparation</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resume 1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>psychologist</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume 2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>psychologist</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume 3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>psychologist</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume 4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume 5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>psychologist</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume 6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume 7</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume 8</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The resumes were scored, totaled, and a mean score for the resume type was determined. Table 2 provides information on the resulting rank order of the resumes. Use of this rank order list, outside the bounds of this study, or as a statement of preference, should be done with caution, due to the low probability of the results (p<.3550).

Table 2. Rank order of the resumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Resume Type</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Type of Professional Preparation</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Resume 1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>psychologist</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30.15</td>
<td>14.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Resume 7</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Resume 2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>psychologist</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27.06</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Resume 5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>psychologist</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26.82</td>
<td>12.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Resume 6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>14.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Resume 4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.33</td>
<td>12.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Resume 8</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24.26</td>
<td>13.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Resume 3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>psychologist</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>10.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of the resume study

The data obtained in this study were subjected to a 3 way ANOVA as implemented through the General Linear Models Procedures [PROC GLM] contained in the Statistical Analysis System [SAS]. An alpha level of .05 was established as the critical value of rejecting the null hypotheses in all cases. As the frequency of ratings was uneven for the returned resumes, the data set was treated as being an unequal \( n \) setting. The resulting F statistic was \( F(7,127) = 1.12, \ p < 0.3550 \) and was not significant at the 0.05 level.

As there was a total of 12 items in the questionnaire, and each item had a maximum rating of 5 points, the maximum score each individual resume could have received was 60 points. Each item could have a minimum rating of one point and a minimum overall rating of 12 points. This procedure represents the existence of a ceiling, as well as a floor effect in the scores that each resume could receive.

As the data were not significant at the 0.05 level, it was suspected that the frequency distribution of the rating scores of each resume was not normally distributed. A lack of normal distribution violates a basic assumption for the valid use of the parametric test of ANOVA.

In order to investigate this basic assumption, an interval midpoint frequency distribution of each resume was charted. The interval midpoint frequency distribution for each graph deviated considerably from the "bell shaped curve" that would be expected in a normal distribution. Seven of the
plots exhibited either positive or negative skewness. This evidence of deviation from normal distribution required the use of a transformation to amend for skewness in the dependent variable.

A standard correction procedure of transforming the score variable into its reciprocal was applied. The reciprocal score was then treated as the dependent variable and subjected to another 3-way ANOVA. This correction procedure resulted in an F statistic of \( F(7,127) = 1.51, p < 0.1686 \) which was also not significant at the 0.05 level.

Based on the outcomes of both ANOVA's, the conclusion can be made that the model, as a whole, with all of its factor and interaction effects, does not account well for the variance of the dependent variable. If there exists any significant effect with reference to an individual factor, the significance can most likely be attributed to chance rather than an indication of a substantive effect.
Hypotheses conclusions

The following conclusions pertaining to the null hypotheses of interest in the present study can be stated:

Hypothesis 1. A 29 year-old candidate will be evaluated equally to a 49 year-old candidate.

An analysis of the data indicated that there was no age effect in the evaluation of the resumes. Therefore the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

Hypothesis 2. A school psychologist will be evaluated equally to a special education teacher.

The data indicate that there was no effect in the evaluation of the background training of individuals proposed in the resumes. The null hypothesis that a school psychologist candidate will be evaluated equally to a special education teacher candidate cannot be rejected.

Hypothesis 3. A male candidate will be evaluated equally to a female candidate.

An analysis of the data does not indicate a gender effect in the evaluation of the resumes. The null hypothesis that a male candidate will be evaluated equally to a female candidate cannot be rejected.

Hypothesis 4. The effect of age on candidate evaluation is not affected by the area of preparation of the candidate.

There was no interaction effect between age and professional preparation in the evaluation of the resumes. The null hypothesis that the effect of
age on candidate evaluation is not affected by the area of preparation of the
candidate cannot be rejected.

*Hypothesis 5. The effect of age on candidate evaluation is not affected by the gender of the candidate.*

There was no interaction effect between age and gender in the evaluation of the resumes. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected as the effect of the age of the candidates was not influenced by the gender of the candidate.

*Hypothesis 6. The effect of gender of the candidate is not affected by the area of preparation of the candidate.*

There was no interaction effect between the area of preparation of the candidate and the gender of the candidate in the evaluation of the resumes. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected as the effect of area of preparation is not influenced by the gender of the candidate.

*Hypothesis 7. There is no specific combination of age, area of preparation, and gender that affect candidate evaluation.*

There were no second order interaction effects between age, gender, and area of preparation in the evaluation of the resumes. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected regarding mutual influences among professional background, gender and age of the candidates.

As the data indicated that none of the sets of scores, associated with each resume, was normally distributed, and as there were unreturned
(missing) ratings in the data set, an additional non-parametric technique was implemented to further analyze the data.

In this method, the independent variable continued to refer to the individual resumes and the dependent variable continued to be the score associated with each resume. This arrangement readily lent itself to a one-way non-parametric layout, and a Kruskal-Wallis test was performed in SAS. The resulting chi square statistic was $X^2 = 8.7698$, $p<0.2696$. This result was also not significant at the 0.05 level. The results of this non-parametric methodology served to confirm the conclusion that the null hypotheses which served as the basis for this study cannot be rejected.

**Analysis of Respondent and Incumbent Data**

Resume research in education has been focused primarily in the area of teacher selection (Allison, 1981; Pounder, 1984; Voss, 1983; Wallich, 1984). In the reporting of these studies, there has been attention to the detail of the manipulation of variables contained in the resume, and the reporting of the results of the statistical analysis of the variables under question. In none of the reports was basic consideration paid to determining who was filling out the resume response form, or to gathering current information on the individuals who were currently filling the position under question.

If a charge of discrimination in the selection process is to be considered, by using the resume selection procedure as a model, it would seem a requirement to determine how well the model reflects the decisions made.
One method is to compare the resume selection model to existing decisions that have been made, using the incumbents in the position under investigation. In the current study, information on the respondents, as well as the incumbent, were collected and are reported for purposes of making these comparisons.

Results of the survey study - Respondent data

Position titles of the respondents

Table 4. Position titles of the respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Director</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Director</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant superintendent</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal/Special Education Director</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent/Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator of Special Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent/Special Education Director</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of title responses: 154

* One individual provided a personal name rather than a position title for a total of 155 returned forms

Gender of the respondents

Of the 146 individuals who provided information on their gender, 125 (85.62%) were identified as male and 21 (14.38%) as female.
Years of Administrative experience of the respondents

Chief Hiring Officers, or superintendents responding to the study reported between zero and 44 years of administrative experience with the mean being 14.87 years. A total of 15 respondents exhibited the mode, 15 years of administrative experience.

Ages of the respondents

The average age of the Chief Hiring Officers, or superintendents responding was 47.56 years. Ages ranged between 34 and 71 years. A total of 14 respondents were 48 years old, the mode.

Highest degree obtained by the respondents

Of the 144 individuals who provided information on personal educational attainment, the greatest number (55 respondents - 38.19%) reported their highest degree obtained as the Master of Arts.

Area of highest degree obtained by the respondents

Of the 130 individuals who provided information on the area of their highest degree, the greatest number (84 respondents - 64.61%) reported their area as the Education Administration.
Number of Special Education quarter credits obtained by respondents

Of the 144 individuals who provided information on the number of special education quarter credits they had completed, the greatest number (71 respondents - 49.3%) reported they had completed zero to five credits. A range of zero, to 235 quarter credits completed was obtained. Over three-fourths, a total of 111 (77.08%), of the respondents indicated less than 15 quarter credits completed in special education.

Number of actual selections of the director position made by the respondents

A question was asked regarding the number of selections of special education administrators the respondent had made. One hundred twenty-two respondents replied. A total of 42 respondents (34.42%) reported that they had made no selections. A total of 103 of the respondents (84.43%) had been involved in zero to three selections of the Director position in their careers. The range of selections made went from a low of none, to a high of 100 performed by one individual.

Response to a question regarding competence in selecting the director position

One hundred forty respondents replied to a question regarding their competence to make a selection of a special education administrator. Thirty-two (22.86%) indicated they felt incompetent to make this type of selection.
Response to a follow-up question asking for competencies acquired that make the respondent qualified to make a decision regarding the director position

Of the 108 individuals who responded that they were competent to make a decision regarding the Director decision, only 32 chose to respond to an inquiry regarding their qualifications. No individual responded that they had accumulated any specific coursework in personnel or personnel selection. Six individuals responded that they were formerly involved in special education either as teachers or as special education administrators. Most respondents to this question indicated that they acquired their skills on the job.

Fourteen individuals indicated that they had taken workshops in personnel selection. No information was provided on how extensive these workshops were, or on the specific content.

Results of a comparison of respondent/nonrespondent data

As a less than optimal return rate was obtained, the standard method of a follow-up of ten percent of the non-responding districts was performed (15 Chief Hiring Officers). Table 4 provides the results of the comparison. The survey of non-respondents was created from an alphabetical list and every fifth non-respondent was contacted by phone until the ten percent was obtained. On the factors selected for comparison, both groups were essentially
similar. The groups differed slightly in the average number of selections made. Competency in making the selection differed by approximately ten percent. The data indicates that, on the selected factors, both groups were essentially the same, and the preceding respondent data can be viewed as representative of Chief Hiring Officers in Washington state.

Table 4. Comparison of respondent/Non-Respondent data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondent data</th>
<th>Follow-up of Non-Respondents data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Years of Administrative Experience</strong></td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average age</strong></td>
<td>47.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Special Education Credits Completed Mode (0-5 quarter credits)</strong></td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Number of Special Education Director selections made</strong></td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competent to make a Selection of a Special Education Director</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of the resume study - Incumbent data

Gender of the incumbent

After a sorting process, eliminating cooperative programs, programs supervised by ESD's, and non-respondents, 96 responses remained for whom information could be analyzed. Of these individuals 63 were male (65.62%) and 33 were female (34.38%), a ratio of approximately 2:1.
Ages of incumbent

Table 5. Ages of incumbents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total respondents .......... 95
Average age .............. 44.68

The average age of the incumbent special education administrator in Washington State was 44.68 years. Ages ranged between 31 and 64 years. A total of 11 respondents were 40 years old, the mode.
**Degree held by Incumbent**

Table 6. Degree held by person responsible for Special Education Program administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.T.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total .................................. 97

**Area of highest degree held by Incumbent**

Table 7. Area of highest degree held by Incumbent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Personnel Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Children</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total .................................. 89
### Titles used for the position

Table 8. Titles used for the position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant for Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent for Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator of Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator of Special Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Special Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Federal Programs of Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Pupil Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Special Education</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Special Education and Special Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Special Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Special Services</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Student Services</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Student Support Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Coordinator/Director</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Director</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher/Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs Director</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Services Director</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor of Special Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor of Student Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Title</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total responses ............................................................................... 79

A prior study (Marro & Kohl, 1972) indicated there were less than a dozen titles used for the position nationwide. Within the state of Washington, of the 79 districts responding, it appears that there are at least 24 separate titles used, and 3 individuals operate without a title.
Administrative years of experience of incumbent

Table 9. Administrative years of experience of incumbent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YRS. EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses ................................ 96
Average years admin. experience . .8.78
1989-90 Average salary, and salary range

In reviewing salaries for this position, an attempt was made to eliminate all individuals whose primary function was other than that of Special Education Administrator (e.g., principals, superintendents, teachers, etc.). A total of 73 incumbent salaries was arrived at in this manner.

The minimum salary received was $26,000, the maximum was $67,000. The average salary received for the 1989-90 school year was $47,885, and one standard deviation was computed to be $9,950.11.

Assuming responsibility for other programs

Ninety-eight incumbents were identified as meeting criteria for this question. Only 25 (25.51%) assume responsibility for special education programs exclusively. Table 7 provides a duplicated count on the remaining 73, who in addition to special education programs, have responsibility for the other programs.

Several districts volunteered information not specifically asked for in this section. In addition to the tabled school programs, Special Education Directors are also assuming responsibility for administering a state provided Learning Assistance Program (LAP), Federal Headstart programs, alternative High Schools, Vocational Education programs, and/or Health Services.
Table 10. Other programs administered by incumbent special education administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homebound Instruction</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Instruction</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homebased Instruction</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Education</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson-O'Malley (Indian Education Programs)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Educational Staff Associate responsibilities performed by Special Education Administrators**

Ten individuals were reported as performing staff roles in addition to their administrative responsibilities. Nine persons were performing the role of a psychologist. One person was functioning as a communication disorders specialist.

The communication disorders specialist (CDS) was also reported to be functioning in the roles of school psychologist, occupational therapist, physical therapist and audiologist. The only role that the person had appropriate certification for was as a CDS.
Credentials held by incumbent

Seventy-nine school districts provided information on the incumbent for this area. Table 11 provides an unduplicated count of the credentials held by the incumbent.

Table 11. Credentials held by incumbent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administrator</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Disorders Specialist</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Certification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the time of the writing of this report, confirmation was made, with the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of Washington, to confirm the fact that the State of Washington did not require a separate credential for Special Education Administration. The Program Administrator credential was confirmed as being optional.

Seven individuals were reported to have Special Education Administration credentials. From the data collection method it is uncertain as to whether the individuals have a credential from another state, or if there is confusion regarding the status of the Program Administrator credential.

Of particular importance to the current study is the relationship of teacher to school psychologist credentials. Nine individuals were reported to hold both credentials. Subtracting these nine individuals from the total
reported count of teachers and school psychologists, provided a resulting tally of fifty-one teacher, to sixteen school psychologist credentialed individuals. From the available reported information, an approximate ratio of teacher, to school psychologist credentials, of 3:1 was obtained.

How districts meet administrative responsibilities without an on-site Special Education Administrator

In an unduplicated count, 59 districts responded to this question. Forty of the districts are meeting the administrative responsibilities through cooperative agreements with Educational Service Districts and 14 report that they are engaged in interdistrict agreements, the remaining five have assigned the responsibility to the district superintendent.

Table 12 provides information on the position title of the 54 districts who reported that they are engaged in some type of cooperative agreement, who also report that they have an individual, on-site, who assumes partial responsibility for administration of the program.

Table 12. Individuals assigned special education administrative responsibility in cooperatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education teacher</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Special education teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychologist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes a summary of the study. Research findings, conclusions, implications for further research, recommendations and speculations are also presented in this chapter.

The purpose of this study was to increase understanding of the variables of age, gender and the type of professional preparation in the selection process of Special Education Administrator in the state of Washington. Specifically, the study compared Chief Hiring Officer's evaluations of 29-year-old candidates and 49-year-old candidates. It compared males versus females. Finally, the study compared the type of professional preparation, specifically a special education teacher versus a school psychologist.

Only those individuals, from the 296 school districts in the state of Washington, who responded to a research instrument addressed to the "Superintendent or Chief Hiring Officer" were included in the summary of
this study. The study was conducted during the months of May through June 1990.

A total of 155 school districts returned the instruments through the mail. This represented a total return of 52.36% of the research instruments. Of the 155 returned instruments, 20 were considered incomplete. Eight instruments were returned blank. Twelve were returned partially completed. Those sections that were completed were included in the analysis. Group sizes were noted in the summary or tabled data where appropriate to understanding. Upon elimination of non-respondents and incomplete returns, a total of 135 usable instruments were obtained for the resume portion of the study. This represented a 45.61% usable instrument return rate for the resume evaluation study.

The three variables of age, gender, and professional preparation, in a 2x2x2 design, necessitated the creation of eight different resumes. The Chief Hiring Officer's evaluations of the eight different resumes were analyzed by a three-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Results of the ANOVA are discussed in this chapter and an explanation of the findings in light of attribution theory is offered.

Seven null hypotheses were developed to test the effects of age, gender, type of professional preparation and the interaction of these variables in the screening potential special education administrator candidates.
In all cases the null hypotheses could not be rejected. The results yielded an age and gender effect, however, this interaction was most likely due to chance. This result was attributed to the weakness of the model. As less than 10% of the variance was accounted for by the model, a statement of substantive interaction could not be made.

Results of a survey methodology, examining the individuals who responded to the resume study were presented. This information indicated that the evaluators have limited experience or training in special education. Approximately one-fourth of the individuals feel incompetent to make this type of decision, and approximately one-third of the individuals responding reported that they have never made a selection of a Special Education Director.

It is necessary to restate the words of Hebert & Miller that the, "special education supervisor, '...maintains an uncertain relationship with general education,'" (1985). Several respondents provided unsolicited comments on the position, that could, at best, be described as extremely uncomplimentary, and in two cases blatantly offensive.

The results of the survey regarding the incumbent in the position indicate that there is little uniformity of practice, and that in most cases (74.49%) the individual assumes responsibilities for other programs in addition to special education. Salaries appear to have little relationship to responsibility or district size. An actual salary study, well beyond the bounds
of the current questions under study, should be conducted before any
definitive statement regarding salary should be made.

Prior research (Marro & Kohl, 1972) indicated less than a dozen titles
for the position nationwide, the current research indicates that, in
Washington State, out of 79 respondents, 24 separate titles were used and
some individuals operate without a title.

From the 89 individuals who provided information on the area of
study for the highest degree held by the incumbent, it was noted that only 22
were reported as being in special education.

Discussion

This discussion will concern itself first, with the major results in terms
of their agreement with other "paper-people" judgment tasks and, second,
with their implication for the "paper-people" paradigm in research.

In several respects, this study replicates findings of previous
"paper-people" studies and other "paper-profile" judgment tasks. It is not
unusual to find studies in these areas which show that expert judges (inter­
viewers, radiologists, stockbrokers, etc.) do not agree with each other when
asked to make a judgment in an area of common expertise (Hakel, 1971;
The results of this study showed that, even with evaluators in practice,
differences of opinion are still evident. While the task and data were highly
familiar to all evaluators, interrater reliabilities continue to be a question. Low interrater agreement has been a consistent finding.

This is, in part, due to the reactivity of the procedures used. Participation in the study had caused a rethinking, by the researcher, of what factors are important in the selection process. This change of mind was made after the analysis of the resume portion of the study.

An essential question of the study is, to what extent are paper-people decisions like the decisions made in an actual resume review situation. The present study used:

(a) cue sets (resumes) that represented potential applicants,
(b) raters who were completely familiar with the task, and the data presented, and
(c) experienced raters.

In short, every attempt was made to make the task "representative" of the actual resume review situation. Nevertheless, many raters provided unsolicited comment that a "valid" decision could not be made without a personal interview, several remarked on their response sheets that the "resume looked good, but I can't know without an interview"

The raters in the resume portion of this study made decisions about paper people which were quite different from the real people picture presented in the survey study, or external measure of validity.
The assessment of the external validity of a simulation is, in the final analysis, a judgmental assessment. But, that judgment must be based on data, not merely analogies or apparent similarities between the simulation and the task simulated, or domain of generalization. Thus, this research tried to present sufficient detail to permit readers to draw their own inferences concerning the import of these results relative to the external validity of paper vs. actual practice analogy.

Results of the current study indicate that there is an urgent need for researchers to attribute more importance to questions of external validity, or representativeness, when conducting paper people studies. There is growing awareness of this imperative, not only in industrial and organizational psychology, but in areas from perception and information processing (e.g., Neisser, 1976; Wetherick & Dominowski, 1976), to the areas of personality and clinical psychology (e.g., Breger, 1969).

Conclusions

In this study, evaluations of resumes made by Chief Hiring Officers were examined. Although, by title, Chief Hiring Officers should be responsible for the hiring in most school districts, the possibility of input from others in the organization was omitted. In schools of various size and role organization, the superintendent, personnel director, assistant principal,
department heads, or teachers may have major roles in administrator selection.

With each bit of information that has been gained in the study comes the need to examine reasons why, to probe more deeply and explicitly, or to explore additional areas in question. This study has been presented with the hope that it offers some insights in the area of Special Education Administrator selection, in the State of Washington, and that it encourages future research of the profession.

If one agrees that knowledge is gained through the creation of new ideas, and then testing them against reality, it would seem logical that the study of resume selection processes must include some sort of measure to compare the selections made in actual practice. This study would tend to indicate that if there were acceptance of the unsubstantiated preferred age and gender effect of the current research, the individuals who are currently in practice are of a different combination.

If a statement was made that discrimination took place at the resume selection level, based solely on the current research design, without any external measure, the statement might go unexamined or unchallenged. Any introductory text in anthropology tells us certain things happen in that process, the idea becomes part of our myth or folklore, and becomes a very powerful, and seemingly irreversible belief.
The results of the current research would tend to indicate, that through a review of the incumbents, preferences are being expressed, for example males outnumber females approximately two to one. This is contradictory to an unsubstantiated finding of the resume selection study, where females were preferred. There is a numerical discrepancy in the area of preference in both methods of study. This discrepancy has not been accounted for using the current methodology.

Recommendations and Implications

The current investigation would tend to indicate that the position of Special Education Administrator, as implemented in the state of Washington, is worthy of further investigation. The methodology of examining discrimination in the selection process, at the resume level, as implemented in the current study, does a poor job of accounting for the choices that were made by the raters used in the study. The lack of understanding of the position examined in the review of the literature, and the flaws discovered in the study design, should encourage continued inquiry into the position and the selection method. We are unlikely to improve the quality of the individuals who are chosen for the position, if we do not continue seek improvements in the selection process.
Until there is an understanding of decisions made in the selection process, it is unlikely that there will be an answer to the basic question raised in this study, is discrimination taking place at the resume selection level?

This study introduced an external validity measure, by examining the representativeness of the resume study, with the comparison to the incumbents in the position. Additional research is considered necessary to gain an understanding of the applicant pool and the actual selection of the candidate. Questions arise as to the individuals who are attracted to the position of Special Education Director.

If the act of selective discrimination is present, it would only seem logical to examine the marketplace. The questions might be asked, who is attracted to the position? What are their experiences? Are there commonalities?

From the same marketplace concept, an examination of the selection making process, with reference to the costs concerns of districts, would seem most appropriate. It is plausible that cost constraints may limit districts from hiring the most qualified individual to fill the position, and that the decision would be fiscal, rather than based on applicant skill, ability, or acquired competencies.

This study examined only the resume selection process. It might be possible, upon further research, to determine if discrimination occurs at another section of the selection process, such as the interview. Research of
the pre-interview stage could be addressed to combinations of selection factors, such as excellent transcripts and poor recommendations, compared to an opposite counterpart.

An implication for practice from this study is straightforward, evidence of discrimination, either intentional or unintentional, could have costly implications for school systems in light of expenses involved in litigation. School systems should take all possible steps to avoid discriminatory practices in hiring. The areas of discrimination identified by law should be closely examined. To comply with the law, it could be suggested that all reference to age, race, sex, etc., should be eliminated from candidate resumes during the pre-interview stage, to remove any potential claim of unfair hiring practice.

A clear implication of the study would be to clarify the role(s) of the director on a statewide level, so that steps can be taken to gather as much candidate information as possible relevant to specified evaluative criteria.

The current study should have value to college and university programs. If these institutions assume responsibility for providing, and producing, educational leaders, it is compulsory that there be a fusion of leadership training with the desires of potential school district employers.

In the final analysis, this study has implications for the prospective employee. To prevent bias in the selection process, determining, and eliminating, resume information which may negatively influence employers, is worthy of precautionary measures.
With reference to the microanalytic nature of the study, a children's fable about blind men and an elephant offers a cogent reminder. After the blind men each feel only a small section of a large elephant, they all offer their differing interpretations of their limited and isolated study. A member of royalty chastises them and states, "The elephant is a big animal. Each man touched only one part. You must put all the parts together to find out what the elephant is like."

Potentially by studying all the parts, the applicant pool or the marketplace, as well as the complete hiring process from the development of the position posting, through the actual hiring of a candidate, might we be able to gain a complete answer to the questions of discrimination in the selection process, raised in this and other studies.

Major research and design questions remain in the personnel selection process in the field of education. Continued research is required to assist those individuals who make hiring decisions in education, to eliminate intentional, or unintentional, discriminatory practices in the selection process.

Further, it would appear that the position of Special Education Administrator, as implemented in the State of Washington is, to say the least, nebulous. We know it is in existence. The final questions continue to be, what is it, and what should it be?
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APPENDIX A
SAMPLE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT
Dear Colleague:

During the past two years a variety of changes have been made in certification standards for a number of certificated positions. Additional changes have been discussed in several arenas, most notably in parent advocacy groups, for establishment of a set of standards for the position of Special Education Director. You have been selected to participate in a study on the resume' selection process for Special Education Directors entering the field.

The selection of an individual for an administrative position can be one of the most important decisions made by a local education agency. Research on the initial resume' screening process for the position of Special Education Director appears to be non-existent. Your participation in this research is critical to developing a body of knowledge.

The task I am asking of you should take only a few minutes of your time. In order to increase the reliability of the study your input is critical.

1) Please read the enclosed candidate resume and consider it as if it were included with an application for the position within your district.

2) There is a also modified position summary, originally developed by the National School Board Association, enclosed that can provide information to you that can make this task more realistic.

3) Most importantly, there is a candidate evaluation form enclosed. Please evaluate the candidate, as you normally would, if you were to screen for candidates who are to be interviewed.

4) In order to obtain some information about the current decision making process, a brief survey is enclosed to obtain information about you as the decision maker, as well as the current status of the position of Special Education Director in the State of Washington.

5) Please return all materials in the enclosed envelope.

It should be taken as a given, that you will generally have more information, such as an application, transcripts, and recommendations during a real candidate evaluation. During this simulation please consider only the resume that has been provided.
The confidentiality of your response is assured. Individual responses will be treated anonymously and will be destroyed once group norms are calculated. We wish to thank you in advance for your time, effort, and cooperation in this project. Your contribution to this research will hopefully benefit all of us in the field of education.

We will be pleased to mail a summary of the results if you so indicate on the return sheet.

Yours truly,

Joseph G. Pagkos
Principal Investigator

Raymond Swassing
Project Director
TITLE: Special Education Services Director

QUALIFICATIONS:

A. Appropriate certification, license, or other legal credential as may be required. Possession of Program Administrator's credential desired.

B. Master's Degree, or higher, in an area related to the administration or provision of Special Education programs.

C. Minimum of three years experience in Special Education.

D. Such alternatives to the above qualifications as the Board may find appropriate and acceptable.

PERFORMANCE RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Contributes to the development of the total school philosophy of education.
2. Assists in the adaptation of school policies to include special education needs.
3. Recommends policies and programs essential to the needs of exceptional children.
4. Keeps informed of all legal requirements governing special education.
5. Provides leadership in establishing new programs and developing improved understanding of existing programs.
7. Supervises and coordinates special education programs which include special programs for students who are identified as eligible and in need of special education programs.
8. Evaluates existing programs as an ongoing responsibility, and recommends changes and additions as needed.
9. Establishes procedures for placement, evaluation, assignment and reappraisal of students with regard to the special education services program.
10. Develops procedures for referral, securing medical records, psycheducational assessment, and placement.
11. Supervises and coordinates home instruction for homebound or hospitalized students.
12. Evaluates, determines tenure, and recommends for promotion any personnel serving in the special education area.
13. Assists in the recruitment, selection, and recommendation for hiring of any special education personnel.
14. Assumes responsibility for compiling, maintaining, and filing any reports, records, and other documents legally required or administratively useful.
15. Develops and maintains complete and cumulative individual records of all children receiving special services or enrolled in special classes.
16. Supervises preparation of attendance reports and similar data necessary to reimbursement of funds, collecting of tuition for out-of-district students, and similar fiscal matters.
17. Arranges for transportation of all children in special classes.
18. Develops budget recommendations and provides expenditure control on established budgets for special education.
20. Interprets the objectives and programs of the special education services to the board, the administration, the staff, and the public at large.
21. Maintains a permanent inventory of equipment purchased for special education.
22. Establishes procedures for requisitioning, ordering, and paying for special education equipment and supplies.
23. Approves all supplies, materials, and texts used by special education personnel.
24. Evaluates on an ongoing basis, the total special education program, curriculum, procedures, and individual students' needs and achievements.
25. Makes recommendations on design, furnishings, equipment, and location of new special education facilities.
26. Provides for programs of a remedial nature to supplement regular classroom instruction for those students with learning or visual disabilities.
27. Consults with parents of students enrolled in the program.
28. Assumes responsibility for own professional growth and development; for keeping current with the literature, new research and findings, and improved techniques; and for attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.

TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT: Salary and work year to be established by the Board.

EVALUATION: Performance of this job will be evaluated in accordance with provisions of the Board's policy on Evaluation of Professional personnel.
After reviewing the Position Summary and the Resume' provided, please rate this candidate as if you were screening Resume's to fill a similar position in your school district.

SCALE: 1= low 2= below average 3= average 4= above average 5= high

a) ability to transmit knowledge about special education programs .....1 2 3 4 5
b) potential to make a contribution to the overall school program ......1 2 3 4 5
c) ability to create an effective working environment .....................1 2 3 4 5
d) potential for professional growth ..............................................1 2 3 4 5
e) special education program planning ability ................................1 2 3 4 5
f) ability to organize a special education program ...........................1 2 3 4 5
g) ability to select and manage special education staff .....................1 2 3 4 5
h) ability for effective special education program development ........1 2 3 4 5
i) ability to coordinate all the necessary components of a special education program .................................................................1 2 3 4 5
j) ability to prepare and provide necessary reports and materials for management of a special education program ....................1 2 3 4 5
k) ability to prepare and manage budgeting responsibilities of a special education program .......................................................1 2 3 4 5
l) overall evaluation ........................................................................1 2 3 4 5
PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION ABOUT YOURSELF AS A CHIEF HIRING OFFICER

1) Your current position title ___________________________

2) Your administrative experience in years _____________

3) Your age_________  4) Your sex____

5) Highest academic degree completed_________

6) Area of academic major for your highest degree ______

7) Professional Certification(s) you currently hold:

   a) __________________________

   b) __________________________

   c) __________________________

8) Number of Special Education Administrator selections that you have been directly involved with in your professional career _______

9) Number of quarter credits that you have completed in coursework directly related to special education ___________

10) Do you feel that you are competent and qualified to make a selection decision regarding the position of Special Education Administrator? YES____ NO____

11) If number 10 was answered Yes, please briefly describe the competencies that you have acquired that qualify you to make a decision regarding this position:

    ______________________________________

    ______________________________________

    ______________________________________
Please provide the following information regarding the current Special Education Administrator.
(If your district does not currently employ an on-site director please go directly to question number 14)

1) Current position title for the individual responsible for Special Education Programs

2) Administrative experience of the current individual responsible for Special Education Programs in years

3) Age

4) Sex

5) Highest academic degree completed

6) Academic major of highest degree

7) Professional Certification(s) held by the individual responsible for Special Education Programs:
   a) 
   b) 
   c) 

8) Current Salary

9) Current Salary Range $ to 

10) Does your director of Special Education assume responsibility for other programs in addition to special education? YES NO

11) If question number 10 was answered yes, what additional program responsibilities does the director have:

   Chapter 1
   - Homebound Instruction
   - Bilingual Instruction
   - JOM (Indian Education)

   Chapter 2
   - Homebased Instruction
   - Migrant Education
   - Gifted Education
13) In addition to administrative responsibilities, does the current individual responsible for Special Education Programs currently function in any of the following ESA roles:

- [ ] Psychologist
- [ ] Occupational Therapist
- [ ] Social Worker
- [ ] CDS
- [ ] Physical Therapist
- [ ] Audiolist

14) If your district does not currently have an on site director of special education, how are you meeting the administrative responsibilities for special education programs? (please place a check on the appropriate line)

a) contractual services with an ESD .........................................................

b) contractual services with another school district .................................

c) responsibility assigned to district superintendent ..............................

d) responsibility assigned to a building principal ...................................

e) responsibility assigned to a special education teacher ........................

g) responsibility assigned to a non-special education teaching staff member

f) responsibility assigned to an ESA specialist ........................................

15) If (f) was chosen, what credential does the ESA specialist have?

- [ ] Psychologist
- [ ] Occupational therapist
- [ ] Social Worker
- [ ] CDS
- [ ] Physical Therapist
- [ ] Audiolist
Resume 1 - Female, psychologist, Age 49

CANDIDATE RESUME

JANE SAMPLE
1000 FIRST STREET
SMALL TOWN, WASHINGTON
(206) 555-1212

DATE OF BIRTH: April 15, 1941
AGE: 49

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington State</td>
<td>M. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington State</td>
<td>B. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Town High School</td>
<td>DIPLOMA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

1985 - Present
GEORGE AND MARTHA WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT
100 Lincoln Street
Small Town, Washington

Served on District's curriculum steering committee to develop student learning objectives.
Served on School-Community relations committee. Served on Student Recognition and Awards Committee

PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS

Educational Staff Associate School Psychologist - Continuing Level Certification
Initial Program Administrator Credential

EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Local Education Association
State Education Association
National Education Association

PROFESSIONAL GOALS:

To serve as the Director of Special Education Programs for a local school district, and to continue with my professional education and growth.

REFERENCES: Furnished upon request
Resume 2 - Male, Psychologist, Age 29

JOHN SAMPLE
1000 FIRST STREET
SMALL TOWN, WASHINGTON
(206) 555-1212

DATE OF BIRTH: April 15, 1961
AGE: 29

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington State</td>
<td>M. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington State</td>
<td>B. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Town High School</td>
<td>DIPLOMA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

1985 - Present
GEORGE AND MARTHA WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT
100 Lincoln Street
Small Town, Washington

Served on District's curriculum steering committee to develop student learning objectives.
Served on School-Community relations committee. Served on Student Recognition and Awards Committee

PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS

Educational Staff Associate School Psychologist - Continuing Level Certification
Initial Program Administrator Credential

EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Local Education Association
State Education Association
National Education Association

PROFESSIONAL GOALS:

To serve as the Director of Special Education Programs for a local school district, and to continue with my professional education and growth.

REFERENCES: Furnished upon request
JANE SAMPLE  
1000 FIRST STREET  
SMALL TOWN, WASHINGTON  
(206) 555-1212

DATE OF BIRTH: April 15, 1961  
AGE: 29

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington State</td>
<td>M. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington State</td>
<td>B. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Town High School</td>
<td>DIPLOMA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

1985 - Present  
GEORGE AND MARTHA WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT  
100 Lincoln Street  
Small Town, Washington

Served on District's curriculum steering committee to develop student learning objectives. 
Served on School-Community relations committee. Served on Student Recognition and Awards Committee

PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS

Educational Staff Associate School Psychologist - Continuing Level Certification  
Initial Program Administrator Credential

EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Local Education Association  
State Education Association  
National Education Association

PROFESSIONAL GOALS:

To serve as the Director of Special Education Programs for a local school district, and to continue with my professional education and growth.

REFERENCES: Furnished upon request
Resume 4 - Female, teacher, Age 29

JANE SAMPLE
1000 FIRST STREET
SMALL TOWN, WASHINGTON
(206) 555-1212

DATE OF BIRTH: April 15, 1961
AGE: 29

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington State</td>
<td>M. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington State</td>
<td>B. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Town High School</td>
<td>DIPLOMA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

1985 - Present
GEORGE AND MARTHA WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT
100 Lincoln Street
Small Town, Washington

Served on District's curriculum steering committee to develop student learning objectives.
Served on School-Community relations committee. Served on Student Recognition and Awards Committee

PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS

K - 12 Teaching - Continuing Level Certification, with Special Education endorsement
Initial Program Administrator Credential

EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Local Education Association
State Education Association
National Education Association

PROFESSIONAL GOALS:

To serve as the Director of Special Education Programs for a local school district, and to continue with my professional education and growth.

REFERENCES: Furnished upon request
RESUME 5 - Male, psychologist, Age 49

JOHN SAMPLE
1000 FIRST STREET
SMALL TOWN, WASHINGTON
(206) 555-1212

DATE OF BIRTH: April 15, 1941
AGE: 49

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington State</td>
<td>M. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington State</td>
<td>B. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Town High School</td>
<td>DIPLOMA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

1985 - Present GEORGE AND MARTHA WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT
100 Lincoln Street
Small Town, Washington

Served on District's curriculum steering committee to develop student learning objectives.
Served on School-Community relations committee. Served on Student Recognition and Awards Committee

PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS

Educational Staff Associate School Psychologist - Continuing Level Certification
Initial Program Administrator Credential

EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Local Education Association
State Education Association
National Education Association

PROFESSIONAL GOALS:

To serve as the Director of Special Education Programs for a local school district, and to continue with my professional education and growth.

REFERENCES: Furnished upon request
CANDIDATE RESUME

JANE SAMPLE
1000 FIRST STREET
SMALL TOWN, WASHINGTON
(206) 555-1212

DATE OF BIRTH: April 15, 1941
AGE: 49

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington State</td>
<td>M. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington State</td>
<td>B. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Town High School</td>
<td>DIPLOMA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

1985 - Present  GEORGE AND MARTHA WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT
                100 Lincoln Street
                Small Town, Washington

Served on District's curriculum steering committee to develop student learning objectives.
Served on School-Community relations committee. Served on Student Recognition and Awards Committee

PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS

K - 12 Teaching - Continuing Level Certification, with Special Education endorsement
Initial Program Administrator Credential

EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

- Local Education Association
- State Education Association
- National Education Association

PROFESSIONAL GOALS:

To serve as the Director of Special Education Programs for a local school district, and to continue with my professional education and growth.

REFERENCES: Furnished upon request
JOHN SAMPLE
1000 FIRST STREET
SMALL TOWN, WASHINGTON
(206) 555-1212

DATE OF BIRTH: April 15, 1961
AGE: 29

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:

INSTITUTION | DEGREE
-------------|--------
University of Washington State | M. A
University of Washington State | B. A
Home Town High School | DIPLOMA

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

1985 - Present
GEORGE AND MARTHA WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT
100 Lincoln Street
Small Town, Washington

Served on District's curriculum steering committee to develop student learning objectives.
Served on School-Community relations committee. Served on Student Recognition and Awards Committee

PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS

K - 12 Teaching - Continuing Level Certification, with Special Education endorsement
Initial Program Administrator Credential

EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Local Education Association
State Education Association
National Education Association

PROFESSIONAL GOALS:

To serve as the Director of Special Education Programs for a local school district, and to continue with my professional education and growth.

REFERENCES: Furnished upon request
Resume 8 - Male, teacher, Age 49

JOHN SAMPLE
1000 FIRST STREET
SMALL TOWN, WASHINGTON
(206) 555-1212

DATE OF BIRTH: April 15, 1941
AGE: 49

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:

INSTITUTION                      DEGREE
University of Washington State   M. A
University of Washington State   B. A
Home Town High School           DIPLOMA

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

1985 - Present GEORGE AND MARTHA WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT
100 Lincoln Street
Small Town, Washington

Served on District's curriculum steering committee to develop student learning objectives.
Served on School-Community relations committee. Served on Student Recognition and Awards Committee

PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS

K - 12 Teaching - Continuing Level Certification, with Special Education endorsement
Initial Program Administrator Credential

EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Local Education Association
State Education Association
National Education Association

PROFESSIONAL GOALS:

To serve as the Director of Special Education Programs for a local school district, and to continue with my professional education and growth.

REFERENCES: Furnished upon request
APPENDIX C
PILOT TEST - RESUME INTERPRETATION INSTRUMENT
PILOT TEST - RESUME INTERPRETATION INSTRUMENT

1) How old is the Special Education Candidate represented in the resume?
   a) 29
   b) 35
   c) 41
   d) 49

2) What special credential does the candidate hold?
   a) Educational Staff Associate School Psychologist- Continuing level
   b) K-12 Teaching-Continuing Level, with Special Education Endorsement
   c) Educational Staff Associate Physical Therapist- Continuing level
   d) K-12 Teaching-Continuing Level

3) What is the sex of the Candidate?
   a) Male
   b) Female
   c) Not Given

4) What is the race of the candidate?
   a) Black
   b) White
   c) Caucasian
   d) Oriental
   e) Not Given

5) What is the marital status of the candidate?
   a) single
   b) married
   c) not given