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The purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship exists between the score attained on the Teacher Perceiver Interview instrument used in the Chippewa Valley School System and teacher success. Specifically, this study analyzed teacher success by having each respondent complete a self-satisfaction instrument and by having each respondent's immediate supervisor complete an administrative evaluation about the respondent. Results obtained on these instruments were then correlated to the Teacher Perceiver Interview results attained by the respondents at the time of their hire. This correlation was determined by using a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient.

The sample of teachers used in this study was drawn from those teachers who had a complete Teacher Perceiver Interview score on record, were willing to participate in the study by allowing an administrative rating to be completed about them by their immediate supervisor, were willing to personally complete a self-satisfaction instrument, and would allow this researcher to obtain specific demographic information from their personnel file. Twenty-one elementary and 29 secondary teachers comprised the final sample. The correlation analyses were conducted separately for elementary and
secondary teachers.

The study found that a direct relationship exists for elementary teachers between the Teacher Perceiver Interview and administrative ratings as well as between the Teacher Perceiver Interview and self-satisfaction. Relationships for secondary teachers between the Teacher Perceiver Interview and administrative ratings and between the Teacher Perceiver Interview and self-satisfaction were not found.

The results of this study support the use of the Teacher Perceiver Interview process when personnel selection administrators hire elementary teachers. Utilization of the Teacher Perceiver Interview to aid in the hiring of secondary teachers is not recommended since no relationships were supported in this study.
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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The need for good teachers in education is greater now than ever before. Our rapidly changing society places demands upon the teacher which require specialized skills and adaptiveness in order to effectively achieve the educational goals. It is, therefore, imperative that a correct choice is made when selecting a person for a teaching position.

Assessing and understanding the human qualities of a prospective teacher has been a long-standing concern for all educational administrators. Supply and demand plays an important part in the assessment process. When supply is high and the demand is low, it is incumbent upon the administrator to make the best selection since the field to choose from is so large.

It is the overall purpose of this research to analyze one method of identifying the effective teacher through the interview process.

Background and Need

With the existing oversupply of teachers and a collapsing job market in education, the administrator must be provided with an instrument or device to help make accurate personnel decisions. Weaver (1979) spoke to the job market in education:

1
The declining test scores of new teacher candidates appear to be, to a large extent, the legacy of the collapsing job market for educators. Since 1970 the public schools have generally been oversupplied with new teacher graduates and since the mid-1970's have been oversupplied in every specialty. Fewer than one-half of the new teacher graduates are being placed in teaching jobs.

As a result, fewer students are majoring in education and among those who do, test scores are significantly lower. The better students are migrating to growth fields. (p. 32)

The importance of making a good selection is the responsibility of the administrator and, thus, becomes his/her greatest challenge.

Ryans (1964) stated: "Some educators may not agree, but it is the writer's firm belief that selection of teachers is the most important single job of the education administrator" (p. 56). Brown (1974) supported this statement through his observation that the most important activity of an administrator is making personnel decisions.

It is a generally accepted belief that quality education within a school system is directly attributable to quality teachers. There are human elements in the field of teaching that serve as the basis for the successful education of students.

Tractenberg (1973) stated: "Nothing affects the education of children more directly than who their teachers are, and without good teachers there can be no good education" (p. 7).

Criscuolo (1977) supported this statement by contending that:

Hire a bad history teacher or geography teacher, and you hinder your students from learning about their country and the world. Hire a bad reading teacher, and you risk inflicting even greater damage. Your students may not acquire the very basic skills they need to succeed in school, at work, and in life. (p. 27)
Castetter (1971) spoke to this overall concern by stating:

It's generally conceded that the success of any human endeavor is closely related to the quality of personnel who perform the tasks necessary to the achievement of purpose. The extent to which public education succeeds will depend largely upon the quality of the personnel engaged in the educational process. (p. 3)

This research, therefore, clearly supports the belief that teachers are the key to the quality of education that exists. The process of selecting teachers is paramount if we are to achieve quality education in our schools.

The current excess supply of teachers affords each school system the opportunity of selecting a teacher from several candidates. The ability to select the best person from among several candidates will affect the quality of education that is later produced. School systems must utilize an identification and selection process that will result in hiring teachers with outstanding qualities and capabilities.

Administrators must also concern themselves with using an identification and selection process that is objective and impartial to all candidates. Subjective evaluations are often made of the applicants and become the basis for selection. While removing the subjectivity involved would seem impossible, increasing the objectivity seems logical. A standardized selection procedure could help achieve this goal.

Valentine (1974) stated:

Teacher selection, by definition, is choosing one teacher in preference to other applicants on the basis of specific qualities that are desired in the person filling the job. The key question concerning the selection process is:
Can a teacher candidate's suitability for a particular position be forecast? If the normal interview techniques cannot assist in the selection of the best candidate, then the educational leader will be hampered in achieving his/her objective of selecting the teacher who is best qualified for the position. (p. 6)

A personal interview is considered the most popular technique used in employee selection. Martin (1973) believed the interview is an essential step toward employment, but questioned the validity of questions asked by interviewers. Drake (1972) found throughout his studies that an interview is often not valid because the interviewer had no specific interview training and/or the interview was not carefully structured. He stated: "A well-conducted structured interview, however, does hold great potential for gathering useful information about a candidate" (p. 12). Schwab (1969) believed that interviewers should not be comfortable with the interview as it is presently used and must research better methods of interviewing. McIntyre (1971) found that professionals were seldom employed without the benefit of an interview and, with few exceptions, claimed that the interview was not useful as a predictor of behavior and selection of personnel.

It seems, therefore, that the value of the interview lies within the capability of the interviewer to correctly perceive and assess the characteristics of the applicant. An interview technique that can help the interviewer perceive correctly is known as the structured interview. Millard and Brooks (1974) support the structured interview concept by stating:

A valid method of selecting teachers through a structured interview is of the utmost importance to students, because
if better teachers can be identified by this process, schools will be in a position to improve education by selecting better teaching professionals. A structured process is also important to parents, since they are interested in having the best teachers possible for their children. And the process is important for teachers. They are interested in what kinds of selection procedures will be used in the future to fill teaching vacancies. If the selection procedure is validated successfully, the possibility that a teacher would take a job in a school system in which he or she would ultimately be unhappy would diminish. (p. 3)

The increased need for a structured interview was recognized by Dr. Donald Clifton of Selection Research Incorporated (SRI) (1978a). In 1971 he began developing a structured, low-stress Teacher Perceiver Interview (TPI) based on his belief that a structured interview was an in-depth way of listening to another person. The instrument included questions that, when asked by the interviewer, allowed him to objectively hear what the interviewee was saying in the following 12 thematic areas: mission, empathy, rapport drive, individualized perception, listening, investment, input drive, activation, innovation, gestalt, objectivity, and focus.

Various researchers began to recognize the potential of this instrument and offer their support. Scholtz (cited in SRI, 1978a) endorsed the process in these words: "I believe that the Perceiver Process is an important tool that will do much to improve the quality of teachers in school systems" (p. 9).

Writers in the field of personnel support the process as well. Bolton (1973) stated: "In selection, teacher performance is judged in terms of behavior of the teacher or results of his behavior. In either case, the evaluation is attempting to find predictors of
success" (p. 6). Sanbery (1969) wrote the following which also re-
lates to this process:

A candidate should do most of the talking during the
interviewing—and he will if he is allowed to. He wants
to give full answers to the interviewer's questions and
the more he talks, the more he will reveal about himself,
his experiences, his maturity, and his concepts of the
educational process. (p. 81)

Asby (1972) indicated that technology must be increasingly applied
to education and, particularly, to the humanizing element of educa-
tion. It would be logical then to conclude that if the structured
interview process, the Teacher Perceiver Interview, is found to be
more reliable than other approaches to interviewing, then it may be viewed as a positive step toward applying technology to the selec-
tion of teachers.

Importance of the Study

Since the recruitment and selection of teachers for the 1978-79
school year, Chippewa Valley Schools located in Mt. Clemens, Michi-
gan, has been using the structured interview technique as developed
by Selection Research Incorporated (SRI). This technique was
adopted to help the interviewers approach the interview in an ob-
jective and systematic manner.

The procedure used required the applicant to submit an applica-
tion, credentials, and respond to 12 questions in written form.
Applicants who showed the highest potential based on these three
categories were then invited for personal interviews. The interview
was conducted by the principal of the building in which the vacancy
was located. The responses given by the interviewee were analyzed by the principal who was also a trained SRI perceiver. While the results of the interview were used in the selection decision, it was not the sole criterion. Credentials, recommendations, and experience are factors that were also considered along with the immeasurable degree of subjectivity that exists.

Subjectivity is considered to be the personal prejudices, innate feelings, likes, and dislikes that an interviewer possesses. The degree and extent to which these subjective measures affect the outcome of the interview is varied and extremely difficult to determine. Thus, the need to establish an objective and systematic process of selection is further strengthened. A process of selection that is objective and systematic provides a fair opportunity for the candidate during the interview, increases the possibility of the interviewer selecting a person who is best qualified, and reduces the possibility of the interviewer being challenged for making an unfair or improper selection.

The selection decision is critical, indeed. Zanella (1977) believed that hiring new teachers is one of the most important responsibilities facing the administrator. He stated:

> Every administrator realizes that careful consideration must be taken during the interviewing of prospective staff members. A mistake made during this process may have severe implications that haunt an administrator and a school district for years. (p. 66)

Schumann (1977) offered additional support to these contentions by stating: "In this time of many applicants for a few jobs, administrators should give serious thought to sharpening their interview
techniques so that they hire the very best teachers possible for their schools" (p. 62).

A local research base was needed to determine if present administrative ratings and self-evaluation results correlate positively with the TPI responses that were given by the subject at the time of hire. This study is important in order to determine whether the process does indeed help identify teacher success.

The study is important to students, parents, teachers, administrators, and surrounding school districts, because if the process is found to be a predictor of teacher success, the aforementioned parties would all be positively affected. Conversely, if the process failed to identify successful teachers more accurately, the school systems should investigate alternate methods of selecting personnel.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine whether there exists a relationship between the original TPI score and selected behaviors and performance measures of the interviewed teachers after they have been placed in a working position for a period of 1, 2, or 3 years. This study speaks to the need of testing the value of the TPI in predicting teacher success. It also supports or rejects the establishment of a process to serve as a model for other school systems to test the quality of their personnel decisions.
Definition of the Problem

The problem addressed in this study is the void that exists as to whether the TPI process does or does not actually identify an applicant who will be a successful teacher. This problem focuses on the structured interview process specifically and does not address the many other existing variables that are present in the interview process. A study was needed to determine if the TPI instrument is a predictor of successful teacher capability.

Furthermore, since the average TPI score for elementary teachers differs from the average TPI score for secondary teachers, this study will analyze whether the TPI is a predictor of successful teacher performance relative to these two independent categories. This study, therefore, addresses the following research questions:

1. Does a relationship exist between the TPI instrument and success of elementary teachers as measured by administrative ratings?
2. Does a relationship exist between the TPI instrument and success of secondary teachers as measured by administrative ratings?
3. Does a relationship exist between the TPI instrument and success of elementary teachers as measured by teacher satisfaction?
4. Does a relationship exist between the TPI instrument and success of secondary teachers as measured by teacher satisfaction?

Definition of Terms

1. Interview process: The actual face-to-face verbal exchange between a school administrator and a teacher applicant.
2. Life themes: Life themes are defined by the TPI and are basic qualities found in all successful teachers.

3. Predictable response: A response by a teaching candidate that is similar to responses gathered from other successful teachers.

4. Structured interview: An interview where all interviewees (candidates) are asked the same questions.

5. Teacher Perceiver Interview: A systematic interviewing instrument developed by Selection Research Incorporated of Lincoln, Nebraska. This instrument will be known as TPI.

6. Teacher selection: The process used to select a teacher from among the available candidates.

7. Teachers of grades kindergarten through six are considered elementary.

8. Teachers of grades seven through 12 are considered secondary.

Assumptions

Certain assumptions were necessary in designing this study.

1. The behavioral themes measured by TPI are inherent in individuals early in life and changed little with teaching experience. Therefore, data which had been gathered from experienced teachers could be generalized to potential teachers.

2. There is relationship in how a teaching candidate said he or she would behave and how she or he actually behaved.

3. Perceptual data is a reliable form of information regarding human behavior.
4. The teachers in this population are the same type as those who may be hired in the future relative to their cultural background, ethnic background, education, socioeconomic characteristics, and areas of expertise.

Summary

A quality education can only be realized by providing quality teachers for each classroom. There is presently an abundance of available teachers; therefore, a process of selection must be used to fill available positions. This process must result in the hiring of quality educators. Research clearly states that a structured interview process will most likely result in the selection of the best candidate.

Selection Research Incorporated has gone one step farther in the selection process. They have developed a structured interview that specifically identifies a successful teacher. This research project will investigate the possibility of whether a relationship does indeed exist between this interview process and teacher success at both the elementary and secondary levels.

Overview of Remaining Chapters

Chapter II will further substantiate the need for good teachers and the value of the structured interview toward meeting this need. The TPI will also be reviewed relative to validation studies that have been conducted to substantiate its claim as a predictor of teacher success.
Chapter III will discuss the overall design of this study. Specifically defined in this chapter will be the population surveyed, a description of the survey instruments, the hypotheses that will be tested, and a description of the analysis procedure that will be used to test the hypotheses.

Chapter IV will present the data that have been collected and the results of the analyses procedures that were used. The findings will be discussed relative to each of the four hypotheses stated in Chapter III.

Chapter V will include a discussion of the conclusions drawn relative to each hypothesis. Additionally, overall conclusions of this study and the implications will be discussed. Finally, some recommendations for further research study will be offered.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of literature for this study consists of five sections. The first area involves a review of the general topic of teacher selection and specific criteria that are used in the selection process. The second section of this chapter is a review of the structured interview. The third section further discusses the structured interview in terms of the Teacher Perceiver Interview. Section four of this chapter reviews the background and use of the Administrative Survey instrument used in this study. Part five reviews the background and use of the Job Descriptive Index instrument relative to teacher satisfaction.

The Teacher Selection Process

The school administrator has devoted varying degrees of time toward the teacher selection process over the history of education. Historically, teacher supply and demand fluctuates, thus, presenting the administrator with a multitude of variables in the selection process. The present surplus of teachers may or may not continue. Musemche and Adams (1978) believe that today's surplus is simply a prelude to a shortage that will occur in the mid-1980's. They further contend that population growth will surpass the availability of teachers now enrolled in training institutions.
Regardless of whether administrators must choose from a scarce or surplus market to fill a teaching vacancy, research speaks of the importance of proper selection procedures and the difficult nature of the selection process. Shackan (1973) stated, "One lesson learned from the available teachers' surplus was to improve our teachers' selection procedures and thereby attain better talent for teaching" (p. 6).

Bolton (1969) expressed the following relative to teacher selection:

So crucial is the selection of a teacher to the quality of the educational program, that it seems obvious that this decision should be made with the utmost certainty regarding its utility. Yet such decisions are frequently intuitive and arbitrary, and despite a certain amount of theory development, a lack of empirical data has left the teacher selection process a highly subjective one. (p. 329)

Castetter (1976) developed a selection process model (Figure 1) based on the following belief:

The primary aim of selection is to fill existing vacancies with personnel who meet the established qualifications, who appear likely to succeed on the job, who will find sufficient position satisfaction to remain in the system, who will be effective contributors to unit and system goals, and who will be sufficiently motivated to achieve a high level of self-development. When the selection process is properly planned, additional benefits are derived. The system is able to exercise an important responsibility on behalf of the community and the profession: the elimination of candidates unlikely to succeed. Proper selection of time, effort, and funds that must be invested in developing a school staff. (pp. 167-168)

Simmons (1976), in researching the Teacher Perceiver Instrument, concluded that the selection of teachers is vital to the future development of human resources. He believes that teachers are the
Step 1: Develop Selection Policies and Process
- Establish system selection policies and process. Selection activities delegated to internal and external personnel.

2: Prescribe Position Role
- Establish role prescription for position (expected patterns of behavior).

3: Define Position Behavioral Characteristics
- Analyze mental, physical, personal, professional behavior components in order to compare required and expected behavior patterns.

4: Compile Appropriate Information on Candidates
- Develop information about candidates from application blank, transcript, recommendations, examinations, interviews, observations, reference and background checks, biographical inventory.

5: Evaluate Information and Screen Applicants
- Compare candidate profile and appraisal report on difference between required and actual behavior pattern.

6: Make Employment Decision
- Prepare eligibility list. Both applicant and system involved in decision.

7: Make Employment Offer
- Employment offer made jointly by unit administrator and others.

8: Place in Position
- Consider unit leadership style, followership style, position situation.


Figure 1
A Model of Selection Process
essential quality necessary for success in the educational process. Brown (1974) summarized his findings by concluding that there is no more important single activity of an administrator than making personnel decisions that select outstanding teachers.

Criteria for Teacher Selection

The research does indeed reflect an importance for proper teacher selection. However, the question of which qualities and characteristics the administrator must pick in a candidate remains as the most important aspect in the selection process.

An article in the Journal of the Nebraska School Administrators ("The Structured Interview," 1979) stated the problem as follows: "The key to understanding the uniqueness of teaching talent has been a problem to principals, personnel directors, and indeed, all educators for decades" (p. 1).

Clifford (1975) believes no one single criterion is suited to staff selection. He stated: "Selection must be suited to the needs of the community which necessitates a needs assessment" (p. 8).

Candela (1977) conducted a study of the desired selection and hiring processes of the greater Detroit area schools. He found the personnel directors believed the following criteria should be considered in the teacher selection process:

- The holding of a valid teaching certificate, a complete application form, reference checks in writing or by phone, up-to-date credentials, evidence of interview, and a written recommendation for employment, recommendation from building principal, complete transcripts, central office veto authority, following of the selection process, complete applicant file, written definition of administrative
staff participation in selection process, personal inter-
view, a written selection process and pre-employment
physical exam. (p. 19)

Blom, Gerard, and Kingsinger (1974) described the effective
middle school teacher in the following terms:

The effective middle school teacher understands the con-
cept of middle school and is able to identify the stages
of child growth and development for the 10-14 year old
child.

The effective middle school teacher knows himself
and has a positive self-image. He can relate with both
children and adults, is accepting of differences in people
and respects the worth of each human being. He gives of
himself to help others grow and learn and is able to re-
ceive from others for his own growth and learning.

The effective middle school teacher is consistent
in the adult model which he portrays. He has expecta-
tions for himself and children, is firm but always fair
with them, and is insistent upon respect for the individ-
ual, for safety, property, and right of each person to
learn.

The effective middle school teacher realizes that
children have the on-off switch for learning. He knows
his job must be to motivate, plan and organize in such
a way as to maximize the opportunity for the learning
switch to be in the "on" position.

The effective middle school teacher has a commit-
ment, he can share that commitment and he works hard to
fulfill it. He strives for excellence. He cares and
others know it. (p. 9)

Broudy (1963) described his ideas as to what qualities a middle
school teacher should have as follows:

Someone who has not yet fully incorporated the values of
the middle aged, who shares the anxiety of the group in
coping with elders and officials, and who still has some
of the youthful rebel in him. In other words, he is
still warm from the transitional state albeit indubitably
a member of the adult community. (p. 8)
In a study of intern teachers, Haberman (1965) isolated five behavior patterns that distinguished the successful from the unsuccessful teaching interns:

1. demonstrating belief in youngsters' potential
2. organizing classroom activities effectively
3. showing enthusiasm for subject matter
4. setting appropriate standards of student behavior
5. being willing to listen (pp. 215-20)

Weldy (1979) believed that school principals should be aware of the following negative types of teaching behavior during the selection and evaluation processes if schools were going to improve:

1. sarcasm
2. excessive criticism
3. discourtesy
4. impatience
5. intolerance (p. 75)

Reavis and Mehaffie (1980) made the following list of eight characteristics which they felt school administrators should consider before hiring a teacher for a small secondary school:

1. Be able to teach more than one subject and more than one grade level.
2. Be able to teach students of a wide range of abilities in the same classroom during the same time span.
3. Be knowledgeable about materials and resources and requisition procedures for these.
4. Be able to direct a variety of extra curricular or co-curricular activities.
5. Be able to supervise and assist students who are taking correspondence courses.
6. Teach different subjects in alternate years.
7. Work with combinations of more than one subject/grade in a single class.
Alberti (1974) felt the following six qualities of teacher applicants should be taken into consideration during the selection process:

1. The personal and social characteristics of the applicant.
2. The ability and accomplishment of the applicant.
3. The competency displayed in the chosen teacher area.
4. The applicant's appearance.
5. The applicant's curricular and extra-curricular training and experience.
6. The applicant's physical fitness and training.

In the search of quality and excellence in the teaching profession, the research provides a wide variety of factors and personal qualities for the school administrators to consider during the selection process. After an extensive review of related literature, Getzels and Jackson (1963) concluded:

Despite the critical importance of the problem and half a century of diligent research effort, very little is known for certain about the nature and measurement of teacher personality, or about the relationship between teacher personality and teaching effectiveness. The regrettable fact is that many of the studies so far have not produced significant results. Others, have produced only partisan findings. For example, it is said after the usual inventory tabulation that good teachers are friendly, cheerful, sympathetic, and morally virtuous rather than cruel, depressed, unsympathetic, and morally depraved. But when this has been said, not very much has been revealed that is especially useful. For what conceivable human interaction—and teaching implies first and foremost human interaction—is not the better if people involved are friendly, cheerful, sympathetic, and virtuous rather than
the opposite? What is needed is not research leading to the reiteration of the self-evident, but to the discovery of the specific and distinctive features of teacher personality of the effective teacher. (p. 574)

Getzels and Jackson's conclusion of 20 years ago served as a point of historical interest in that they summarized the lack of conclusive evidence toward the criteria that should be used by school administrators in the selection process. In recent years, gains have been made in the process of teacher selection. Specifically, these gains have occurred in the identification and characteristics which are present in effective teachers. The Teacher Perceiver Interview process, discussed later in this chapter, is indicative of a process that has been developed in order to identify the characteristics which are found in successful teachers. A research base is needed to determine if a positive relationship exists between the TPI and teacher success.

The literature reviewed thus far indicates a great need to accurately and consistently assess the various attributes and characteristics of potential teachers. Of particular need is the assessment of human relation skills rather than just the mechanical skills.

The Structured Interview

The structured interview is a process whereby questions asked of teacher candidates are standardized for all and predictable responses are listened for.

Miner and Miner (1974) believe that the structured interview is not used as much as it should be in the interview process. They
When more structured interview techniques are used, when the questions are standardized and the responses are recorded in a systematic manner, the consistency of the judgmental process increases markedly. Within limits, it does not matter which interviewer is used; the results tend to be similar. Unfortunately, however, the structuring of a kind that will increase consistency of judgments appears to be the exception rather than the rule in most personnel offices. (p. 276)

Coker, Lorentz, and Coker (1978) concluded that the structured interview is a potentially useful screening device that is also relatively inexpensive. The structured interview was particularly helpful in the elimination of discrimination claims. They also cited a need to more clearly identify successful teachers among a growing number of candidates. Finally, they concluded that an instrument which can be used to predict effective teachers would be a very useful tool in the selection process.

An article in the *Journal of the Nebraska School Administrators* ("The Structured Interview," 1979) defined the structured interview as follows: "A structured interview is an in-depth way of listening to another person. Ultimately the acid test for the structured interview is whether or not it measures what it purports to measure" (p. 2). The Journal found positive value in the structured interview by claiming that it is the first significant technological step towards increasing reliability and the validity of the interview part of the selection of teachers.

Bolton (1973) also cited the need to improve the reliability and validity of the interview through structure when he concluded:
Research indicates that when the objectives of the interview are vague and ill-defined, and when no form is given to the interview, there is little reliability or validity to the conclusions. Care should be taken to define objectives and to specify the structure that will be used. (pp. 14-15)

Carlson, Thayer, Mayfield, and Peterson (1973) also supported the need for using technology to improve the validity of the interview process. Findings of their study regarding the validity of the interview process are as follows: "(1) New methods of interviewing should include comprehensive structured interview guides. (2) Intensive training for interviewers is necessary" (pp. 91-96).

Carlson (1971) also commented on a series of studies conducted in the late 60's and early 70's, and concluded that the structured interview enables the interviewers to agree with each other and that a highly structured interview has the best potential for valid selection. Carlson stressed the importance of training interviewers (pp. 268-275).

An appropriate example of a structured interview is the Teacher Perceiver Interviewer. The TPI is based on the proposition that the personalities and potentialities a person brings to the field of teaching are critical and essential elements in achieving excellence in teaching, and furthermore, that such qualities can be measured through a structured interview process. This proposition serves as the basis for the research questions which will be studied in this research effort.
The Teacher Perceiver Interview

According to Miller (1976), the Teacher Perceiver Interview was developed by Selection Research Incorporated, a company that came into existence in 1969 with a mission to mobilize the caring forces in society. It was begun by Dr. Donald O. Clifton and associates, educational psychologists from the University of Nebraska who, as psychologists, had been studying patterns of success in people for over 20 years. Perceiver Academies, a subsidiary of SRI, has a unique mission in and to education. Simply stated, its mission is to mobilize the caring talent in our schools through the identification and development of teaching talent: "Our greatest contribution is to be sure there is a teacher in every classroom who cares that every student, every day, learns and grows and feels like a real human being" (p. 1).

The TPI process involves 60 structured open-ended questions in a stress-free interview which is used to identify the success patterns, or basic life themes, within the teacher applicant. SRI developed the structured questions on the premise that if one wants to know about a person, it is best to ask them, and then believe what the person says. The interview is designed to provide an understanding of each person's strengths, motivations, and values.

Responses to the questions are scored as correct or incorrect and are assigned a value of zero or one, so that a total score can range from zero to 60. The questions are distributed across the 12 themes mentioned in Chapter I. Teacher candidates are given the 60
questions by a trained interviewer in a clear, concise, consistent, and exact manner. Interviews are tape recorded and scored by a Teacher Perceiver.

SRI offers an intensive training program of over 100 hours of training for individuals who wish to use the TPI structured interview. This author is trained to be a Teacher Perceiver. In order to achieve this status, an individual is required to reach a minimum degree of 85% consistency on item by item coding with SRI staff members.

Although "scores" are calculated for each interviewee, the TPI trainers and researchers indicate that an overall "understanding" of each candidate is more important than the actual scores obtained from the analysis.

In a 3-year study of the TPI process published by Millard and Brooks (1974), it was reported that:

The SRI process of identifying teachers who are likely to be most effective in a given school district appears to be successful. This can be seen by the fact that of the 34 comparisons of ratings made by peers, administrators, and students, approximately 68 percent of them favor those groups who were most highly recommended by the SRI process while less than 15 percent favored those groups who were not as highly recommended. (p. 30)

In the 1976 study of the Carroll County Public Schools in Georgia, Coker et al. (1978) tested the Teacher Perceiver Interview (TPI) for its potential usefulness as a screening device for teacher selection and retention. Discriminant analysis revealed that the 32 teachers judged "effective" by administrators differed significantly overall on seven of the 12 life themes from those who were
judged to be "less effective" teachers.

Based on the findings of this study, the researchers concluded: "It is apparent, therefore, that the structured interview is potentially useful as a relatively inexpensive and useful screening device" (p. 6).

When vocational agricultural teachers were studied by Simmons (1976), he found positive correlations between the TPI interview and students and administrative ratings of those teachers. Preuss (1972) reported that there was 93% agreement between professors' classifications of student teachers' potential success in teaching and the SRI interview process.

Jones (1978) conducted a study that indicated a positive correlation between the TPI and the administrator's perception of classroom climate. Stoudnour (1978) found a positive relationship between student teacher TPI scores and ratings by their supervisory personnel. Schilling (1975) measured the relationship between TPI selected teachers and teachers hired by conventional means. Although the results were positive toward the TPI method, they were inconclusive.

In a study by Lasher (1976), the research found that different variables of sex, class, and teaching level correlated with the TPI. Class in this study was defined as freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors. Twenty students from each grade were administered the TPI. The 80 participants contained 40 males and 40 females. Half of these were in elementary education and half were in secondary education.
1. Overall there was no difference between males and females, but females did better on specific themes.

2. Differences were not significant from freshmen to seniors.

3. Formalized instruction appeared to have had little effect upon student TPI scores.

Lasher pointed out in summary that the highest correlation found was between student ratings and teacher success. Lesser correlations with sex, age, intelligence, experience, and self-rating relative to teacher success were found, but further study was needed.

In the Selection Research Incorporated (1978b) Teacher Perceiver Technical Report, the authors emphasized the following:

However, it should be noted that the researchers and authors of the Teacher Perceiver Interview hold strongly to a local validation perspective. Each school that is involved in the utilization of the perceiver process is strongly encouraged to conduct a local validation of the interview process for their school district. It is not the conclusion of this report that the Teacher Perceiver Interview is a valid instrument in every school district within the United States and Canada. (p. 4)

Cook (1981) undertook the task of conducting a local validation study of the TPI process in the Chippewa Valley Public School System. His study concluded that there was a relationship between a teacher's TPI score and the overall administrative rating of the teacher. Furthermore, the results suggested an even greater relationship between the TPI score a teacher received and student ratings for the teacher. He further stated in his conclusions:

The knowledge of the significant t-test and correlations which were obtained between overall administrative ratings and the total T.P.I. score as well as the T.P.I. Interpersonal Index should be useful for administrators in Chippewa Valley Schools during teacher selection. This information should help to increase the probability
of selecting teachers who are more likely to be successful because it will mean that the decision to hire or reject a teacher candidate will be based on some data other than just administrative judgment.

The usefulness of selecting teachers who will be rated highly by their students is apparent. Thus, the significant correlations which were obtained between the total T.P.I. score and student ratings will give an added dimension to the teacher selection process if the T.P.I. technique is utilized by a T.P.I. trained administrator.

It was the firm belief of Cook, and this researcher as well, that the single most important task of the educational administrator is the selection of excellent teaching personnel. A child's education lies in a critical balance between those who touch the child at home and at school. The classroom teacher probably has more influence and impact upon the child than any other factor outside of the home environment. It can, therefore, be concluded that a quality educational program cannot exist for the child unless an excellent teacher is present in the classroom each day to present such a program to the child.

Since the literature suggests that a relationship exists between the TPI and teacher success, this research will analyze whether this relationship exists at the local level. To determine whether a relationship exists in Chippewa Valley, this research will compare success, as measured by a current administrative rating and a self-analysis of job satisfaction, against the TPI scores that were recorded at the time of hire. It is the belief of this researcher that those who scored highest on the TPI will also score highest on the Administrative Survey instrument and the Job
It is necessary to determine if this interview process provides actual benefits to Chippewa Valley. The belief that hiring excellent teachers is critically important to education combined with the research that suggests the TPI is a valid predictor of teacher success, logically suggests to this researcher that the next step is to determine if there is a relationship between the TPI and teacher success within our school district. To know if this process really works would be of tremendous value to our school district and others as well.

The next two sections of this chapter will review the instruments that will be used in this research effort.

The Administrative Survey Instrument

The Administrative Survey (AS) instrument was developed by Cook (1981) by adapting items from various surveys which had been used in rating teacher performance. This instrument is a 36-item form with a 5-point Likert scale.

By assigning values of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 to the first 36 answers, a scale is obtained. A strongly disagree answer receives 1 point, disagree receives 2 points, undecided receives 3 points, agree is assigned 4 points, and strongly agree receives a value of 5 points. By use of this procedure, a total score of between 36 and 180 is generated for each teacher using the 36 questions on the administrative survey form.

According to Cook (1981):
This instrument was checked for internal consistency reliability using Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. The obtained reliability coefficient was .75. This statistical methodology was chosen because items on the administrative survey are nondichotomously scored, that is, items are not marked right or wrong. (p. 60)

Cook developed the Administrative Survey instrument in 1981 for use in a local validation study of the TPI. The proposed questionnaire was subjected to review by nine public school administrators with similar job responsibilities in terms of working with teacher evaluation. From this review, Cook deleted four questions deemed to be of little value, changed terminology in five questions, and reorganized the question sequence. Through this process, it is reasonable to believe that this instrument has face or content validity. Furthermore, because this research effort is utilizing the same type of administrative evaluation as one of its components to measure teacher success, the instrument will be valid for the study.

The Job Descriptive Index Instrument

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) was developed as a result of research originally known as the Cornell Studies of Satisfaction. This instrument was selected for use in this research effort because it has been clearly established as reliable and valid when measuring job satisfaction.

The JDI measures five areas of job satisfaction: (1) the type of work, (2) the pay, (3) the opportunities for promotion, (4) the supervision, and (5) the co-workers on the job. A list of short phrases or adjectives exists for each of the five areas. Respondents
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are instructed to read each phrase or adjective and mark "Y" if the phrase or word describes their particular job situation, "N" if it does not, or "?" if they cannot decide.

There are four advantages in using the JDI over other satisfaction instruments. First, it is directed toward specific areas of satisfaction rather than general areas. Although satisfaction measures that are general in nature have many components, the components may or may not be independent of one another. The JDI provides for those job situations where there are some discriminable differences which the respondent can report with reasonable assurance.

Secondly, the verbal level required to complete the JDI is low. The JDI requires only a general understanding of each word or phrase rather than abstractions or interpretations. A study conducted on the JDI placed the modal educational level at fourth grade.

Thirdly, the JDI avoids asking the respondent how satisfied he is with his work in a direct manner. Rather, the JDI asks the respondent to describe his work. The responses, therefore, have a job-referent rather than self-referent. The respondent does, through his description of his job, provide information which may be used to infer his satisfaction. The avoidance of a self-referent was deliberate since the basic needs and drives of the organism or their relevance to job satisfaction are unclear.

Lastly, the JDI is a straight-forward instrument that does not project measure of satisfaction. It does not attempt to trick the respondent by sneaking by his defenses.
Summary of Literature Review

Discussed in this chapter was the concept of teacher selection and criteria that are used in the selection process, the structured interview, the Teacher Perceiver Interview, the Administrative Survey instrument, and the Job Descriptive Index instrument. Each of these areas has overall relative importance to this research effort. Chapter III will describe the design of this study based on the theoretical and practical knowledge acquired through this review of literature.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to establish the relationship of the Teacher Perceiver Interview (TPI) process to teacher success in the Chippewa Valley Public School System. The degree to which each subject's original TPI score correlates to present administrative ratings and self-evaluations was analyzed in order to determine the usefulness of the TPI instrument. Additionally, an analysis was made to determine if the TPI instrument correlates independently to elementary and secondary teachers relative to their determined degree of success. This independent analysis was done because the TPI instrument has established distinctly different average scores for elementary and secondary teachers.

Population

The Chippewa Valley School District is comprised of portions of Macomb and Clinton Townships and is located in what has been one of the fastest growing geographic areas in the state of Michigan. Chippewa Valley is the fifth largest school system of the 21 school systems in Macomb County as of October 1, 1982. Chippewa Valley is located approximately 26 miles northeast of Detroit. The 28 square mile district consists primarily of residential dwellings and has a total student population K-12 of 6,659 as of October, 1982.
The population for this study consisted of 98 teachers hired after January 1979 who were presently employed in Chippewa Valley. Members of the population also had been administered the TPI at the time they were hired. The accessible population consisted of those teachers from the population who have a complete TPI score on record, were willing to participate in this study by allowing an administrative rating to be completed about them by their immediate supervisor, were willing to personally complete the JDI self-satisfaction instrument, and allowed this researcher to obtain specific demographic information from their personnel file.

Thirty-seven secondary certified teachers and 27 elementary certified teachers comprised the accessible population. The sample drawn from the accessible population for use in this study was the entire accessible population.

From the 98 teachers in the population, 34 teachers were excluded from this study due to lack of a complete TPI score or improper administration of the TPI. The remaining 64 subjects in the population were sent a written request asking for their participation in this research study. From this initial request, 48 teachers agreed to participate, nine declined, and seven did not respond at all. A second written request to acquire the participation of the remaining 16 people was followed with a personal contact by this researcher. From this effort, two agreed to participate and 14 gave definite negative responses towards participation. The final number of respondents drawn from the accessible population was 50. This represents a response rate of 78.1%.
Of the 14 subjects who refused to participate in this study, eight were classified as secondary and six as elementary. All but three of these subjects were female. This researcher was unable to detect a common element within the group of nonrespondents that would indicate a reason as to why they chose to not respond. The vast majority offered no reason for not choosing to participate. Two people indicated that they were not willing to give the necessary time. One individual had taken ill and this researcher chose not to pursue her participation. In summary, this researcher was unable to determine a reason as to why the nonrespondent rate was nearly 22%.

It was the intent of this research to establish a relationship between teacher success and the original TPI score. Since it was not possible to collect data from those prospective teachers who were not hired, a restriction in range of the TPI score may occur. Field based research of this nature cannot concern itself with those subjects who are no longer available. The practicality of collecting such data and deeming them reliable is not reasonable. However, the TPI establishes no minimum scores or cutoff points in its attempt to predict a good teacher prospect. Also, the TPI score is typically not the sole criterion used in the hiring decision; thus, it is entirely possible that people can or could be hired with relatively low TPI scores.
Instrumentation

The Teacher Perceiver Interview instrument was developed on the proposition that the personalities and potentialities that one brings to the field of teaching were critical elements in achieving excellence in teaching, and furthermore, that such qualities could be measured through a systematic interview process.

The TPI measured the predictable responses to 60 open-ended questions about teacher behavior. The 60 items in the TPI were asked in an exact and consistent manner for each teacher. The total interview was tape recorded to allow the opportunity for the interviewer to review at a later time the exact responses of each interviewee so a more reliable judgment could be made when grading the responses. An analysis was then made of each of the interviewee's responses to each item, and a numerical score of one (1) or zero (0) was assigned each response. The interview questions were divided into 12 thematic areas and are defined by SRI (1978b) as follows:

Mission—Mission is what takes some individuals and groups out of society's mainstream in order to assure the quality and purposiveness of that mainstream. Mission is a deep underlying belief that students can grow and attain self-actualization. A teacher with mission has a goal to make a significant contribution to other people.

Empathy—Empathy is the apprehension and acceptance of the state of mind of another person. Practically, we say we put ourselves into the other person's place. Empathy is the phenomenon that provides the teacher feedback about the individual student's feelings and thoughts.

Rapport drive—The rapport drive is evidenced by the teacher's ability to have an approving and mutually favorable relationship with each student. The teacher likes students and expects them to reciprocate. Rapport is seen by the teacher as a favorable and necessary condition.
of learning.

**Individualized perception**—Individualized perception means that the teacher spontaneously thinks about the interests and needs of each student and makes every effort to personalize each student's program.

**Listening**—The listening theme is evident when a person spontaneously listens to others with responsiveness and acceptance. Listening is more than merely hearing. It is viewed as beneficial to the person speaking.

**Investment**—The investment theme is indicated by the teacher's capacity to receive a satisfaction from the growth of students. The satisfaction comes with the response of the learner rather than the performance of the teacher.

**Input drive**—Input drive is evidenced by the teacher who is continuously searching for ideas, materials, and experiences to use in helping other people, especially students.

**Activation**—Activation indicates that the teacher is capable of stimulating students to think, to respond, to feel—to learn.

**Innovation**—The innovation theme is indicated when a teacher tries new ideas and techniques. A certain amount of determination is observed in this theme because the idea has to be implemented. At a higher level of innovation is creativity where the teacher has the capability of putting information and experience together into new configurations.

**Gestalt**—The gestalt theme indicates the teacher has a drive toward completeness. The teacher sees in patterns—is uneasy until work is finished. When gestalt is high, the teacher tends toward perfectionism. Even though form and structures are important, the individual student is considered first. The teacher works from individual to structure.

**Objectivity**—Objectivity is indicated when a teacher responds to the total situation. Gets facts and understands first as compared to making an impulsive reaction.

**Focus**—Focus is indicated when a person has models and goals. The person's life is moving in a planned direction. The teacher knows what the goals are and selects activities in terms of these goals. (pp. 5-6)
A reliability coefficient of .91 has been established in test-retest situations involving the TPI.

A sample of 493 TPI scores was collected between 1975 and 1978 by SRI in an effort to compare scores of elementary teachers with secondary teachers. This comparison revealed the average secondary teacher score at 24.66 and the average elementary teacher score at 25.62. TPI scores that fall above these averages are considered to be "above" average for the purposes of comparing teacher candidates. Scores that fall above 35 are considered superior.

The TPI instrument is kept in strict confidence by Selection Research Incorporated and its certified teacher perceiver interviewers. Confidentiality of this instrument is necessary because it is conceivable that, if allowed to do so, a teacher candidate could learn and memorize the desired responses to each question and thereby produce an inaccurate perceiver score during the interview. Therefore, the high degree of confidentiality is necessary in order that the TPI instrument remains a viable system for the selection of personnel.

The Administrative Survey instrument was developed by Cook (1981) by adapting items from various surveys which had been used in rating teacher performance and then validating the instrument with a panel of experts. This instrument is a 36-item form with a 5-point Likert scale. In using this form, the administrators will be asked to rate the teacher on each of the 36 items by selecting one of five responses to the question as follows: strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree, strongly agree.
By assigning values of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 to the 36 answers, a scale was obtained. A strongly disagree answer received 1 point, disagree received 2 points, undecided received 3 points, agree was assigned 4 points, and strongly agree received a value of 5 points. Utilizing this procedure, a total score of between 36 and 180 was generated for each teacher using the 36 questions on the administrative survey form.

This instrument was checked for internal consistence reliability using Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. The obtained reliability coefficient was .75. This statistical methodology was chosen because items on the administrative survey are nondichotomously scored; that is, items are not marked right or wrong.

The Job Descriptive Index was developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin in 1969 and later copyrighted by Bowling Green State University in 1975. With this instrument, teachers were asked to score five sets of questions, each containing between nine and 18 questions. Responses were categorized as yes responses, no responses, or do not know responses. A total score was realized to determine the degree of satisfaction the respondent had toward his/her job.

The JDI measures five areas of job satisfaction: (1) the type of work, (2) the pay, (3) the opportunities for promotion, (4) the supervision, and (5) the co-workers on the job. A list of short phrases or adjectives exists for each of the five areas. Respondents are instructed to read each phrase or adjective and mark "Y" if the phrase or word describes his/her particular job situation, "N" if it does not, or "?" if he/she cannot decide.
The five scales of satisfaction were developed using 988 subjects. On the basis of content analysis of critical-incident interview, and of previous research reports, the item content of the five scales of job satisfaction was established by Smith et al. (1975). They further stated:

The JDI items were written in check-list form, balanced in the number of favorable and unfavorable items, and item-analyzed against the extent to which each item discriminated between the jobs which each worker indicated as best or worst for himself, as well as against the total score for each scale. (p. 150)

The check list format allows for use of the questionnaires across all levels of education. The completion time is short and the JDI is applicable to a wide variety of content areas.

To establish convergent validity, in terms of high agreement with other scales, the authors constructed the measures with a different format. Convergent validity of each separate scale in relation to other measures of the same characteristic was established. Cross-validation and generalization designs were used throughout. The authors took these steps in an effort to permit greater sensitivity, discriminability, and usefulness.

Data Collection Process

After the population was identified by the researcher, each teacher and his/her respective administrator was personally contacted by the researcher. A confirming letter, assuring confidentiality of findings, followed. The self-evaluation forms were delivered during the first week of November 1982 and returned by
December 1, 1982. The administrative surveys were delivered December 1, 1982, and returned by December 8, 1982. This researcher scored, tabulated, recorded, and prepared all data for computer processing.

Hypotheses

For the purpose of this research study, four hypotheses were generated and tested. Following are the four research hypotheses along with their corresponding null hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1:** There is a positive relationship between the TPI and success of elementary teachers as measured by administrative ratings, $\rho > 0$. $H_0$: There is no relationship between the TPI and success of elementary teachers as measured by administrative ratings, $\rho = 0$.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is a positive relationship between the TPI and success of secondary teachers as measured by administrative ratings, $\rho > 0$. $H_0$: There is no relationship between the TPI and success of secondary teachers as measured by administrative ratings, $\rho = 0$.

**Hypothesis 3:** There is a positive relationship between the TPI and success of elementary teachers as measured by teacher satisfaction, $\rho > 0$. $H_0$: There is no relationship between the TPI and success of elementary teachers as measured by teacher satisfaction, $\rho = 0$.

**Hypothesis 4:** There is a positive relationship between the TPI and success of secondary teachers as measured by teacher satisfaction,
$\rho > 0$. $H_0$: There is no relationship between the TPI and success of secondary teachers as measured by teacher satisfaction, $\rho = 0$.

Analysis

The basic design for this research study was a correlational design. Null Hypotheses 1 through 4 were tested for the degree of relationship between the two variables in each hypothesis by using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Each null hypothesis considers the TPI score with either administrative ratings or self-satisfaction ratings. Correlations were drawn relative to these variables and whether the teacher is employed in an elementary or secondary position. Each null hypothesis was tested using an alpha level of .05.

Additionally, means, standard deviations, and frequencies were found relative to the TPI, JDI, AS, and demographic information such as age, sex, hire date, teaching experience, and level taught. Information such as the TPI score, age, sex, date of hire, teaching experience, and the level that is taught was obtained from the personnel file of each respondent included in this study. The Administrative Survey score for each respondent was obtained from the survey that was completed by each respondent's immediate supervisor. The JDI score was obtained by having each respondent complete the five-section JDI instrument. All the data that were collected were formatted and computerized for analysis using the Statistical Package for the Social Services (SPSS) program.
The purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship exists between the teacher interview process used in the Chippewa Valley School System and teacher success in the classroom. To determine teacher success, a self-evaluation satisfaction instrument was completed by each respondent and each respondent's immediate supervisor completed an administrative evaluation about the respondent. Each of the scores obtained on these instruments were then correlated to the Teacher Perceiver Interview (TPI) score attained by the teacher at the time of hire.

This chapter will first describe the demographic information of the respondents in this study. Secondly, the results of the correlations that were found in this study will be presented as related to the four null hypotheses in question.

Demographic Analysis of Respondents

A total of 50 teachers were included in this study. Twenty-one teachers were categorized as elementary while the remaining 29 were categorized as secondary.

Age

Ages of elementary teachers ranged from 25 years to 46 years with a mean age of 34.1 years. Ages of secondary teachers ranged
from 24 years to 49 years with a mean age of 32.2 years. Thus, on average, the elementary teachers involved in this study were approximately 2 years older than the secondary teachers. Mean ages of respondents are found in Table 1.

Number of Months Employed

Table 1 reports the number of months each respondent was employed by the district as of the time of this study. This was determined through review of the respondent's personnel file. Elementary teachers ranged from 24 months to 46 months with a mean of 31.2 months. Secondary teachers ranged from 12 months to 43 months with a mean of 29.8 months. Thus, on average, the elementary respondents were employed approximately 1.4 months longer than the secondary respondents at the time of this study.

Years of Experience Prior to Hire

The elementary respondents ranged from 0 years to 12 years of previous teaching experience prior to being hired in Chippewa Valley. The mean was 1.8 years. The secondary teachers ranged from 0 years to 22 years with a mean of 4.3 years of experience. These data are reported in Table 1. Thus, on average, the secondary teachers in this study had 2.5 more years of teaching experience than the elementary teachers had prior to being hired in Chippewa Valley.
Table 1
Demographic Statistics of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Elementary Mean</th>
<th>Secondary Mean</th>
<th>Elementary SD</th>
<th>Secondary SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months employed at time of study</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience prior to hire in Chippewa Valley (years)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Male-Female Breakdown

Elementary respondents numbered 21 with 19 female and two male. The secondary respondents numbered 29 with 18 female and 11 male. It is interesting to note the predominance of female respondents in both categories as presented in Table 2. Sixty-two percent of the secondary respondents were female and 90% of the elementary respondents were female.

Table 2
Male-Female Breakdown of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Elementary frequency</th>
<th>Secondary frequency</th>
<th>Elementary %</th>
<th>Secondary %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Demographic Analysis

Overall, the respondents in this study were between 24 and 49 years of age. The 21 elementary respondents' average age was about 2 years greater than the average age of the 29 secondary respondents. The respondents were employed in the district between 12 and 46 months at the time of this study. Those respondents categorized as elementary were employed an average of 1.4 months longer than secondary respondents. Prior teaching experience ranged from 0 to 22 years with secondary teachers averaging 2.5 more years of experience over elementary. Of the 50 respondents, 37 were female and 13 were male with 90% female in elementary and 62% in secondary.

Survey Results

This section will discuss the results obtained through the use of three instruments, the TPI, JDI, and AS. These results are presented in Table 3. A relative comparison of meaning to these scores for the purpose of this study is also presented.

Teacher Perceiver Interview

A potential TPI score for both elementary and secondary teachers may fall between 0 and 60. The mean TPI scores found in this research, as shown in Table 3, were 27.7 for elementary and 24.0 for secondary teachers. Therefore, on average, elementary teachers scored approximately 3.7 points higher on the TPI than the secondary teachers. Compared to nationally normed data reported in the
Teacher Perceiver Technical Report (SRI, 1978b), the mean TPI score for elementary teachers in this research is approximately 2.1 points higher than SRI's reported mean of 25.6. SRI's reported mean for secondary teachers is 24.7 which indicated that, on average, the secondary teachers in this study scored approximately .7 of one point below SRI's reported mean.

Table 3
Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Elementary Mean</th>
<th>Secondary Mean</th>
<th>Elementary SD</th>
<th>Secondary SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Perceiver Interview</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Descriptive Index</td>
<td>160.2</td>
<td>171.3</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Survey</td>
<td>155.1</td>
<td>166.9</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job Descriptive Index

The cumulative score a respondent might have achieved on the total JDI instrument fell between 0 and 270. The statistically expected score for a balanced satisfaction attitude according to the authors of the JDI is 135. It is interesting to note in Table 3 that in this research, the elementary mean score was 160 while the secondary mean score was 171. Hence, on average, the secondary teachers scored 11 points higher than the elementary teachers in self-evaluating their level of job satisfaction. Furthermore, the
mean scores for both the elementary and secondary teachers in this study are considered to fall in the "very satisfied" range relative to the expected balanced score of 135.

Administrative Survey

The AS utilized in this research allowed the respondent to acquire a score between 36 and 180. Based on the score received, this instrument categorized success levels of teachers in one of four categories; 36-72 points = low success; 73-108 = average success; 109-144 = above average success; 145-180 = superior success. Table 3 points out in this research that the elementary teachers achieved a mean of 155 while the secondary teachers achieved a mean of 167. Thus, on average, the secondary administrators ranked their teachers approximately 12 points higher in terms of achieving success on the job over the elementary administrator's rankings of elementary teachers. Based on the mean scores achieved, the teachers involved in this study were considered to have experienced superior success on the job as determined by their administrators.

Statistical Results of Hypotheses Testing

The analysis in this study included four null hypotheses. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to determine if a positive relationship existed in each hypothesis utilizing an alpha level of .05. Each null hypothesis was written as an explanation of the equation $H_0: \rho = 0$. 
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Hypothesis 1

Null Hypothesis 1 stated that the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between the TPI and success of elementary teachers as measured by the Administrative Survey is zero. Table 4 shows a correlation coefficient of .46 for this hypothesis. With this correlation coefficient, \( p = .02 \) which indicates that this null hypothesis can be rejected since alpha was set at .05. With \( r^2 \) equal to .21, this research is able to account for 21% of the variance explained. This research concludes that Research Hypothesis 1 can be accepted.

Table 4

Summary of Correlation Analysis for Elementary and Secondary Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Ele. N</th>
<th>Sec. N</th>
<th>Ele. r</th>
<th>Sec. r</th>
<th>Ele. ( r^2 )</th>
<th>Sec. ( r^2 )</th>
<th>Ele. ( p )</th>
<th>Sec. ( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Perceiver Interview and Job Descriptive Index</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Perceiver Interview and Administrative Survey</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05.
Hypothesis 2

Null Hypothesis 2 states that the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between the TPI and success of secondary teachers as measured by the Administrative Survey is zero. Table 4 indicates that a correlation coefficient of -.12 was found for this relationship. With this correlation coefficient, $p = .27$ which indicates that this research fails to reject Null Hypothesis 2 since alpha was set at .05. Therefore, there is not enough evidence to accept Research Hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 3

The third null hypothesis tested in this study stated that the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between the TPI and success of elementary teachers as measured by teacher satisfaction is zero. The results of this correlation are shown in Table 4 and reveal a correlation coefficient of .39. With this correlation coefficient, $p = .04$ which indicates that this null hypothesis can be rejected since alpha was set at .05. With $r^2$ equal to .15, this research is able to account for 15% of the variance explained. This research concludes that Research Hypothesis 3 can be accepted.

Hypothesis 4

Null Hypothesis 4 states that the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between the TPI and success of secondary teachers as measured by teacher satisfaction is zero. The results of
this correlation are shown in Table 4 and indicate that a correlation coefficient of .10 was found. With this correlation coefficient, \( \rho = .31 \) which indicates that this research fails to reject Null Hypothesis 4 since alpha was set at .05. Therefore, there is not enough evidence to accept Research Hypothesis 4.

Summary

This chapter included all relevant statistical analyses germane to this study. The statistical data characterized the relationships between the TPI and JDI as well as the TPI and the AS. This relationship was further analyzed between elementary and secondary teaching levels. To test these relationships, Pearson product-moment correlations were performed between the variables.

Demographic information was collected relative to each respondent. These data, found in Tables 1 and 2, were collected in order to establish the characteristics of the respondents in this study. Further analyses, or future related research, may utilize these data for comparative purposes.

The findings of this study revealed that Research Hypotheses 1 and 3 can be accepted with alpha at .05. Research Hypotheses 2 and 4 cannot be accepted or rejected with alpha at .05.

Chapter V will summarize the purpose of this study, discuss the results in practical terms, summarize conclusions, discuss implications for further study, and offer recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter will be divided into four sections. First, a general overview of the purpose of this study as it relates to practical usage for any agency interested in the hiring of teachers. Secondly, this chapter will discuss each of the four hypotheses that were tested in this research study and relate the results to practical application. Thirdly, conclusions will be drawn relative to the results found in testing the four hypotheses. Lastly, implications for further study will be discussed and recommendations for utilizing the results of this study, presently and in the future, will be offered.

General Summary of Purpose

The need for quality teachers in education is greater now than ever before. Selecting a teacher that will provide this quality and who will prove to be successful in the classroom is the single most difficult task for the personnel selection administrator. Much research has been conducted in an effort to find an instrument and a process that will help the personnel administrator make accurate decisions and selections.

The Chippewa Valley School System has utilized a teacher selection process for 4 years. This process was developed by Selection Research Incorporated and is called the Teacher Perceiver Interview.
(TPI). Its purported value as a predictor of teacher success in the classroom is the focus of this research effort.

Since the research literature clearly supports the need for quality teachers and a process in which to select them, it was logical to investigate whether or not the process used in our school district was actually resulting in placing successful teachers in our classrooms. Stated in question form, one would ask, does the process work and is it worth continuing?

To determine an answer to this question, this researcher used two instruments to determine the degree of success each subject has achieved. One of the instruments was a job satisfaction instrument called the Job Descriptive Index. This highly validated instrument was used to determine the level of teacher satisfaction. Utilization of a "satisfaction level" score for use in this study was premised on the theoretical basis that higher levels of job satisfaction generally allow for and indicate a higher degree of job success. The other instrument used in this research was the Administrative Survey. This instrument was validated in an earlier local study by Cook (1981) and is used for the purpose of establishing a success rating of a teacher as perceived by the teacher's immediate supervisor. This success rating is determined by the degree to which the subject teacher carries out and fulfills specific job requirements and expectations.

The scores attained by each subject teacher on these two instruments were then related to the TPI score the subject received at the time of hire. From these relationships it was then possible to
determine whether or not the TPI actually predicted, or helped predict, the degree of success the subject would experience on the job.

This degree of predictability would be beneficial to our school district, and to other similar agencies, because it would help us focus our efforts in the selection process toward the most beneficial procedures in terms of attaining the highest quality people in the most cost efficient manner.

Discussion of Results

For the purpose of investigating and testing each research hypothesis, the corresponding null hypothesis was stated in terms of a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Relationships between the TPI and the AS and the TPI and the JDI were separated for elementary and secondary teachers because SRI has conducted its research in this manner. A discussion of each hypothesis follows:

Hypothesis 1

This research hypothesis revealed that a relationship between the TPI score and the AS score for elementary teachers was supported. Since a relationship does exist, the results suggest that it would be reasonable to expect higher administrative ratings and higher success on the job from those teacher candidates who attain high TPI scores compared to those candidates who attain lower TPI scores. The results indicate to the personnel selection administrator that consideration of the TPI should be given when selecting an elementary teacher from several candidates since the higher the TPI score
is, the more likely the candidate will experience success on the job.

Hypothesis 2

Research Hypothesis 2 examined the same relationship as described in Research Hypothesis 1 except that it analyzed this relationship for secondary teachers rather than elementary teachers. The results of this analysis failed to support that a relationship exists between the TPI and the AS score. Since this research hypothesis was not supported, we are unable to determine if the TPI has any predictive value in determining future success of secondary teachers. It should be noted that the TPI score might be valuable and might relate to teacher success; however, this study did not demonstrate support for this relationship. Therefore, based on the relationship found between the variables that were selected for analysis, the use of this instrument could not be supported when considering the selection of a teacher for a secondary position.

Hypothesis 3

Research Hypothesis 3 examined the relationship between the TPI score and the JDI score for elementary teachers. The results support that a relationship does exist between these two variables. With this relationship, it is reasonable to believe that the higher the TPI score is prior to hiring an elementary candidate, the higher the level of job satisfaction the candidate will achieve on the job. Because the research literature clearly states that high job
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satisfaction is essential to high job success, it, therefore, is important to consider the TPI-JDI relationship when hiring elementary teachers if the desired outcome is teacher success on the job.

Hypothesis 4

Research Hypothesis 4 examined the same relationship as described in Research Hypothesis 3 except it investigated the relationship for secondary rather than elementary teachers. The results of this analysis do not support an existing relationship between the TPI score and the JDI score. Since a relationship is not supported, it is not possible to determine if the TPI has any predictive value in determining future satisfaction and success of teachers. This is not to say that the TPI does not have any value in making this determination. Based on this study, this relationship is not supported; therefore, the use of this instrument could not be supported when attempting to determine future satisfaction/success of secondary teachers.

Conclusions

Relationships between the TPI and the two instruments used to determine a degree of teacher success, the JDI and the AS, do indeed exist for elementary teachers but were not supported for secondary teachers. These relationships suggest that the TPI scores for elementary candidates would be helpful in determining future on the job success. Furthermore, the higher the TPI score was prior to hire, the higher the probability would be that the success level would
also be higher after the person was working.

This relationship is consistent with research findings of Coker et al. (1978), Jones (1978), Preuss (1972), Schilling (1975), Simmons (1976), and Stoudner (1978). Results from research conducted by these people suggest that some degree of relationship exists between the TPI and teacher success. Each of these studies, however, bases its results on TPI data and job success data concurrently collected. This research measured present day success and related that measure to the predictive score attained at the time of hire.

Relationships between the TPI and the JDI and between the TPI and the AS with secondary teachers suggest little or no value in using the TPI to predict future on the job success. The TPI does not necessarily have any useful benefit when hiring secondary teachers. This study does not reveal a relationship between the two variables. More information is needed and greater analysis would have to be conducted to determine if a beneficial relationship exists.

Lasher (1976) also determined inconclusive results using secondary teachers and concluded that more study would be needed to determine levels of teacher success with secondary teachers. Furthermore, in the Teacher Perceiver Technical Report (SRI, 1978b), the authors emphasize that the TPI instrument may not be valid in every school district and under all conditions. The report suggests that local districts undertake validation studies in their own districts to determine a degree of local validity.
Implications for Further Study and Recommendations

The relationship found in this study between the TPI and teacher success for elementary teachers may be partially attributed to the fact that the pool of candidates available for elementary positions is most often much larger than the available candidate pool for secondary positions. Hence, it is possible that the lack of a relationship between the TPI and teacher success for secondary teachers may exist in this study because some of the candidates chosen to fill secondary teaching positions were chosen from candidate pools that were very small in number. The nature of certain secondary teaching positions often warrants specialized qualifications. As qualifications are increased, the quantity of candidates decreases. Therefore, it is possible that the TPI selection process may break down when the highest scoring candidate is chosen from a very small and restricted group of candidates and there are no other candidates to choose from. The result may then be that the best candidate for future success is chosen, but their potential success level is much less than desired or than that of other comparable teachers.

A lack of candidates rarely exists for elementary positions; hence, the scope of selection is broader and the selector has a greater opportunity to scrutinize qualifications and make the best choice.

Another implication as to why differences exist between elementary and secondary candidates is the fact that several different
interviewers were involved during the hiring process. While the
interview training process does standardize the interviewer's per-
ceptions to a large degree, a level of subjectivity remains in the
process, thus, leaving the opportunity open for the interviewer to
insert personal values and desires.

District philosophy, curriculum requirements, building expecta-
tions, rules, and similar such factors may also cause the inter-
viewer to place less importance on certain components in the TPI.
Such judgments would invalidate certain portions of the instrument
and suggest another reason why this study found different results
between the elementary and secondary teaching levels.

Additionally, nearly 22% of the accessible population chose not
to participate in this study. This researcher was unable to estab-
lish the existence of a common element or reason as to why these
members of the population chose not to participate in the study.
Because of this fact, it is not possible to speculate whether par-
ticipation of these people would have affected the results of this
study in any way. It is recommended that similar studies conducted
in the future would attempt to obtain data from all members of the
accessible population.

The Chippewa Valley School District should review its usage of
the TPI when using it to determine potential future success of sec-
ondary teaching candidates. No relationship exists between the TPI
and the JDI or the TPI and the AS for secondary teachers in this
study. Yet, our teachers were judged to have achieved a relatively
high degree of success on the job. Therefore, the district should
attempt to determine if another kind of relationship is present. Perhaps a relationship would exist between the TPI and a different instrument which is designed to measure success on the job. Perhaps, too, portions or subscores of the TPI could be found to relate to portions or subscores of either the JDI and/or the AS.

The Chippewa Valley School District should continue to utilize the TPI as an indicator of potential teacher success for elementary positions. It is not recommended that the TPI becomes the sole criterion in the determination of the elementary candidate selection. This is due partly to the fact that the TPI does not measure every necessary attribute needed for a particular job. Secondly, the relationships of the TPI to the AS and the JDI, as outlined in Table 4, indicate that relationships have been observed; however, the degree of these relationships are not high enough to assure that they will always exist.

It is further recommended to utilize this study as a basis for future study in the same general area of concern. Similar studies using similar and nonsimilar demographic data would be useful in determining the reliability of this study. Also, a follow-up study that would measure the job success of persons hired through the means of the TPI over a period of years, would be beneficial in determining the long term predictability of the TPI.
Appendix A

Cover Letter to Solicit Volunteer Teachers
November 1982

Dear

I am requesting your help in my research project. The intent of this project is to determine if the selection interview presently used in the Chippewa Valley Schools actually measures what it is intended to measure. I am requesting the following from you:

1. Permission to review your personnel file and collect information relative to your interview score, date of hire, past experience, certification, sex, and age.

2. Permission for your immediate supervisor to complete an Administrative Survey about you (sample enclosed).

3. That you would complete the enclosed Job Descriptive Index pamphlet of questions and return it to me by December 1, 1982, in the enclosed envelope (via school mail) along with your signature of approval on this letter.

I assure you that all information will be kept strictly confidential. Upon completion of this research the results will be made available to you. Please sign the bottom of this letter and return it in the enclosed envelope with the Job Descriptive Index pamphlet. Feel free to contact me at Fox School should you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you for participating and lending your cooperation toward this effort.

Sincerely,

Richard J. Zaranek

I hereby grant permission to Richard J. Zaranek to review my personnel file for the purpose of obtaining information relative to this research effort and to allow my immediate supervisor to complete an Administrative Survey questionnaire about me.

Signature ___________________________ Date _____________

COPY
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Appendix B

Cover Letter for Administrative Participation
Dear (Administrator)

Thank you for your assistance with this research project. You are helping me determine the extent of the relationship between the Teacher Perceiver Interview Process and teacher success.

I ask you to complete one of the enclosed administrative rating forms for each of the teachers listed below. Please evaluate each teacher independently without comparing one to another. These forms are requested to be returned to me in the enclosed envelope by ______________. All evaluation data will be kept in strict confidence.

Please complete one administrative rating form for:

1. ______________________________________

2. ______________________________________

3. ______________________________________

I thank you for your assistance once again. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Richard J. Zaranek
Appendix C

Administrative Survey Form
ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY

Teacher ____________________________

Subject Matter Taught: ____________________________

DIRECTIONS: The purpose of this survey is to obtain your assessment of this teacher. There are no right or wrong answers. Your responses will be used for this study only. Please read each item carefully and circle the response which indicates your level of agreement. Use the following code:

SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; U = Undecided; A = Agree
SA = Strongly Agree

Circle One

SD D U A SA 1. This teacher believes education is important.
SD D U A SA 2. This teacher enjoys teaching.
SD D U A SA 3. This teacher knows what she/he is doing and why.
SD D U A SA 4. This teacher is friendly and sympathetic to students.
SD D U A SA 5. This teacher knows and understands his/her students.
SD D U A SA 6. This teacher is empathetic with his/her students.
SD D U A SA 7. This teacher uses good judgment in interpersonal relationships with students and colleagues.
SD D U A SA 8. Pupils show a respect for this teacher.
SD D U A SA 9. This teacher respects each student.
SD D U A SA 10. This teacher attempts to individualize instruction.
SD D U A SA 11. This teacher is alert to pupil's special needs.
SD D U A SA 12. This teacher has pupils help set their own goals.
SD D U A SA 13. This teacher listens well to students and colleagues.
SD D U A SA 14. Students discuss personal concerns with this teacher.
SD D U A SA 15. This teacher enjoys listening to students.
SD D U A SA 16. This teacher wants his students to succeed.
SD D U A SA 17. This teacher is happy when his/her students are successful.
SD D U A SA 18. This teacher does not give up on students.
SD D U A SA 19. This teacher wants to improve himself/herself.
SD D U A SA 20. This teacher attempts to improve instruction through innovative teaching techniques.
SD D U A SA 21. This teacher supplements his/her textbooks with additional materials from outside of school.
SD D U A SA 22. This teacher uses many different techniques to aid student learning.
SD D U A SA 23. This teacher tries to motivate all students.
SD D U A SA 24. This teacher exhibits and shares a healthy sense of humor.
SD D U A SA 25. This teacher is innovative.
SD D U A SA 26. This teacher uses a variety of techniques and materials.
SD D U A SA 27. This teacher provides for and encourages pupil's creativity.
SD D U A SA 28. This teacher is well organized.
SD D U A SA 29. This teacher gets his/her reports done on time.
SD D U A SA 30. This teacher is reliable in meeting responsibilities in the classroom and the total school.
SD D U A SA 31. Students view this teacher as fair.
SD D U A SA 32. This teacher is fair in dealing with students.
SD D U A SA 33. This teacher does not jump to conclusions.
SD D U A SA 34. This teacher will probably always be a teacher.
SD D U A SA 35. This teacher has goals for himself/herself.
SD D U A SA 36. This teacher is trying to improve his/her teaching.


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reavis, C., & Mehaffie, S. Staff recruitment and inservice development in smaller schools. *NAASP Bulletin, 64*(438), 32-35.


Sanbery, J. How schoolmen can recruit teachers more effectively. *Nation's Schools*, May 1969, pp. 80-81.


Simmons, J. E. A study to test the teacher perceiver interview as an instrument that would select vocational agriculture instructors that develop rapport with their students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1976.


Weaver, W. T. In search of quality: The need for talent in teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 1979, 61, 29-46.

Weldy, G. Principals are instructional leaders: Its a fact—not a myth. NAASP Bulletin, 1979, 63(438), 71-76.