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The major purposes of this study were to describe the recruitment practices of the public school divisions in Virginia and to examine the relationship between recruitment sources used in Chesapeake Public Schools and four measures of personnel effectiveness (retention rates, job performance, job satisfaction, and attendance of teachers). Data were collected using three questionnaires designed for the study, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, and archival records maintained by Chesapeake Public Schools. Information was solicited from the superintendents or chief personnel officers of the 133 public school divisions in the Commonwealth of Virginia and from teachers hired in Chesapeake Public Schools between 1989 and 1993, inclusively.

Data related to the recruitment practices of Virginia school divisions were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Data related to recruitment source effectiveness were analyzed using chi-square tests and analyses of variance.
Study findings indicated that most Virginia school systems do not have written policies addressing teacher recruitment or a plan for regularly evaluating the recruitment process. In addition, most use traditional methods of recruiting such as campus recruitment and recruitment brochures and provide little or no training for recruiters. No statistical difference was found in the retention rates, job performance, job satisfaction, or attendance rates of teachers who were recruited from different sources. Results of this study suggest that school systems need to carefully evaluate their recruitment efforts to determine if their recruitment goals are being met.
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CHAPTER 1
The Problem

Introduction

Many writers have cited the significant positive relationship between staffing (recruitment, selection, induction, and development of personnel) and school effectiveness, especially as it relates to teachers (Castetter, 1992; Erickson & Shinn, 1977; Jensen, 1987; Lipsett, Rodgers, & Kentner, 1972; Renner, 1985; Schneider, 1976; Webb, Montello, & Norton, 1994). Erickson and Shinn summarized the significance of poor staffing decisions in education by pointing out that not only do bad decisions result in poor use of public funds, but more importantly, when poor staffing decisions are made, "children are the focus because they can suffer irretrievable damage if deprived of the best teachers available" (p. 3). Renner further emphasized the significance of good school staffing decisions when he concluded, "The quality of a teacher . . . is the single most important determinant of what students learn in a classroom" (p. 36).

Staff quality is not a new issue in education. As early as 1882, J. M. Blass, superintendent of public instruction in the state of Indiana, wrote in his report to the governor:
Our children must be taught by competent teachers. If it be the good teacher who makes the good school, and this is undoubtedly true, it must follow that if we are to have better schools in Indiana we must have better teachers.

(Webb et al., 1994, p. 150)

More recently, 85% of the respondents to the 1991 Gallup Poll on public education listed the quality of the teaching staff as a factor that they would consider in selecting a public school for their children. In addition, the difficulty in hiring good teachers was cited as the biggest problem facing schools today (Webb et al.).

Staffing schools with quality teachers apparently will remain a significant issue in the near future. The U.S. Department of Education has determined that between 1994 and the year 2000 an estimated 1,375,000 new teachers will be needed in the nation's schools. The National Center for Education projects that the supply of new teachers will fall short of this demand by approximately 40% in the year 2000. The Center also predicts that even in those areas where there will be enough teachers, the quality will be limited (Webb et al., 1994).

Schneider (1976) defined staffing as "the processes involved in identifying, assessing, placing, evaluating, and developing individuals at work" (p. 3). Castetter (1992)
described the staffing process as including recruitment, selection, induction, and development. Two parts of the staffing process, recruitment and selection, are identified in the literature as the most important tasks performed not only by school systems but also by other organizations (Anderson, 1992; Castetter, 1992; Jensen, 1987; Phillips, 1987).

Recruitment refers to those activities of the organization which are designed to attract potential applicants who can carry out the work of the organization (Castetter, 1992; Erickson & Shinn, 1977; Lipsett et al., 1972). Castetter identified the recruitment and selection process as "the foremost and perhaps most challenging problem of any organization" (p. 111), while Phillips (1987) described effective recruitment and selection practices as essential to the survival of an organization.

Clearly school districts increase their odds of hiring the best teachers when they seek to increase their pool of applicants through recruitment. A large number of applicants is advantageous, because it allows those doing the hiring to be more selective than they could be otherwise (Williams & Dreher, 1992). Aggressive recruiting becomes even more important when teachers are needed for urban or rural settings, when teachers are needed for high-demand or specialized subject areas, or when teachers are needed to meet the demands of rising enrollments (Jensen, 1987).
Most of the research on recruitment is concentrated in the fields of business and industry. Research in these fields has focused primarily on such independent variables as the behavior or characteristics of the recruiter, recruitment sources, and recruitment policies and procedures and such dependent variables as pre-hire and post-hire outcomes. The pre-hire outcomes (applicant impressions of recruiters, perceived job or organizational attractiveness, intentions to pursue job offers, expectancies of receiving job offers, and actual job choices) have been studied as measures of the effectiveness of recruitment practices (Powell, 1984; Rynes, Bretz, & Gerhart, 1991; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987) or in relation to recruiter behavior and characteristics (Harris & Fink, 1987; Maurer, Howe, & Lee, 1992; Powell, 1991; Rogers & Sincoff, 1978; Rynes & Miller, 1983; Turban & Dougherty, 1992). The post-hire outcomes (job satisfaction, commitment, performance, and turnover/retention) have most frequently been studied as measures of recruitment source effectiveness (Breaugh, 1981; Caldwell & Spivey, 1983; Decker & Cornelius, 1979; Gannon, 1971; Kirnan, Farley, & Geisinger, 1989; Swaroff, Barclay, & Bass, 1985; Taylor & Schmidt, 1983).

The significance of recruitment as it relates to the staffing process and to school effectiveness has been well established in the literature (Anderson, 1992; Castetter, 1981, 1992; Cox 1981; Erickson & Shinn, 1977; Jensen, 1987;
Lipsett et al., 1972; Renner, 1985; Schneider, 1976; Stanton, 1977; Webb et al., 1994). A review of the extant research in education, however, reveals that few studies have been conducted on recruitment as it relates to teacher selection and appointment. Those studies that have been completed are primarily descriptive studies of the recruitment practices of school systems in one or more states or geographic regions (Blankenship, 1970; Deweese, 1987/1988; G'Fellers, 1992/1993; Nuckolls, 1993/1994; Schleicher, 1989/1990; Vanderheiden, 1981/1982; Wollman, 1987/1988). In addition, many journal articles are available that recommend specific recruiting practices (Anderson, 1992; Burnside, 1987; Cox 1981; Engelking, 1987; Fielder, 1993; Grier, 1993; Halcrow, 1988; Harmon, 1987; Kolze, 1988; Lazares, 1988; Lewis, 1992; McGrath, 1984; Reavis & Mehaffie, 1980; Renner, 1985; Seifert & Kurtz, 1983; Snyder, 1987; Stoddart, 1991; Stone, 1990). Actual research on effective practices, however, is limited to a few major studies such as those conducted by Wise, Darling-Hammond, and Berry (1987) and Steuteville-Brodinsky, Burbank, and Harrison (1989).

Statement of the Problem

Recruitment is recognized as a significant part of a school system's staffing process; therefore, it is essential that studies be conducted which add to the literature describing recruitment practices. This is especially true
in Virginia where the only comprehensive study of recruitment practices was completed as part of a master's degree thesis in 1970 (Blankenship, 1970). In addition, if the primary goal of selection is to match individuals to jobs within the organization, then hiring follow-up studies should be conducted to determine if this goal is being achieved. Such studies involve analyzing the relationship between recruitment sources and employee success. Follow-up studies on the topic of hiring appear to be almost non-existent in the education literature.

This study will have two major purposes: (a) to describe the recruitment practices of the public school systems in Virginia and (b) to examine the relationship between recruitment sources (i.e., the means by which individuals are attracted to or referred to an organization for possible employment) used in Chesapeake Public Schools and measures of personnel effectiveness: specifically, retention rates, job performance, job satisfaction, and attendance of teachers employed in Chesapeake between 1989 and 1993, inclusively.

Research Question for Phase I - Identification of Recruitment Practices of Public School Systems in Virginia

I.1. What are the predominant practices that guide the recruitment process in Virginia public school divisions?
Research Hypotheses for Phase II - Relationship Between Recruitment Sources and Measures of Personnel Effectiveness

II.1. There is a significant difference (p<.05) in the retention rates of teachers in Chesapeake Public Schools with employment dates of 1989, 1990, 1992, and 1993 as determined by the recruitment source of the teachers: Career Commitment recruiting, other campus recruiting, all other sources.

II.2. There is a significant difference (p<.05) in the job performance of teachers who were recruited from different sources and who were employed in Chesapeake Public Schools between 1989 and 1993, inclusively.

II.3. There is a significant difference (p<.05) in the job satisfaction of teachers who were recruited from different sources and who were employed in Chesapeake Public Schools between 1989 and 1993, inclusively.

II.4. There is a significant difference (p<.05) in the attendance rates of teachers who were recruited from different sources and who were employed in Chesapeake Public Schools between 1989 and 1993, inclusively.

Theoretical Rationale

Employment of personnel is a matching process which results from decision-making by both the organization and the individual job seeker. The organization, through recruitment and selection, communicates job openings, attracts potential applicants, evaluates applicants, and
makes job offers. The individual identifies organizations as potential employers, makes inquiries, files applications, participates in the screening process, evaluates employers, and accepts job offers. The primary measure of effectiveness of the employment process, at least from the organization's perspective, is the degree to which the employee meets the needs of the organization. The consequence of a poor match is poor job performance. A second measure of effectiveness is the degree to which the organization meets the needs of the employee. In this case, the consequences of a poor match are lack of commitment and low job satisfaction (Schwab, 1982; Taylor & Schmidt, 1983; Wanous, 1980).

Organizational and Individual Balance

Schneider (1976) defined recruitment as "the organization's attempt to satisfy organizational needs by showing how the organization can satisfy human needs" (p. 96). This definition puts recruitment into the context of an organizational system in which the needs of the organization must be balanced with the needs of the individual in order for both to succeed. A recruitment program, therefore, should be concerned not only with identifying people the company needs but also with ensuring that these people, once hired, will be satisfied with and committed to the organization.
One of the earliest theorists to envision the organization as a system in which the satisfaction of both individual and organizational needs was necessary for success was Chester Barnard. Barnard termed the fulfillment of the goals of the organization "effectiveness" and satisfaction of individual needs "efficiency" (Morphet, Johns, & Reller, 1967).

Getzels and Guba later developed a social systems model with a theoretical framework similar to that established by Barnard. The Getzels-Guba Social Systems Model postulates that social behavior (B) in an organization is a function of the nomothetic dimension or normative dimension of activity in an organization (R) and the idiographic or personal dimension of activity in the same organization (P); therefore, \( B = f (R \times P) \). The nomothetic dimension is representative of the institutional role (position, office, or status in the institution) and is defined by role expectations and the nature of the organization. The idiographic dimension is representative of the individual in the organization and is defined by the individual's personality and needs disposition (Morphet et al., 1967; Webb et al., 1994). When the two dimensions are in balance, the actual behavior outcomes will be positive for both the organization and the individual.

Theoretically, the outcome of teacher recruitment should be the employment of personnel whose personal needs
and expectations will be in congruence with the role expectations and needs of the school system. As was summarized by Webb et al. (1994),

The maximization of human resources within the school system requires a meaningful integration of the system's goals and the employees' need-dispositions. When these considerations are brought into relatively close congruence, achievement of goals and personal fulfillment are more likely to be realized. (p. 219)

Differential Source Effectiveness

Research in the fields of business and industry indicates that the degree of effectiveness of the employment process (the degree to which there is a good match between individual and organization) may vary according to the recruitment source (Breaugh, 1981; Caldwell & Spivey, 1983; Decker & Cornelius, 1979; Gannon, 1971; Kirnan et al., 1989; Swaroff et al., 1985; Taylor & Schmidt, 1983). Two theories addressing the causes of differential source effectiveness are identified in the literature: (a) the realistic information hypothesis and (b) the individual difference hypothesis (Breaugh, 1981; Breaugh & Mann, 1984; Kirnan et al., 1989; Quaglieri, 1982; Schwab, 1982; Taylor & Schmidt, 1983).

The realistic information hypothesis suggests that using recruitment sources which provide more accurate
information about the job will result in employees who perform better, are more committed to the organization, and achieve greater job satisfaction (Breaugh & Mann, 1984; Quaglieri, 1982; Taylor & Schmidt, 1983). When the potential employee receives realistic information prior to making the decision to join the organization, a better match may result for the following reasons:

1. Applicants are able to evaluate their own abilities and needs in relation to the needs and need-fulfilling characteristics of the organization. The realistic preview of information serves as a screening device for those individuals who would find the job unacceptable and who would later resign.

2. Once hired, employees may feel a greater commitment to the decision to join the organization. Individuals who are aware of the expectations prior to employment and voluntarily make the employment decision may be more committed to making the match work.

3. New employees who are fully aware of the job situation are better able to cope with job frustration. Employees who have realistic expectations for the job are more likely to be satisfied with the job and are less likely to be disillusioned (Ilgen & Seely, 1974; Taylor & Schmidt, 1983; Wanous, 1980).

The individual difference hypothesis predicts that recruitment sources will vary in effectiveness because they
reach different populations (Breaugh, 1981; Taylor & Schmidt, 1983). Because of the varying levels of education or other requirements needed for specific occupations, some recruitment sources may be more appropriate than others. For example, the population reached through employee referrals, walk-ins, high schools, and public employment services may be more appropriate for office/clerical or plant/service personnel. Private agencies and colleges/universities may be more appropriate sources from which to recruit professional/management and technical personnel.

Research conducted by Schwab (1982) suggested that organizations should conduct hiring follow-up studies to determine from which populations employees who are most successful on the job are selected. Organizations should then focus their recruitment efforts on sources identified as having a similar population.

Significance of the Study

The relationship between teacher effectiveness and school effectiveness has been established in the literature. Renner (1985), along with many other educators, has cited the quality of the teacher as "the single most important determinant of what students learn in a classroom" (p. 36). According to Cox (1981), "Research on school effectiveness for the last 75 years indicates the key role that teachers play in providing effective schooling" (p. 3).
Selecting and employing competent teachers requires attracting those teachers to the system as applicants. Attracting personnel who will not only meet the needs of the organization but who will be satisfied with and committed to the organization is the purpose of recruitment. Castetter (1992) summarized the vital role of effective teacher recruitment programs as follows:

Research has demonstrated that well-designed recruiting programs result in greater employee commitment, higher productivity, and higher quality of work. The recruitment process has the potential to attract to the school system its future leaders, career devotees, high achievers, problem solvers, and innovators. Unplanned, haphazard, and casual approaches to recruitment frequently create costly problems such as position-person mismatches, ineffective performance, undue supervision, absenteeism, lateness, turnover, antiorganization behavior, unwarranted tenure, and personnel litigation. (p. 3)

As noted by Castetter (1992), a poorly planned and poorly managed recruitment program can result in costly problems in terms of money, personnel, and overall organizational effectiveness. Many school districts hire teachers, screen out the obviously weak ones during their
first few years of employment, and grant tenure to the rest. The basic premise behind an effective, well-planned recruitment effort is to attract the best applicants so that only the top percentage of teacher applicants will be employed. According to Cox (1981), school systems, rather than screening out inadequate teachers, should be screening in only the top 3%, "the gifted teachers who will continue to contribute significantly for years to come" (p. 4).

To develop an effective recruitment program, school systems must be able to answer the following:

(a) What constitutes effective recruitment practices?
(b) From what sources are the most effective teachers recruited as measured by such post-hire outcomes as attendance, performance, job satisfaction, and retention rate?

This study is significant because it will add to the limited body of research on the vital topic of teacher recruitment and will provide school systems with more data from which to answer the questions above. By describing the recruitment practices in one state, this study will provide a better understanding of the teacher recruitment practices of school systems.

In addition, if the goal of recruiting is finding individuals who can be effectively matched with jobs within the organization, then the relationship of recruiting sources to such post-hire outcomes as attendance,
performance, job satisfaction, and retention rate is a significant area of research. Research such as that conducted in this study can provide school systems with important information on which recruitment sources yield the highest quality personnel.

**Operational Definitions**

The following are definitions of key terms used in this study:

**Attendance Rate.** As used in this study, attendance rate refers to the percentage of the total number of work days possible each teacher has been in attendance during the teacher's tenure in Chesapeake Public Schools.

**Career Commitment.** Career Commitment refers to an early recruitment and employment program utilized by Chesapeake Public Schools. The program, initiated in 1984, was developed to identify and employ outstanding teachers. Teacher education majors identified by Chesapeake's Personnel Department in the fall are invited to Chesapeake for a two-day orientation in January to learn more about the city and the school system. The school board provides lodging in a local hotel for two nights and provides transportation and meals during the orientation. Activities include a tour of the city, school visitations, group and individual meetings with Chesapeake teachers, and a reception attended by city officials, principals, former Career Commitment teachers, and other selected school
personnel. Prospective teachers are offered contracts at the conclusion of the two-day visit. Periodic contacts are maintained with those who sign contracts until they report for work the next school year.

**Recruitment.** Recruitment refers to those activities of the organization which are designed to attract potential applicants who can carry out the work of the organization (Castetter, 1992; Erickson & Shinn, 1977; Lipsett et al., 1972).

**Recruitment sources.** Recruitment sources refer to the means by which individuals are attracted to or referred to an organization for possible employment. For purposes of this study, recruitment sources will include (a) campus recruiting other than Career Commitment, (b) Career Commitment, (c) job fairs, (d) advertising in newspapers, (e) advertising in educational publications, (f) self-referrals, (g) referrals by friends or relatives, and (h) employee referrals.

**Selection.** Selection refers to those activities of the organization which are designed to choose the best qualified individual for each job from those recruited (Castetter, 1992; Erickson & Shinn, 1977; Lipsett et al., 1972).

**Teacher.** Teacher refers to "a person (a) who is regularly employed full time as a teacher, visiting teacher/social worker, guidance counselor, or librarian and (b) who holds a valid teaching license" (Virginia Department
of Education, 1994, p. 3). For purposes of this study, the term teacher will not include visiting teachers/social workers, guidance counselors, or librarians.

**Teacher job performance.** Teacher job performance refers to the professional behaviors of a teacher both inside and outside of a classroom (Mitze, 1982).

**Teacher job satisfaction.** Teacher job satisfaction refers to the degree to which the work environment fulfills the teacher's needs or preferences for reinforcers. For purposes of this study, job satisfaction shall be measured by the short-form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.

**Limitations of the Study**

The following limitations apply to the interpretation of the results of this study.

1. The description of recruitment practices is limited to the public school systems in Virginia.

2. The study of the relationship between recruitment source and retention rate for teachers is limited to the retention rates of teachers employed in Chesapeake Public Schools during the years 1989, 1990, 1992, and 1993 (data unavailable for 1991).

3. The study of the relationship between recruitment source and each of the post-hire outcomes of job satisfaction, attendance, and job performance is limited to data collected on teachers who were employed in Chesapeake
Public Schools between 1989 and 1993 and who are still employed in the school division.

**Major Assumptions**

Listed below are the major assumptions underlying this study.

1. Recruitment is an essential personnel function.
2. Recruitment methods influence the number and types of applicants in a school system.
3. Job performance, attendance, retention, and job satisfaction are indicators of teacher effectiveness.
4. Job performance, attendance, retention, and job satisfaction are measures of recruitment source effectiveness.
5. The survey instruments used are valid measures of the intended variables.
CHAPTER 2

Review of Related Literature

Introduction

The significance of recruitment as it relates to the staffing process and to organizational effectiveness has been well established in the literature. A review of the literature and extant research both in education and in business and industry revealed that recruitment is most often addressed in terms of such independent variables as recruiter behaviors or characteristics, recruitment sources, and recruitment practices, policies, and procedures. The purpose of this review of the literature is to analyze the extant research on recruitment-related variables with a specific emphasis on their relationship to the variables of pre-hire and post-hire outcomes.

Recruiter Effects on Pre-Hire Outcomes

Research suggests that the recruitment process may have a significant influence on the applicant's attraction to an organization. A primary factor affecting applicant attraction is the recruiter (Alderfer & McCord, 1970; Fisher, Ilgen, & Hoyer, 1979; Harn & Thornton, 1985; Harris & Fink, 1987; Herriott & Rothwell, 1981; Liden & Parsons, 1986; Maurer et al., 1992; Powell, 1984; Rogers & Sincoff, 1978; Rynes & Miller, 1983; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976; Turban &
Dougherty, 1992). As the individual responsible for conducting the recruitment interview and providing the applicant with knowledge of the job, the recruiter can make an impression on the applicant which is transferred to the organization and which can influence the applicant's employment decisions.

Research has suggested that the recruiter may influence the applicant's attraction by influencing the applicant's expectations of receiving a job (expectancy perceptions) or by influencing the perceived attractiveness of the job to the applicant (variance perceptions) (Harris & Fink, 1987; Turban & Dougherty, 1992). Three recruiter characteristics have been identified as contributing to this overall effect: (a) recruiter knowledge of the organization and the job vacancy, (b) recruiter personality and behaviors, and (c) recruiter personal characteristics (Rynes, Heneman, & Schwab, 1980).

Early research on the recruiter as an integral part of the recruitment process focused on applicants' likes and dislikes about the recruiter. Beginning with Alderfer and McCord's study in 1970, however, the focus changed. Researchers began to treat recruiter behaviors and characteristics as independent variables capable of influencing a variety of dependent variables (Rynes, 1991). Dependent variables studied have included applicant impressions of the recruiter or the company, expectancy of
receiving or accepting a job offer, and job attractiveness. In general, research concerning recruiter effects on applicants has been conducted using either a field survey or an experimental design. Studies investigating recruiter effects on various pre-hire outcomes are summarized in Table 1 and are discussed below.

**Effects of Recruiter Behavior on Expectancy and Variance Perceptions**

The first major study of applicant perceptions of recruiter behavior during the interview and their effect on such outcomes as receiving or accepting a job offer (expectancy perceptions) and applicants' perceptions of job attractiveness (variance perceptions) was conducted by Alderfer and McCord (1970). Based on earlier research indicating that behavior and attitudes are a function of the person and the situation, Alderfer and McCord predicted that (a) satisfaction of interpersonal needs during the recruitment interview would be related to satisfaction with the interview and (b) interpersonal satisfaction would be related to the expectancy of receiving a job offer and the probability of accepting an offer.

Using a three-part questionnaire, Alderfer and McCord (1970) collected information from 112 graduate students at Cornell University on the students' needs satisfaction and their reactions to three recruitment interviews they had experienced: the best, the worst, and an average one. For
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alderfer and McCord (1970)</td>
<td>Independent: interpersonal satisfaction received from interview</td>
<td>Positive effects for certain interviewer behaviors and characteristics with highest correlations for interviewer's interest in candidate and candidate's potential contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent: satisfaction with interview, expectancy of receiving and accepting job offer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt and Coyle (1976)</td>
<td>Independent: interviewee's perceptions of interviewer's actions during the interview</td>
<td>Positive effects for interviewer's warmth and thoughtfulness, thought and speech patterns, ability to provide job information, and interviewer's ability to ask clear and specific questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent: applicant's perception of own performance, expectancy of receiving job offer, actual receipt of job offer, acceptance of job offer, favorable perceptions toward organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers and Sincoff (1978)</td>
<td>Independent: recruiter presentation, recruiter age and title</td>
<td>No effect for positive presentations; negative effect for recruiter non-fluency; positive effect for title; positive effect for age 30-year old recruiter over 50- or 20-year old interviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent: student's impressions of interviewer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, Ilgen, and Hoyer (1979)</td>
<td>Independent: recruiter credibility</td>
<td>Positive effect for interviewer's ability to provide both positive and negative information about job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent: applicant's decision to join organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herriott and Rothwell</td>
<td>Independent: interviewer behaviors including how much interviewers talked, degree to which interviewer allowed applicant to ask questions, how much opportunity was provided for discussion</td>
<td>No effect for single recruiter behaviors; positive effect for certain combinations of behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent: likelihood of job acceptance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rynes and Miller</td>
<td>Independent: recruiter behaviors and recruiter behaviors in combination with various job attributes</td>
<td>Positive effect for recruiter behaviors alone and in combination with job attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent: applicant's impression of recruiter and job, expectancy of receiving and accepting job offer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>Independent: recruiting practices and job attributes</td>
<td>Positive effect for job attributes only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent: applicant's job acceptance decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harn and Thornton</td>
<td>Independent: applicant's perception of certain recruiter behaviors</td>
<td>Positive effect for recruiter counseling behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent: applicant's perception of recruiter warmth and friendliness and applicant's willingness to accept job offers</td>
<td>(table continues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liden and Parsons</td>
<td>Independent: recruiter behavior, recruiter gender, recruiter race</td>
<td>Positive effect for recruiter behavior on applicant's impressions; no effect on acceptance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1986)</td>
<td>Dependent: applicant's impressions of recruiter and likelihood of job acceptance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris and Fink</td>
<td>Independent: recruiter behavior, recruiter gender, recruiter race</td>
<td>Positive effect for recruiter behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1987)</td>
<td>Dependent: applicant's impressions of recruiter and likelihood of job acceptance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor and Bergmann</td>
<td>Independent: recruiter behavior and applicant's perception of recruiter empathy</td>
<td>Positive effect for recruiter behavior and applicant's perception of recruiter empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1987)</td>
<td>Dependent: applicant's attraction to the organization and likelihood of job acceptance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauer, Howe, and Lee</td>
<td>Independent: recruiter behavior indicative of interpersonal characteristics, interviewer's gender, field of study, and position</td>
<td>Positive effect for recruiter behavior indicative of interpersonal characteristics; positive effects for field of study and interviewers of opposite sex; no effect for position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1992)</td>
<td>Dependent: applicant's impressions of interview and likelihood of job acceptance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turban and Doughtery</td>
<td>Independent: recruiter behavior and characteristics</td>
<td>Positive effect for perceived recruiter interest; negative effect for perceived recruiter intimidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1992)</td>
<td>Dependent: applicant's attraction to organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
each interview, applicants were asked to complete a questionnaire rating 17 statements about the interviewer. In addition, respondents were asked to estimate the probability that a job would be offered and the probability that the offer, if given, would be accepted.

Alderfer and McCord (1970) concluded that the more effective an applicant perceived the interviewer to be at (a) answering questions, (b) sharing information about careers of other MBAs, (c) encouraging the candidate to discuss his own strengths and weaknesses, (d) asking technical questions, (e) suggesting that a high salary was a possibility, and (f) demonstrating a familiarity with a candidate's background, the more likely the candidate was to rate the interview highly. In addition, the interview was rated more positively if the interviewer was perceived as being interested in the candidate, having an understanding of the point of view of the MBA, and being interested in the specific contributions the candidate could make to the organization. Certain interviewer characteristics were also determined to be significantly related to the candidate's expectation that a job would be offered and to the candidate's willingness to accept a job offer if one were made. The two factors having the highest correlations were the interviewer's interest in the candidate and the interviewer's interest in the candidate's potential contributions to the organization.
After investigating the relationship between job applicants' impressions of the interview process and applicants' attitudes towards the company and the interviewer, Schmitt and Coyle (1976) came to the same conclusion as Alderfer and McCord (1970): the interview is an interpersonal situation in which the interviewee forms impressions of the interviewer. These impressions affect the applicant's perception of the organization and play an important role in the applicant's decisions regarding the company.

Schmitt and Coyle's (1976) study involved 237 undergraduates at Michigan State University selected from those students who were interviewed at the University Placement Center for either permanent or summer jobs during a one-month period. The students completed a three-part questionnaire using their last interview as a frame of reference. Part I of the questionnaire required students, using a Likert-type scale, to respond to 74 items describing their impressions of the interviewer (e.g., "warm personality," "thoughtful," "cooperative," and "objective"). Part II included nine questions designed to measure what decisions, attitudes, or impressions resulted from the interview. The answers to these questions represented the outcome or dependent variables. Demographic variables necessary to describe the characteristics of the sample
studied were measured by Part III of the questionnaire (Schmitt & Coyle).

Using a factor analysis of student responses, six factors, each representing an independent variable and accounting for a percentage of the variance in student's evaluations of the interviewer or in students' employment decisions, were identified. After performing a multiple regression analysis, Schmitt and Coyle (1976) determined that all six factors describing the interviewee's perceptions of the interviewer's actions during the interview were related to the nine dependent variables describing the interviewee's impressions or job decisions following the interview. Specific findings were as follows:

1. The applicant's perception of his or her own performance and the degree to which an applicant thought a job offer would be received were significantly related to those factors associated with the interviewer's warmth and thoughtfulness, thought and speech patterns, and ability to provide job information.

2. Actual receipt of a job offer was significantly related to the extent to which the interviewer provided job information. The researchers concluded that when both the applicant and the interviewer felt that employment was a realistic expectation, more time was spent discussing the job itself.
3. The actual acceptance of or willingness to accept a job offer was significantly related to those factors associated with the interviewer's warmth and thoughtfulness, the interviewer's ability to ask clear and specific questions, and the interviewer's ability to provide job information. In a similar question, applicants were asked to consider their willingness to accept a job offer immediately after the interview. In this case, a significant relationship was found with the interviewer's warmth and thoughtfulness and the interviewer's thought and speech patterns. Therefore, it appears that information regarding the actual job and questions related to the applicant's qualifications for the job were overshadowed in the short run by the interviewer's interpersonal and presentation skills.

4. An applicant's favorable perceptions toward the organization were significantly related to the interviewer's warmth and thoughtfulness, ability to ask clear and specific questions, thought and speech patterns, and ability to provide job information. Perceived interviewer pleasantness was related to the same factors with the exception of the interviewer's thought and speech patterns.

As part of a larger study to determine applicants' trust in, liking for, and evaluation of expertise of four sources of information about a job (recruiter, person on the job, friend who had interviewed with the company, and
professor), Fisher et al. (1979) also investigated the effect of the recruiter on applicants' decisions to join the organization. Their findings suggested that the interviewer was the least liked and least trusted of the four sources. In addition, applicants were less likely to accept a job offer when their only source of information was the interviewer. An interesting finding was that sources were considered more expert when they gave negative information; therefore, the researchers concluded that interviewers could increase their credibility by providing both positive and negative information about the job and the organization. Findings also indicated, however, that applicants were less likely to accept jobs about which they had received negative information.

In the second of two experiments designed to study the effects of employers' recruitment practices on students' intentions of accepting job offers, Herriott and Rothwell (1981) investigated the effects of seven recruiter behaviors (e.g., how much the interviewer talked, the degree to which the interviewer allowed the applicant to ask questions, how much opportunity was provided for discussion) on the applicant. Seventy-two final-year students at a British university were divided into six groups, two of which were control groups. All groups completed pre- and post-interview questionnaires including questions on the students' feelings about working for the organization. The
control groups, however, also received questions related to the interview itself (what they expected from the interview, what they expected from an ideal interview, and what the interview was actually like).

Unlike earlier researchers (Alderfer & McCord, 1970; Fisher et al., 1979; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976) who found that individual recruiter behaviors had an effect on applicants' intentions to accept job offers, Herriott and Rothwell (1981) found that no single recruiter behavior was related to the likelihood of job acceptance. They concluded, however, that there was a relationship between certain combinations of behaviors (i.e., opportunity to ask questions in combination with opportunity for discussion, how much the interviewer talked, and how much the interviewer asked questions related to the organization) and job acceptance.

Rynes and Miller (1983) conducted two experiments to determine the effects of recruiter behaviors alone and in combination with various job attributes on applicants' impressions of the recruiter and the job, perceptions of the likelihood of receiving a job offer, and intentions of accepting a job if one were offered. Undergraduate students at a large Midwestern university were asked to view one of four videotapes of a simulated campus interview, put themselves in the place of the applicant, and answer
questions about the interview after having viewed the videotape.

Results of Rynes and Miller's (1983) experiments indicated that both recruiter characteristics (behavior and knowledge of the job) and job attributes had an effect on applicants' post-interview impressions. As was the case in earlier studies, Rynes and Miller's research supported the hypothesis that there is a relationship between recruiter behaviors and applicants' perceptions of the likelihood of receiving a job. Recruiter behaviors such as eye contact, however, influenced the applicants' perceptions of job attractiveness only when perceived job attributes were controlled. Therefore, the authors concluded that the recruiter's influence would be greater when the attributes of the job were neither clearly attractive or clearly unattractive.

Rynes and Miller's (1983) experiments also indicated that the dependent variables related to the job itself (job attractiveness, willingness to accept an offer) were more influenced by the recruiter's ability and willingness to provide job information than by the recruiter's behaviors during the interview. In addition, Experiment 1 indicated a significant relationship between recruiter behaviors and the dependent variables of applicants' impressions of the recruiter, likelihood of receiving a job offer, perceptions
of company treatment of employees, and willingness to accept a second interview.

Like Rynes and Miller (1983), Powell (1984) hypothesized that recruiting practices and job attributes would have an effect on applicants' job acceptance decisions. Using a three-part, post-interview questionnaire, Powell collected information from 200 graduating college students on job attributes (e.g., job security, salary, location), recruiting practices, and likelihood of job acceptance.

Powell's (1984) findings suggested that when the effects of job attributes and recruiting practices on the likelihood of applicant job-acceptance are measured together, only job attributes have a significant effect. Powell concluded that the recruiter still has an impact on the job-acceptance decision, because it is the recruiter who often provides the applicant with information about job attributes.

Harn and Thornton (1985) sampled 105 graduating college students to determine the effect of five factors related to applicants' impressions of certain recruiter behaviors on applicants' perceptions of recruiter warmth and friendliness and applicants' willingness to accept job offers. The factor accounting for the most variance (16.8%) included those items describing non-directive behaviors by the recruiter (e.g., "complimented me," "made reference to my
feelings"). Other factors included items related to the degree to which the recruiter (a) indicated the applicants' suitability for the position, (b) used effective listening skills, (c) provided job information, and (d) acted in an insensitive manner. These factors were then analyzed along with recruiter representativeness to determine their relationship to perceived recruiter warmth and friendliness and applicant willingness to accept a job offer.

Harn and Thornton's (1985) findings indicated that recruiter counseling behaviors are related to perceived recruiter warmth and friendliness and applicants' willingness to accept job offers. Although counseling behaviors were more strongly related to perceived recruiter warmth and friendliness, their impact on applicants' willingness to accept job offers increased when the recruiter was seen as a representative of the company.

These findings supported the results of previous studies (Alderfer & McCord, 1970; Herriott & Rothwell, 1981; Rynes & Miller, 1983; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976) indicating a relationship between recruiter behavior and applicants' perceptions of the recruiter and the organization and applicants' willingness to accept job offers. Results of the Harn and Thornton (1985) study also suggested that recruiters should be trained in counseling behaviors in order to improve applicants' perceptions as well as the likelihood of acceptance of job offers.
Studies conducted by Liden and Parsons (1986) and Harris and Fink (1987) examined the relationship between recruiter behaviors and applicants' impressions of the recruiter and job applicants' willingness to accept job offers. These studies resulted in conflicting findings. As in earlier studies, both sets of findings indicated a relationship between recruiter behaviors and applicants' impressions of the interviewer and the job. Liden and Parsons, however, found no relationship between acceptance intentions and applicants' impressions of the recruiter, whereas Harris and Fink reported a significant relationship between recruiter behaviors and the likelihood of job acceptance.

Taylor and Bergmann (1987) and Mauer et al. (1992) came to similar conclusions after conducting separate studies of the effects of recruiter behaviors on applicants. Taylor and Bergmann's study, which employed post-interview questionnaires and measured interviewers' as well as applicants' reactions at different stages of the recruitment process, suggested that recruiter interview behaviors and applicants' perceptions of recruiter empathy were related to applicants' attraction to organizations and applicants' employment decisions. Maurer et al. determined that recruiter behavior indicative of interpersonal characteristics was significantly related to applicants'
impressions of the interview and the likelihood of job acceptance.

The most recent study of the relationship between recruiter behaviors and characteristics and applicants' attraction to organizations was conducted by Turban and Dougherty (1992). Their findings indicating that perceived recruiter interest in the interviewer was positively related to applicant attraction and perceived recruiter intimidation was negatively related supported the work of earlier researchers.

Effects of Recruiter Behavior on Applicants' Impressions of the Recruiter and the Interview

Several studies designed to examine the relationship between recruiter behavior and job acceptance also investigated the relationship between recruiter behaviors during the interview and applicants' impressions of the recruiter and the interview in general (Harn & Thornton, 1985; Liden & Parsons, 1986; Rynes & Miller, 1983; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976). Each of these studies established a significant positive relationship between the variables examined.

In addition to these studies, an investigation by Rogers and Sincoff (1978) specifically examined the effect of recruiter presentation along with several other recruiter-related variables on students' impressions of campus interviewers. Undergraduates (n = 376) enrolled at
Ohio University were divided into 12 groups and each group viewed the presentation of one of three male recruiters. The three interviewers were of similar height, weight, and coloring, but each represented a different age group (ages 20, 30, and 50). Each of the three presentations was introduced with one of two introductions, one in which the interviewer's title was noted and one in which it was not. Each interviewer, using the same interviewee and the same script, taped a presentation with no errors and a presentation which included problems such as hesitations, pauses, repetitions, and mispronunciations. The subjects listened to 1 of the 12 interviews, varying by interviewer age, title, and quality of presentation, and evaluated the interviewer and the organization using a response booklet.

Rogers and Sincoff (1978) concluded that the recruiter's presentation had a significant effect on the students' impressions of the interviewer. Unlike the findings of earlier studies in which positive recruiter behaviors had a positive effect, a follow-up test indicated that students' impressions of the recruiter were not affected by a positive presentation but were negatively affected by non-fluency of the recruiter.

**Effects of Recruiter Demographic Variables on Expectancy and Variance Perceptions**

As part of larger studies on recruiter effects on applicants, Rogers and Sincoff (1978), Liden and Parsons
(1986), Harris and Fink (1987), Taylor and Bergmann (1987), and Maurer et al., (1992) examined the effects of recruiter demographic variables on certain pre-hire outcomes such as applicants' perceptions of the likelihood of receiving or accepting a job offer (expectancy perceptions) and job attractiveness (variance perceptions). Four of the five studies established a relationship between certain demographic variables and applicants' impressions of the interview. Only the study by Harris and Fink (1987), which examined recruiter gender and recruiter function as independent variables, found no significant relationship between demographic variables (recruiter gender and function) and applicants' expectancy and variance perceptions.

Rogers and Sincoff (1978) examined the relationship between recruiter age and title and applicants' impressions of the interviewer. Their findings suggested that recruiter title had a significant effect on student impressions; specifically, having a title was more impressive than having no title. In addition, a significant relationship was found between recruiter age and impressions of the interviewer, with a more favorable overall impression for the 30-year old interviewer over the 50- or 20-year old interviewers.

A study by Liden and Parsons (1986) also established a relationship between certain demographic variables and applicants' impressions of the interviewer; specifically,
female applicants rated interviewers as more personable and competent, black applicants saw the interviewers as less competent, and applicants rated female interviewers as more personable and informative. Maurer et al. (1992) examined several recruiting issues and found not only a relationship between gender and applicants' impressions, but also a relationship with field of study. Specifically, interviewers who had engaged in a field of study similar to that of the applicant and interviewers of the sex opposite of that of the applicant were rated more highly. No significant relationship was found between interviewer's position and either applicants' responses to the interview or intentions to accept a job. Also, no significant relationship was found between trait factors and likelihood of job acceptance.

Taylor and Bergmann's (1987) study of the relationship between certain demographic variables and company attractiveness and probability of offer acceptance supported the findings of earlier studies by Rogers and Sincoff (1978), Liden and Parsons (1986), and Maurer et al. (1992). Specifically, results indicated that the applicant's attraction to the company was lower when the interviewer was older, female, and a member of the personnel department. The probability of an applicant accepting a job was lower when the recruiter was a female.
Recruitment Source Effects On Post-hire Outcomes

Recruitment source refers to the means by which individuals are attracted to or referred to an organization for possible employment. A variety of such sources are employed by school systems in the recruitment of personnel. The source used depends on such factors as school system size and resources, the number of vacancies, and the types of positions available (Webb et al., 1994). Recruitment sources cited in the literature include the following: (a) advertisements in newspapers and professional publications or on television and radio; (b) campus recruiting/job fairs; (c) college or university placement bureaus; (d) employment agencies or search firms; (e) job postings; (f) referrals by friends, relatives, or employees of the organization; (g) pre-employment programs such as internships, part-time employment, student teaching, and summer employment; (h) professional meetings or conventions; and (i) walk-ins, call-ins, and write-ins (Arthur, 1986; Castetter, 1992; Kirnan et al., 1989; Phillips, 1987; Schneider, 1976; Webb et al., 1994).

In general, recruitment sources have been categorized in the literature as formal or informal sources. Advertising, campus recruiting, and college placement bureaus are examples of formal sources. Informal sources include referrals, walk-ins, write-ins, and call-ins. The research on recruitment sources used by business and
industry has focused on recruitment source effectiveness as measured by such post-hire outcomes as job performance, job satisfaction, rate of absenteeism, and tenure with the organization (Breaugh, 1981; Breaugh & Mann, 1984; Caldwell & Spivey, 1983; Decker & Cornelius, 1979; Gannon, 1971; Kirnan et al., 1989; Quaglieri, 1982; Swaroff et al., 1985; Taylor & Schmidt, 1983; Ullman, 1986). The research has suggested a relationship between recruitment source effectiveness and the post-hire outcomes, with informal sources having a more significant positive effect.

Two theories addressing the causes of differential source effectiveness have been discussed in the literature: (a) the realistic information hypothesis and (b) the individual difference hypothesis (Breaugh, 1981; Breaugh & Mann, 1984; Kirnan et al., 1982; Quaglieri, 1982; Schwab, 1982; Taylor & Schmidt, 1983). The realistic information hypothesis suggests that using recruitment sources which provide more accurate information about the job will result in employees who perform better, are more committed to the organization, and achieve greater job satisfaction (Breaugh & Mann, 1984; Quaglieri, 1982; Taylor & Schmidt, 1983). The individual difference hypothesis predicts that recruitment sources will vary in effectiveness because they reach different populations (Breaugh; Breaugh & Mann; Taylor & Schmidt). Because of the varying levels of knowledge, skill, training, or education needed for specific
occupations, some recruitment sources may be better than others when searching for employees. For example, the population reached through employee referrals, walk-ins, high schools, and public employment services may be more appropriate when seeking office/clerical or plant/service personnel. Private agencies and colleges/universities may be more appropriate sources from which to recruit professional/management and technical personnel.

Studies in business and industry have measured recruitment source effectiveness using one or more of the following as dependent variables: (a) job turnover or retention, (b) job performance, (c) job satisfaction, and (d) attendance. Although these studies have been in business and industry, the same measure of recruitment source effectiveness can be applied to education. The importance of using recruitment sources which are effective in attracting employees who remain on the job and perform at the expected level is obvious; however, the importance of job satisfaction and attendance to school systems is less obvious and deserves further discussion.

Teacher job satisfaction has been defined as the degree to which the work environment fulfills the teacher's needs or preferences for reinforcement. Recruiting and selecting teachers who will meet the needs of the organization while having their own needs met is important because job dissatisfaction among teachers has been linked

Research has indicated that almost one-third of teachers leave the profession within their first five years of teaching and the most academically talented leave in the greatest numbers (Sandholtz, 1990). This is particularly true of teachers in inner-city schools (Rosenholtz, 1985). Job dissatisfaction has been identified as one of four factors contributing to teacher stress, and stress has been identified as a major factor in teacher attrition (Litt & Turk, 1985; Rosenholtz, 1989).

Research has also suggested that teachers who are dissatisfied but who remain in the profession often find other ways to deal with their dissatisfaction. Coping skills, including withdrawing emotionally, seeking material rewards, becoming hostile to superiors, and seeking promotions to escape from teaching, may be developed (McLaughlin et al., 1986). In addition, teachers who are dissatisfied may begin to withhold services from students or practice chronic absenteeism (Rosenholtz, 1985).

Absenteeism, whether or not it is related to job satisfaction, has been increasing among teachers (Hill, 1982; Lewis, 1981; Manlove & Elliott, 1979). Increased absenteeism is significant because it results in
instructional, financial, management, and organizational costs to school systems (Manlove & Elliott).

The most significant cost of teacher absenteeism has been in the loss of student learning time. Research suggests that 75 million hours of student contact time annually have been lost in recent years due to teacher absences (Hill, 1982). In addition, it has been reported that substitutes are from six to twenty times less effective in the classroom than the regular teacher (Manlove & Elliott, 1979). Other research has indicated that there is a critical point at which absenteeism begins to inhibit student learning. A nationwide study of 50,000 students and 2,000 teachers suggested that among average achieving students the critical point is 13.5 days of teacher absence (Lewis, 1981).

Financially, absenteeism costs school systems twice for each teacher absence. Systems not only must pay the teacher for a day of sick leave but also must pay for the substitute. According to Hill (1982), 1.6% of school system budgets are spent in substitute costs alone.

Increased management costs have also resulted from teacher absenteeism. The principal generally has the primary responsibility for monitoring teacher absences and arranging for substitute teachers. As absenteeism has increased so has the time spent by principals in dealing with it. When principals are arranging for substitute
teachers, they are using time that would be normally dedicated to more important matters (Manlove & Elliott, 1979).

Teacher absenteeism also results in organizational costs to school systems. Teachers contribute to informal learning by sponsoring clubs and other activities. When teachers are absent, these activities must be canceled. In addition, teacher absence affects school planning and development because it is difficult to conduct planning meeting or staff development activities when members of the staff are absent (Manlove & Elliott, 1979).

As was noted earlier, studies in business and industry have investigated recruitment source effectiveness using job satisfaction, absenteeism, performance, and job turnover as measures; however, no studies of recruitment source effectiveness were identified in education. For purposes of this paper, the studies discussed will be categorized according to those which have investigated the relationship between different recruitment sources and (a) job turnover, (b) job performance and job turnover, and (c) multiple variables (e.g., job turnover, job performance, attendance, job satisfaction). These studies are summarized in Table 2 and are discussed below.
Table 2

**Summary of Studies of Recruitment Source Effects on Post-Hire Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gannon (1971)</td>
<td>Independent: recruitment source (rehires, referrals by high schools, employee referrals, self-referrals, employment agencies, and newspaper ads)</td>
<td>Lowest turnover rates for rehires, referrals by high schools, employee referrals, and self-referrals; highest turnover rates for employment agencies and newspaper ads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent: attrition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decker and Cornelius (1979)</td>
<td>Independent: recruitment source (employee referrals, self-referrals, employment agencies, newspaper ads, and other)</td>
<td>Lowest turnover rates for employee referrals; highest turnover rates for employment agencies and newspaper ads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent: attrition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaugh (1981)</td>
<td>Independent: recruitment source (newspaper ads, college placement, journal-convention ads, and self-referral)</td>
<td>Highest absentee rates for newspaper ads; lowest job performance for newspaper ads and college placement offices; lowest job satisfaction for college placement offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent: performance, absenteeism, and job-related attitudes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell and Spivey (1983)</td>
<td>Independent: recruitment source</td>
<td>Greater employee success for formal ads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent: attrition and job performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent: job performance and attendance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent: attrition and job performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaroff, Barclay, and Bass (1985)</td>
<td>Independent: recruitment source</td>
<td>No effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent: attrition and job performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ullman (1986)</td>
<td>Independent: recruitment source</td>
<td>Lowest turnover rates for employee referrals; highest turnover rates for newspaper ads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent: attrition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirnan, Farley, and Geisinger (1989)</td>
<td>Independent: recruitment source (agent referral, district manager referral, sales manager referral, clerical staff referral, mutual acquaintance, newspaper ad, employment agency, self-referral, school placement, and other)</td>
<td>Highest applicant quality for informal recruiting sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent: employee quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Job Turnover as a Measure of Recruitment Source Effectiveness

Gannon (1971), Decker and Cornelius (1979), and Ullman (1986), investigated job turnover or attrition rates among employees recruited from a variety of sources as a measure of recruitment source effectiveness. The sources investigated included referrals, newspaper advertisements, and employment agencies. In addition, Decker and Cornelius investigated direct applications as a recruitment source, and Gannon included direct applications, rehires, and high school referrals.

A 1971 study by Gannon investigated the attrition rates of 6,390 bank employees recruited from six different sources over a three-year period. Significant differences were found in recruitment source effectiveness as measured by employee turnover. Four sources (rehires, referrals by high schools, employee referrals, and self-referrals or direct applications) had significantly lower turnover rates. The two sources having the highest turnover rates were employment agencies and newspaper advertising. Gannon concluded that companies can improve the selection process by focusing recruitment efforts on the four sources which produced the most stable employees in terms of their tenure with the organization.

Decker and Cornelius (1979) sampled 2,466 employees from an insurance company, a bank, and a professional
abstracting company to determine the sources from which they were recruited. Recruitment sources were categorized as newspaper advertisements, employment agency, employee referral, walk-in, and "other." The employees were followed for a 12-month period. At the end of 12 months, quit rates or attrition rates, according to recruitment source, were computed for each sample. Results of the study indicated that employees recruited by other employees had the lowest quit rates and employees recruited through newspaper advertising or employment agencies had the highest quit rates. Decker and Cornelius concluded that employees referred by other employees may have had more realistic job expectations than those recruited through other sources; therefore, they were less likely to quit due to frustration or dissatisfaction.

Ullman (1986) reviewed the employment records of 263 clerical workers at two large companies. Data were collected on the sources from which the employees were recruited, the reasons for termination, and length of tenure with the company. Although the attrition rates were similar for employees recruited from the three sources investigated (employee referrals, newspaper advertisements, and employment agencies), the attrition rate was lowest for employee referrals and highest for newspaper advertisements. Ullman concluded that company employees may be better at screening applicants than company interviewers and may have
screened out applicants that the interviewers would have hired. Ullman's hypothesis would be tested in later studies such as the study conducted by Kirnan et al., (1989).

Results of these studies (Decker & Cornelius, 1979; Gannon, 1971; Ullman, 1986) indicated that the informal recruitment sources, especially employee referrals, produced employees with lower attrition rates than did other sources. In general, the research supported the realistic information hypothesis suggesting that sources which provide more realistic information about the job will result in employees who are more committed to the organization.

**Job Turnover and Job Performance as Measures of Recruitment Source Effectiveness**

Concluding that employee success was only partially measured by tenure with the organization, several researchers investigated both job turnover and job performance as measures of recruitment source effectiveness (Breaugh & Mann, 1984; Caldwell & Spivey, 1983; Swaroff et al., 1985). As in the studies of employee turnover, a variety of recruitment sources (e.g., campus recruitment, direct application, employment agencies, job posting, newspaper advertisement, referrals) were investigated. In addition, two of the three studies were designed to determine if a relationship existed between recruitment source and certain demographic characteristics of employees (Breaugh & Mann; Caldwell & Spivey).
Caldwell and Spivey (1983) collected information on 1,400 store clerks who had been employed by a large retail chain. None of the clerks were still employed by the company. Data on recruitment source, job performance, and length of tenure (short-term or long-term) were collected from company files. Unlike the findings of the studies in which turnover rate was the only variable, results of this study indicated that formal advertisement was a slightly better recruitment source in relation to employee success than was employee referral. The authors, however, cautioned that the results of this study may have been affected by the fact that the sample was selected from those holding a job which was considered by many employees to be casual employment. Therefore, employees referred by other employees may have entered the job with the expectation that the job would be short-term and that performance would not be important.

Caldwell and Spivey (1983) also analyzed the relationship between race of successful employees and recruitment source. Findings indicated a significant relationship between the two variables. Employee referrals were the best source for recruiting successful white employees while employment agencies were the best source of successful black employees. The authors concluded that employees seeking a racially-mixed labor force should utilize a variety of recruitment sources.
A 1984 study by Breaugh and Mann was designed to investigate the realistic information and individual differences hypotheses. Breaugh and Mann predicted that (a) employees referred by other employees would have more realistic expectations of the job than those recruited through other sources and (b) employees recruited through different sources would differ demographically.

Using a questionnaire, Breaugh and Mann (1984) collected information from 98 social services workers on recruitment source, job expectations, and individual characteristics. Results indicated that employees recruited through employee referrals had a more realistic view of the job and a significantly lower termination rate than those recruited through direct application or newspaper advertisements. In addition, source differences were found for two of the demographic variables, gender and age. More males and older employees were recruited through newspaper advertisements. Results also suggested that employees who applied directly received better performance evaluations than those who were recruited from other sources.

Swaroff et al., (1985) obtained data from the personnel records of 618 male technical sales trainees with a large corporation to investigate the relationship between recruitment source and employee turnover and employee performance. Results of their study indicated no
significant relationship between recruitment source and either variable.

The studies in which recruitment source effectiveness was measured by both employee performance and turnover produced mixed results. Caldwell and Spivey (1983) found that formal sources were more effective, whereas Breaugh and Mann's (1984) research favored employee referrals as the most effective source. Both sets of researchers, however, found a relationship between certain demographic variables (age and gender) and recruitment source effectiveness. Research by Swaroff et al., (1985) indicated no significant relationship between recruitment source and either performance or turnover.

Multiple Variables as a Measure of Recruitment Source Effectiveness

Three studies were reviewed in which three or more measures of recruitment source effectiveness were investigated (Breaugh, 1981; Kirnan et al., 1989; Taylor & Schmidt, 1983). As in studies employing two variables, the results were mixed.

Breaugh (1981) investigated the relationship between four recruitment sources and three dependent variables (absenteeism, performance, and certain work-related attitudes). In addition, five demographic variables (age, sex, education, years with company, and years in present position) were investigated.
The sample for Breaugh's (1981) study included 112 research scientists recruited from 4 sources: newspaper advertisement (n = 30), college placement (n = 24), journal-convention advertisement (n = 26), and direct application (n = 32). Information on performance and absenteeism was gathered from personnel files and demographic information and attitude data were collected through a questionnaire. Three job-related attitudes (work satisfaction, job involvement, and satisfaction with supervisor) were evaluated.

Breaugh (1981) concluded that a significant relationship existed between recruitment source and several of the dependent variables. Specific findings were as follows:

1. Employees recruited through college placement offices and newspaper advertisements performed at a significantly lower level than did those recruited through direct application or journal/convention advertisements.

2. Employees recruited through newspaper advertisements had an absentee rate almost two times that of those recruited through other sources.

3. Employees recruited through college placement offices indicated significantly lower levels of job involvement and supervisor satisfaction than did those recruited through other sources.
4. No relationship was found between recruitment source and any of the demographic variables.

Like Breaugh (1981), Taylor and Schmidt (1983) investigated the relationship between recruitment source and performance, attendance, and certain demographic variables (height and weight, sex, previous pay, and shift preference). Taylor and Schmidt, however, also explored job tenure as a measure of recruitment source effectiveness. They hypothesized that employees recruited from sources believed to provide more realistic job information (employee referrals and rehires) would remain with the organization longer than those recruited from other sources (television, radio, and newspaper advertisements and walk-ins).

Taylor and Schmidt's (1983) sample was composed of 293 seasonal workers hired by a Midwestern packaging plant. The employees were recruited from seven different sources: (a) employee referrals, (b) newspaper advertisements, (c) public employment agency referrals, (d) radio advertisements, (e) rehires, (f) television advertisements, and (g) walk-ins or direct application.

Recruitment source and demographic data were gathered from applications. The demographic information collected was that which was hypothesized to have the closest relationship to the dependent variables (performance, tenure, and attendance). For example, the company representatives believed that older individuals and females
demonstrated better performance and longer tenure; that individuals of average height and weight performed better; and that individuals willing to accept employment on any of the three shifts demonstrated better attendance.

Performance, tenure, and attendance data were gathered from evaluation forms completed by supervisors at the end of the term of employment (Taylor & Schmidt, 1983).

Results of Taylor and Schmidt's (1983) study indicated a significant difference in recruitment source effectiveness as measured by job performance, attendance, and tenure. The hypothesis that employees recruited through sources believed to provide more realistic job information would have longer tenure than those recruited through other sources was only partially supported. No significant difference in tenure was reported for those employees referred by other employees; however, rehires were found to remain with the organization for a significantly longer period of time. In addition, rehires demonstrated better attendance and better job performance. Source differences were also found for the demographic variables with rehires producing individuals who differed significantly from other employees in those characteristics most closely related to the predictors of job success (height, weight, age, gender, previous rate of pay, and shift preference).

Many of the earlier studies on recruitment source effectiveness were conducted to test the hypothesis that
those sources which provided the most realistic job information resulted in employees who better met the job expectations (realistic information hypothesis). A 1989 study by Kirnan et al. was designed to test the pre-screening hypothesis proposed by Ullman (1986). The premise of this hypothesis was that employees referred by other employees tend to be of higher quality because they have already been pre-screened by employees who have knowledge of both the applicant and the job (Ullman). In an attempt to find support for the pre-screening hypothesis, Kirnan et al. investigated applicant quality as measured by the Background Questionnaire (completed at the time of application) and employee quality as measured by the post-hire outcomes of productivity and tenure. The relationship between three demographic characteristics (gender, ethnicity, and age) and recruitment source were also explored. Demographic data were reported in the Background Questionnaire.

The sample for this study included applicants and new hires for the position of insurance agent in a major insurance company for a period of one year. Recruitment source information was gathered from the Background Questionnaire. Recruitment sources identified were as follows: (a) "agent referral," (b) "district manager referral," (c) "sales manager referral," (d) "clerical staff referral," (e) "mutual acquaintance," (f) "newspaper advertisement," (g) "employment agency," (h) "self-
initiated," (i) "school placement," and (j) "some other way" (Kirnan et al., 1989).

Kirnan et al. (1989) found that the informal recruiting sources produced higher quality applicants and new hires than did the formal sources; however, the most significant difference was in the applicant pool. In addition, the pre-screening hypothesis was supported by findings indicating that the informal sources with the greatest knowledge of the job (i.e., agent, sales manager, and district manager referrals) produced higher quality applicants than did other sources. The research on the relationship between recruitment source and characteristics of applicants indicated that female and black applicants were more likely to use formal recruiting sources than informal sources.

Kirnan et al. (1989) concluded that using more informal sources might improve the overall quality of applicants and new hires. Like Caldwell and Spivey (1983), however, they cautioned that relying on informal sources could have a negative impact on affirmative action efforts.

The results of studies in which multiple variables were used to measure recruitment source effectiveness supported informal recruitment sources, specifically walk-ins, rehires, and referrals, as the best sources of employees. Mixed results were found for the demographic variables with Breaugh (1981) finding no significant
relationship between applicant characteristics and recruitment source.

Much of the research on recruitment in business and industry has investigated the effects of such independent variables as recruitment source or the recruiter on certain dependent variables (e.g., pre-hire and post-hire outcomes). This research has suggested that there is a significant relationship between recruiter behaviors or characteristics, recruitment sources, and recruitment practices and such pre-hire outcomes as applicant attraction to the organization, expectations of receiving a job offer, and willingness to accept employment. In addition, a relationship was established between recruitment source and the post-hire outcomes of job performance, attendance, tenure, and job satisfaction.

The research in business and industry has focused on the relationship between certain recruitment-related variables and pre-hire and post-hire outcomes. A review of the extant research in education, however, revealed that much of the recruitment-related research has been limited to descriptive research of the recruitment policies and practices of school systems in a specific state, region, or the nation.
Recruitment Practices, Policies, and Procedures of School Systems

Many of the recruitment-related studies in education collected data through surveys and were designed to identify and describe existing recruitment practices of school divisions (Blankenship, 1970; Engel & Nall, 1984; G'Fellers, 1992/1993; Nuckolls, 1993/1994; Schleicher, 1989/1990; Vanderheiden, 1981/1982; Wollman, 1987/1988). These studies were descriptive only and included no evidence of the effectiveness of the practices investigated. Two major studies were identified which employed the case-study method. Wise et al. (1987) conducted case studies in six school systems to investigate teacher selection and recruitment. Stoddart (1991) used the case-study method to investigate the Los Angeles Unified School District Intern Program.

A review of the educational literature also revealed that many journal articles or papers have been written recommending specific teacher recruitment practices or programs (Anderson, 1992; Burnside, 1987; Connecticut State Department of Education, 1986; Engelking, 1987; Fielder, 1993; Grier, 1993; Harmon, 1987; Kolze, 1988; Lewis, 1992; McGrath, 1984; Reavis & Mehaffie, 1980; Renner, 1985; Seifert & Kurtz, 1983; Snyder, 1987; Stone, 1990; Van Meter, 1984). In general, recommended practices can be categorized as follows: (a) cadet or internship programs, (b) employee
referral programs, (c) incentive/recognition programs, (d) minority recruitment programs, (e) overseas recruitment programs, (f) policy formulation, (g) recruiter selection and training collaborations, and (h) small schools recruitment programs.

Nationwide Studies of School System Recruitment Practices

Vanderheiden's (1981/1982) study of the recruitment practices of school systems nationwide was typical of the survey research reviewed on teacher recruitment. The population for the study included public school systems in the United States with personnel administrators who were members of the American Association of School Personnel Administrators. A sample of 250 school districts was randomly selected and received mailed questionnaires. Based on survey results, Vanderheiden concluded the following:

1. No one person was the key individual in the recruitment process. Decision-making was the responsibility of individuals in several different roles.

2. Personnel administrators, principals, and superintendents, in that order, were the administrators most often involved in teacher recruitment and selection. Principals in larger districts, however, were involved to a lesser degree than principals in smaller districts.

3. The most frequently reported recruitment practices were as follows: (a) communication with placement directors (92.3%), (b) vacancy announcements (91.1%), and (c) college
and university placement listings (81%). Over 50% of the districts surveyed also reported using the following practices: (a) campus recruiting, (b) recruitment brochures, (c) communication with college and university department heads, and (d) newspaper advertisements.

4. The college placement director was the most influential person outside of the district participating in the teacher-recruitment process.

5. Employee referrals were an important recruitment source.

6. Only a small number of school systems used public or private employment agencies.

Like Vanderheiden (1981/1982), Schleicher (1989/1990) sampled superintendents in randomly selected school districts (n = 200) nationwide to determine their recruitment practices. In addition, Schleicher investigated the relationship between district size and the use of certain practices. Schleicher's results were categorized as follows:

1. Policy - Fifty-seven percent of the districts indicated that they had written policies on teacher recruitment. No significant relationship was found between district size and the existence of a board policy on recruitment.

2. Budget - Sixty-three percent of the districts indicated that they had recruiting budgets. Only a small
number of districts indicated that money was budgeted for applicant visits to the district. No significant relationship was found between school system size and the existence of a recruitment budget.

3. Personnel - Ninety-four percent of the districts indicated that principals were actively involved in recruitment. Superintendents were more likely to be involved in recruitment in smaller districts than they were in larger districts.

4. Training - Most systems indicated only occasional or partial training of personnel involved in recruitment. Larger districts were more likely to provide training than were smaller districts.

5. Job descriptions - Seventy-five percent of the school systems had developed written job descriptions for all types of teaching positions. Small districts were as likely to have job descriptions as large districts.

6. Recruitment sources - Ninety-four percent of the districts indicated that they recruited outside of a 50-mile radius. Most districts reported that they only recruited out of state occasionally. No significant relationship was found between school-district size and recruitment sources used.

7. Advertising - Ninety-seven percent of the districts indicated that they used written announcements more than any other source to advertise vacancies. Ninety-
five percent of the districts reported that they also posted vacancies with college or university placement bureaus. Most districts indicated that they never advertised in magazines and only occasionally advertised in newspapers. No significant relationship was found between school district size and the manner in which vacancies were advertised.

8. Campus recruiting - Seventy-five percent of the districts indicated that they engaged in campus recruiting. Larger districts were more likely to use campus recruiting than smaller districts.

9. Reading materials - The majority of the systems indicated that they used recruiting brochures. Only a few districts reported using audio-visual materials. Larger districts were more likely to use brochures or audio-visuals than smaller districts.

10. Community involvement - Seven percent of the districts indicated that they collaborated with the business community in their recruitment efforts. No relationship was found between district size and the extent to which the business community was involved in recruitment.

11. Time frame - The months of April, May, and June were reported as the months in which the majority of recruiting was conducted. The least amount of recruiting was done in September, October, and November.
12. Evaluation - Sixty-three percent of the districts indicated that they evaluated their recruitment programs annually. Larger district were only slightly more likely to conduct evaluations than smaller districts. No specific information was requested or reported as to how such evaluations were conducted.

13. Personnel administrators - The majority of the districts indicated that they employed full-time personnel administrators. A significant positive relationship was found between school-system size and the number of personnel administrators employed by the district.

In summary, Schleicher's (1989/1990) research suggested that a majority of the districts nationwide engaged in the recruitment practices cited in the survey. The areas in which systems indicated little or no involvement were the training of administrators and the involvement of the community in recruitment. A relationship was found between school system size and six of the factors (campus recruitment, reading materials, program evaluation, number of personnel administrators, involvement of principals, and training). Vanderheiden (1981/1982), like Schleicher, found that the three individuals most often involved in recruitment were personnel administrators, principals, and superintendents. In addition, both studies indicated that two of the most frequently used recruitment
practices were vacancy announcements and college and university placement listings.

**Recruitment Practices of School Systems in Six Southeastern States**

G'Fellers (1992/1993) investigated the teacher recruitment practices used in school districts in six southeastern states including Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. Data were collected through a questionnaire mailed to 133 large school districts (enrollments of 10,000 or more) and 229 small school districts (enrollments of 2,500 or less).

The questionnaire cited 43 commonly used teacher-recruitment practices. Fifty percent or more of the participants responded that the following practices were used in their districts (listed in descending order):

1. communication with in-state college or university placement offices

2. communication with other school systems

3. vacancy announcements in the district

4. college or university recruiting

5. employee referrals

6. recruitment brochures

7. job fairs

8. state department of education contacts

9. applicant visits to the district

10. vacancy announcements in the community
11. salary increases  
12. communication with out-of-state college or university placement offices  
13. newspaper advertisements  
14. assignment of an individual to conduct district tours for applicants (G'Fellers, 1992/1993)  

Respondents listed the following practices as the most effective (listed in descending order):  
1. communication with in-state placement offices  
2. college or university recruiting  
3. job fairs  
4. communication with out-of-state placement offices  
5. newspaper advertisements  
6. communication with other school systems  
7. salary increases  
8. timely, courteous communications  
9. state department of education contacts  
10. informal networking (G'Fellers, 1992/1993)  

In addition, G'Fellers (1992/1993) found that the superintendent was the primary recruiter in smaller districts and the personnel administrator was the primary recruiter in larger districts.  

Studies of School System Recruitment Practices in Individual States  

Of the three state studies reviewed, the earliest was a study conducted in Virginia. Blankenship (1970) surveyed
124 public school superintendents in Virginia to determine the practices used by public school administrators for the recruitment of teacher personnel. Several of Blankenship's findings, specifically in the areas of recruitment sources, budgets, and brochures, were consistent with the results of national studies conducted by Vanderheiden (1981/1982) and Schleicher (1989/1990).

Results of Blankenship's (1970) study were as follows:

1. In 97% of the systems, college or university placement bureaus were used to increase the supply of teachers. Other frequently used recruitment sources included (a) candidate-initiated contacts such as voluntary applications (99%), or unsolicited interviews (91%), (b) practice teacher programs (88%), (c) employee referrals (92%), (d) college or university professors (88%), and (e) professional contacts (81%).

2. In 29% of the systems, no money was budgeted for recruitment. Only 6% of the respondents indicated that more than 1% of the school system budget was designated for recruitment. Sixty-five percent indicated that their recruitment budget was sufficient.

3. February, March, and April were reported as the months in which the majority of recruiting was conducted (82%, 90%, and 94%, respectively). The months in which the least amount of recruiting was conducted were July, August, September, October, and November.
4. In 81% of the systems, teachers were recruited from both inside and outside of Virginia. Only 73%, however, conducted interviews both inside and outside of the state.

5. None of the systems recruited teachers who were under contract to another Virginia division without the permission of the employing school system; however, 57% did so with permission.

6. In 61% of the systems, printed recruiting brochures were used. The majority of these divisions' brochures included salary and fringe benefits information; a description of the school system's administration, faculty, enrollment, and physical plant; and a description of the community.

7. In 65% of the divisions, the recruitment interview was conducted by a team consisting of two or more of the following: (a) superintendent, (b) assistant superintendent, (c) personnel administrator, (d) director of instruction, (e) principal, or (f) supervisor.

8. In 87% of the systems candidates were not reimbursed for costs incurred while interviewing.

Wollman (1987/1988) conducted a study of the teacher recruitment and selection practices in Nebraska Class II (less than 1,000 residents) and Class III (1,000 to 100,000 residents) school districts. Questionnaires were distributed to all superintendents in these districts and
233 useable responses were received. Wollman's findings can be categorized in a manner similar to that used by Schleicher (1989/1990).

1. Policy - Thirty-nine percent of the districts indicated that they had a written recruitment policy.

2. Budget - Eight percent (a much lower percentage than that reported in other studies) of the districts reported having a budget in which funds were allotted for recruitment; however, 79% of the districts indicated that the funds available for recruitment were adequate.

3. Personnel - Eighty-nine percent of the districts reported that the superintendent was responsible for directing recruitment activities.

4. Job descriptions - Fifty-three percent of the districts reported that they used job descriptions in the recruitment process on a regular basis.

5. Source of candidates - The most used sources, in descending order, were college/university placement offices, unsolicited applicants, and student teachers. The average number of states in which the districts recruited through advertisements, letters, placement offices, or on-campus visits was four.

6. Time frame - April, May, and June were the months in which the majority of recruiting was conducted.
7. Evaluation - Thirty percent of the districts indicated that they regularly evaluated their recruitment programs. No information was requested or reported on how such evaluations were conducted.

In summary, Wollman's (1987/1988) findings were similar to those of Schleicher's (1989/1990) national study in that the number of systems having recruitment policies was limited; the personnel and sources used for recruitment were similar; and the months in which the majority of recruiting was conducted were the same. Major differences were found in the areas of budget (8% of Nebraska districts had budgets, 68% nationwide); job descriptions (53% of Nebraska districts used job descriptions, 75% nationwide); and evaluation (30% of Nebraska districts evaluated programs annually, 63% nationwide).

A study of the recruitment practices of 310 Illinois school districts conducted by Nuckolls (1993/1994) was slightly different from the other studies cited in that respondents were asked to indicate their perceptions of the importance of specified practices. Findings indicated that a majority of the districts surveyed relied on either applicant self-referrals or university placement services as sources of applicants. Most of the districts did not engage in extensive recruitment programs in general or use special campaigns or incentives to attract minority candidates. Only 7% of the districts engaged in radio or television
advertising. Overall, the districts having larger student enrollments and higher per pupil expenditures used a greater variety of recruiting practices than districts with smaller enrollments and lower per pupil expenditures.

Nuckolls' (1993/1994) findings as to the perceived importance of specific recruiting practices were as follows:

1. Advertising vacancies in college and university placement bulletins was perceived as important by 70% of the respondents.

2. Applicants' letters of inquiry and resumes were perceived as important by 51% of the respondents.

3. Participation in job fairs was perceived as important by 33% of the respondents.

4. Participation in special programs designed to attract minority candidate was perceived as moderately important by 30% of the respondents.

5. Advertising vacancies on local radio or television stations was perceived as important by only 4% of the respondents.

Case Studies

In addition to the survey studies cited, two case studies exploring recruitment practices of school systems were reviewed. Wise et al. (1987) examined the recruitment and selection policies of six school districts nationwide and Stoddart (1991) explored the success of the Los Angeles Unified School District Intern Program.
Wise et al. (1987) concluded that state and local policies increasing salaries, improving benefits, providing incentives, improving working conditions, or providing support for new personnel make recruiting easier. Policies limiting the salary of newly hired experienced teachers, requiring specific courses for state certification, or preventing the transfer of benefits, inhibit the recruitment effort. They concluded that states and local districts could improve their overall recruiting efforts by developing policies that (a) improve working conditions, (b) provide competitive salaries and fringe benefits, and (c) encourage teacher mobility.

In addition, Wise et al. (1987) suggested that school districts could reduce the time between recruitment and hiring through better planning and communication. They recommended that school systems develop a plan to identify specific hiring needs so that these needs could be targeted during the recruitment process. They also recommended better coordination between Central Office and school principals during the recruitment, screening, hiring, and placement portions of the selection process so that desirable candidates would not be lost to other school systems.

Stoddart's (1991) case study described the Los Angeles Unified School District Intern Program. The purpose of this program was to recruit competent individuals to teach in
hard-to-staff schools. Academically competent individuals who (a) earned a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university, (b) passed the state basic skills proficiency test and the National Teachers Examination, (c) taught for two years as an intern, (d) completed a professional development program developed by the school district, and (e) received a recommendation from the school district were granted teacher certification.

Based on the number of new teachers recruited and retained and the number of male and minority teachers recruited, Stoddart (1991) concluded that the LAUSD program was a success. Between 1984 and 1990, the program recruited 1,100 new teachers, 70% of whom were still teaching in the district at the time the study was conducted. The program recruited more men than the traditional teacher education programs (60% as compared to 30%). In addition, 1/3 of those in the intern program were minority teachers.

Summary

A review of the research on the recruitment practices, policies, and procedures of school systems in individual states, selected regions, and nationwide suggested the following conclusions:

1. Personnel administrators, principals, and superintendents were the school system personnel most often involved in the recruitment of teachers (Blankenship, 1970;

2. The most frequently reported recruitment practices were (a) communication with college/university placement offices, (b) vacancy announcements, and (c) college/university placement listings (G'Fellers, 1992/1993; Nuckolls, 1993/1994; Schleicher, 1989/1990; Vanderheiden, 1981/1992; Wollman, 1987/1988).


5. Most recruitment was conducted during the spring months, with April being the most frequently reported month (Blankenship, 1970; Schleicher, 1989/1990; Wollman, 1987/1988).

6. The information on recruitment budgets and policies, recruiter training, and evaluation of recruitment programs was inconsistent; however, one nationwide study reported that 63% of the districts had recruitment budgets and conducted evaluations of the recruitment programs, and that 57% had written recruitment policies (Schleicher, 1989/1990).
Recommended Recruitment Practices

In addition to the studies cited, journal articles recommending specific recruitment practices were reviewed. In general these articles were descriptions of practices found to be effective in individual school systems. For purposes of this study, these articles have been categorized as to the following practices: (a) cadet or internship programs, (b) incentive/recognition programs, (c) school/business collaborations, (d) overseas recruitment programs, (e) small schools recruitment programs, and (f) minority recruitment programs.

Cadet or Internship Programs

As was indicated in studies by Blankenship (1970) and Wollman (1987/1988), student teachers have frequently served as a source of teachers for school systems. Some systems, however, have developed programs in which student teachers are recruited and treated as newly hired staff members. One such program in the Palatine-Schaemberg Township High School District 211 in suburban Chicago was described by Kolze (1988).

In this program, student teaching candidates were screened by the personnel department and interviewed by principals. If assigned to a classroom, student teachers were evaluated at the end of three, six, and nine weeks. The final evaluation report asked the cooperating teacher if he or she recommended the student teacher for employment in
the school system. All recommendations and reports were forwarded to the personnel department. The district found that when the teachers who had been trained in the district and recommended by their cooperating teachers were hired they performed in a more competent manner than teachers recruited through other sources (Kolze, 1988).

Some school systems have found it more effective to begin training potential teachers even before they have graduated from high school. One of the most extensive programs, the Teacher Cadet Program, was developed by the state of South Carolina (Lewis, 1992).

In this program, a course on teaching was offered for elective credit as part of the social studies curriculum. The cadets not only received instruction on the learner, school governance, and teaching, they also observed classes, kept journals, and taught for short periods. A 1990 study of the program indicated that 43% of the former cadets who were in college were planning careers in teaching. In 1989 South Carolina extended the Cadet Program by establishing the Pro-Team Project. The purpose of this exploratory course for seventh and eighth grade students was to encourage more minority students to consider teaching as a career (Lewis, 1992).
Incentive/Recognition Programs

Another method employed by school systems to attract and retain teachers was the use of incentives (Engelking, 1987; Snyder, 1987; Van Meter, 1984). According to Engelking, incentives can be grouped into one of the following categories: (a) compensation plans (e.g., merit pay, bonuses for signing contracts), (b) career options (e.g., career ladders), (c) enhanced professional responsibilities (e.g., master teacher contracts, mentor programs, grants for curriculum writing), (d) nonmonetary recognition (e.g., awards, business cards), and (e) enhanced working conditions (e.g., wellness programs, faculty offices, telephones).

Snyder (1987) described an incentive program used in Prince George's County, Maryland. The school system, in cooperation with the local business community, developed a package of incentives designed to attract new teachers. Incentives included waivers of deposits and one month's free rent at selected apartment complexes, discounts on moving costs, dealer's cost on certain automobiles, food discounts at local restaurants, and free checking accounts and safe deposit boxes at local banks.

Some states have recognized that providing incentives and recognition for existing teachers not only motivates those employees but also attracts new teachers to the system (Connecticut State Department of Education, 1986). One such
program mentioned in the literature was the Connecticut State Incentive Project to Identify and Reward Exemplary Teaching. This program was developed on the premise that, "By affirming the value of teachers, we increase the professional image and status of teaching. Districts which embrace these tenets will be attractive to new teachers entering the profession, will enjoy increased productivity and loyalty among staff and will unlock the potential for success" (Connecticut State Department of Education, p. 1).

The Connecticut program included three components: (a) a recognition component designed to recognize all teachers, (b) an incentive component designed to encourage higher levels of professional achievement, and (c) a support component designed to assist teachers in their professional endeavors. The recognition component included programs to recognize outstanding teachers, appreciation banquets, and recognition awards. Minigrants, sabbatical leave, and short periods of leave for professional study were examples of the incentive component. Support and assistance were provided through professional release time, reimbursement for college courses, and supplements for coursework completed (Connecticut State Department of Education, 1986).

School/Business Collaborations

School/business collaborations were cited in the literature not only as a means of providing incentives, but also as a means of providing the system with a more
effective recruitment program. Harmon (1987) described a Maryland program in which the Prince George's County school system cooperated with the Advisory Council for Business and Industry to improve recruitment as well as the system's image.

The school system had relied on attending job fairs in the eastern United States to recruit teachers. The recruiting budget was limited; however, the Council recognized the need to spend money to attract applicants. They provided funds and personnel to allow the system to attend two selected job fairs, one in Boston where there was an oversupply of teachers and one at the University of Maryland which was the local source of new teachers. Funds were also provided to purchase tote bags to be given to applicants and to set up a hospitality suite at each job fair location. In addition, the Council raised $200,000 to develop high quality television commercials highlighting the school system (Harmon, 1987).

Overseas Recruitment Programs

Although school systems have become more aggressive in their recruiting efforts, some systems have found it necessary to recruit outside of the United States for teachers to staff hard-to-fill positions. For example, New York City hired 170 teachers from Spain over a three-year period to meet the need for teachers to instruct bilingual classes (Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989). The state of
Georgia recruited extensively in West Germany to hire qualified mathematics teachers and the state of Louisiana hired as many as 300 teachers from Belgium, Quebec, and France to teach in French-speaking Cajun classrooms (McGrath, 1984).

**Small School System Recruitment Programs**

Two specific areas in which recruitment has become increasingly important are locating teachers for rural school districts and locating minority teachers. As a consequence, school systems nationwide have developed strategies for meeting these needs (Fielder, 1993; Grier, 1993; Reavis & Mehaffie, 1980; Renner, 1985; Seifert & Kurtz, 1983; Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989; Stone, 1990).

The turnover rate in rural school systems in 1990 was 30% to 50% as compared to only 6% for all school systems nationwide. Isolation, lack of a social life, scrutiny by the community, and demands to teach multiple subjects in multi-graded classrooms not only resulted in resignations but also increased the difficulty of filling vacant positions (Stone, 1990). Seifert and Kurtz (1983) suggested that teachers who will be successful and who will remain in smaller schools must be able to teach more than one subject or grade level, supervise several extra-curricular activities and several different ability levels in the same
classroom, and adjust to the uniqueness of a rural community.

To find teachers with the unique characteristics necessary to teach in rural schools, a number of recruitment strategies were recommended. These strategies were as follows:

1. Advertise widely using an attractive recruiting brochure which emphasizes the attractiveness of the community and deals openly with those things which may concern prospective teachers (Reavis & Mehaffie, 1980; Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989; Stone, 1990).

2. Invite teachers in training and their families to visit the school system and spend a weekend with a host family from the community (Reavis & Mehaffie, 1980; Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989; Stone, 1990).

3. Involve the community in the recruitment effort (Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989).

4. Focus on recruiting teachers from colleges that draw heavily from rural areas (Steuteville-Brodinsky, 1989; Stone, 1990).


6. Pay relocation expenses or provide or subsidize housing (Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989).

8. Make personal contacts with candidates (Renner, 1985).

Minority Teacher Recruitment Programs

Minority recruiting has become increasingly difficult in recent years. Because of better opportunities in business, the number of new teachers produced by historically black colleges decreased 47% between 1979 and 1984 (Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989). In addition, a significant number of minority teachers retired in the 1980s and '90s (Grier, 1993). Consequently, school systems developed more aggressive recruitment strategies. Minority recruitment programs in Marietta, Georgia, and Akron, Ohio, were reviewed as examples of such strategies.

Marietta, Georgia, implemented a nationally recognized recruitment program. In 1986, however, their minority student population was 38% while their minority teacher population was only 14%. Today, after implementing an aggressive program of minority recruitment the percentage of minority teachers has increased to 23%. Marietta's program incorporated the following strategies:

1. The system closely examined the colleges and universities targeted for recruitment. More predominantly black or smaller regional schools were added to the recruitment schedule.
2. The system hired a minority-owned recruiting firm to assist them in identifying potential candidates who were interested in living in the Atlanta area.

3. The system cooperated with 11 other districts in the Atlanta area to form the Metropolitan-Regional Educational Service Agency. Members advertise together in minority publications, operate an electronic bulletin board, and provide a toll-free number for applicants.

4. The system, in cooperation with Kennesaw State College, developed a program to provide two scholarships per year for full tuition to minority students who enrolled in the teacher-education program at the university.

5. The system created the Minority Applicant Support Program which paired minority applicants with minority teachers in the school system who provided the applicants with personal contact, encouragement, and support (Fielder, 1993).

Akron, Ohio, with a minority student population of 42% and a minority teacher population of 17%, expanded the recruitment area and hired a minority recruiter in an effort to find more minority teachers. In 1991, however, the system decided that more aggressive efforts were necessary and asked for help from local businesses. A survey was developed to determine how local businesses, the medical community, and other school districts attracted minorities to their organizations. Based on the data collected, the
Business Education Collaboration of Minorities in Education was formed. The program offered an annual package of scholarships and loans to minority students in Akron who agreed to participate in teacher education programs in college and to become teachers in the district. Specific details of the program were as follows:

1. For each scholarship provided, the local universities contributed $500 and the local businesses contributed $1,000 yearly for up to five years.

2. Students who were offered teaching jobs received forgiveness of one year of the loan for each year they taught in Akron Schools. Students who were not offered jobs did not have to repay the loan.

3. The students were assigned mentors from the sponsoring colleges and businesses.

4. The students were guaranteed summer employment with either the school system or the sponsoring college or business.

5. A team was created to make minority students and their parents aware of the program as early as the eighth grade (Grier, 1993).

Summary of the Literature Review

A review of the literature in business and industry revealed a significant relationship between recruiter behaviors or characteristics and such pre-hire outcomes as applicant attraction to the organization, expectations of
receiving a job offer, and willingness to accept employment. In addition, a relationship was established between recruitment source and the post-hire outcomes of job performance, attendance, tenure, and job satisfaction.

Although the extant research on teacher recruitment was limited to surveys of current practices and a few case studies, certain trends in practice were identified. The research suggested that some practices were used more often than others and were perceived to produce better results. For example, job postings, college and university placement offices, campus recruiting, unsolicited applicants, and student teachers were common teacher recruitment sources. Public and private employment agencies, however, were seldom used. Findings also indicated that school systems involved superintendents, principals, and personnel administrators in the recruitment process, used recruiting brochures, and conducted the majority of their recruiting in the spring months.

It is interesting to note that none of the school system studies measured the effectiveness of recruitment practices; and therefore, provided no evidence that one practice was more effective than another. This lack of research on effective practices for the recruitment of teachers further supported the need for the current study in which recruitment source effectiveness is addressed.
A review of the journal articles in education indicated certain trends in teacher recruitment: (a) incentive and cadet programs, (b) school/business collaborations, and (c) overseas recruiting. The importance of developing aggressive strategies for minority recruitment and specialized strategies for recruitment of teachers for rural schools was also stressed.
CHAPTER 3
Methodology

Introduction

This study was designed with two major purposes: (a) to describe the recruitment practices of the public school divisions in Virginia and (b) to examine the relationship between recruitment sources used in Chesapeake Public Schools and measures of personnel effectiveness: specifically, retention rates, job performance, job satisfaction, and attendance of teachers newly employed in Chesapeake between 1989 and 1993, inclusively. The methodology and procedures used to investigate the research question and hypotheses addressed in the study will be summarized in this chapter.

Research Question

Phase I: Identification of Recruitment Practices of Public School Divisions in Virginia

I. 1. What are the predominant practices that guide the recruitment process in Virginia public school divisions?

Null Hypotheses

Phase II: Relationship Between Recruitment Sources and Measures of Personnel Effectiveness

II. 1. There is no significant difference (p<.05) in the retention rates of teachers in Chesapeake Public Schools.

II. 2. There is no significant difference (p<.05) in the job performance of teachers who were recruited from different sources and who were employed in Chesapeake Public Schools between 1989 and 1993, inclusively.

II. 3. There is no significant difference (p<.05) in the job satisfaction of teachers who were recruited from different sources and who were employed in Chesapeake Public Schools between 1989 and 1993, inclusively.

II. 4. There is no significant difference (p<.05) in the attendance rates of teachers who were recruited from different sources and who were employed in Chesapeake Public Schools between 1989 and 1993, inclusively.

Population

To provide the necessary data for this study, information was solicited from three populations: (a) the superintendents or chief personnel officers of the 133 public school divisions in the Commonwealth of Virginia; (b) all teachers hired in Chesapeake Public Schools between 1989 and 1993, inclusively, who were still employed in the school system as of September 1994; and (c) all teachers hired in Chesapeake Public Schools with employment dates of 1989,
1990, 1992, and 1993, including those teachers no longer employed in the school system. Superintendents and chief personnel officers were surveyed to provide data for Phase I of the study. Teachers hired in Chesapeake Public Schools between 1989 and 1993 who were still employed as of September 30, 1994, and all teachers hired in 1989, 1990, 1992, and 1993, including those no longer employed by the school division, served as the populations for Phase II. In each case, the total population identified was utilized for data collection rather than a sample.

Phase I of this study was designed to answer the following research question: What are the predominant practices that guide the recruitment process in Virginia public school divisions? In order to collect the data necessary to answer this question, the superintendent or chief personnel officer of each of the 133 public school systems in the Commonwealth of Virginia was surveyed. These individuals were identified using the 1994-1995 Virginia Educational Directory published by the Virginia Department of Education.

Phase II of this study included four research hypotheses. Hypothesis II.1. related to the retention rates of teachers in Chesapeake Public Schools. The population for this portion of the study consisted of all teachers with employment dates of 1989, 1990, 1992, and 1993 (n = 692), including those who were no longer employed in the school
system. A list of these teachers was obtained from the Personnel Department. Due to a damaged computer disk, teachers who were employed in 1991 and who later resigned could not be identified and were not included in the study. The population for whom retention data were obtained was stratified according to three categories of recruitment sources: Career Commitment recruiting, other campus recruiting, and all other sources.

Hypotheses II.2., II.3., and II.4. related to differences in job performance, job satisfaction, and attendance rates of teachers currently employed in Chesapeake Public Schools who were recruited from different sources and who were employed between 1989 and 1993, inclusively (n = 744). A list of teachers employed in Chesapeake Public Schools on September 30, 1994, with hire dates between 1989 and 1993, inclusively, was obtained from the Personnel Department. These teachers were surveyed to determine the source by which they were recruited into the school system (campus recruiting other than Career Commitment, Career Commitment, job fairs, advertising in newspapers, advertising in professional publications, self-referrals, referrals by friends or relatives, and employee referrals). Respondents were stratified by recruitment source and were utilized as the population necessary to address Hypotheses II.2., II.3., and II.4.
Generalizability

Results of Phase I of this study may be generalized to include all school divisions in Virginia, and to a lesser extent, all school systems in the United States. Results of Phase II may be generalized to include all teachers employed in Chesapeake Public Schools who were recruited through the recruitment sources investigated, and to a lesser extent, teachers in other Virginia public school systems employing similar recruitment sources and practices.

Instrumentation

Survey of Teacher Recruitment Practices of Virginia Public School Divisions

Phase I of this study required the use of a questionnaire to identify the predominant practices that guided the recruitment process in Virginia public school divisions. A review of the related literature revealed no survey instrument which would provide adequate data; therefore, a survey instrument was developed based on research on teacher recruitment conducted by Blankenship (1970), Dewese (1987/1988), G'Fellers (1992/1993), Nuckolls (1993/1994), Schleicher (1989/1990), Vanderheiden (1981/1982), and Wollman (1987/1988) (see Appendix C for a copy of this survey).

The five-section survey instrument employed a short-answer response format to collect information on school system demographics, assignment of recruiting
responsibilities, recruiter training, and the time frame in which most of the recruiting and hiring efforts were conducted. Likert-type scales having a response range of one to four (not used, seldom used, often used, and regularly used) were employed to collect data on recruitment practices and sources. Each section was preceded by specific directions for the completion of items in that section. In addition, a cover letter explaining the survey was sent to each participant.

**Determination of content validity.** In order to ensure content validity, a panel of judges reviewed the survey instrument. The panel included (a) an officer of the American Association of School Personnel Administrators, (b) an officer of the Virginia Association of School Personnel Administrators, (c) three personnel administrators who were employed in Virginia public school divisions and who participated in the recruitment of teachers, and (d) a university professor of personnel administration. Each judge was selected because of his or her expertise or experience in the field of personnel administration and recruitment.

**Panel review procedures.** The panel of judges reviewed the survey questionnaire to determine if the recruitment practices and sources cited and the areas of recruiter training identified were appropriate and if any additional recruitment practices, sources, or training topics should be
included. Panelists also reviewed the questionnaire for readability, clarity, and ease of completion, and made suggestions for wording or structural changes. In addition, panelists determined if the categories of responses in Sections II and III were appropriate to the questions asked.

An 80% coefficient of agreement was established for panel responses. Any items accepted without modification by 80% of the panel members were identified as appropriate. Items having less than an 80% agreement rate were modified and the final questionnaire was developed.

Panel recommendations resulted in revisions in three sections of the original survey. Revisions included minor structural changes, the addition of time designations (e.g., enrollment as of September 30) for questions requesting numerical data, and minor changes in the categories of responses provided in those sections employing a Likert-type scale. The final survey included 48 items categorized under the original five major headings.

Recruitment Source Survey

The recruitment source survey was designed to determine the sources from which the teachers included in this study were recruited into Chesapeake Public Schools. Although brief, the questionnaire was important because it provided the categories by which members of the sample teacher population in Phase II were stratified. The questionnaire consisted of two parts with each part preceded
by specific directions (see Appendix C for a copy of this survey).

Teacher Job Performance Questionnaire

A survey instrument developed using Scriven's (1988, 1991, 1993, 1994) Duties of the Teacher (DOTT) list as a primary source was utilized to collect data on the job performance of teachers included in this study. The questionnaire included five areas or domains identified by Scriven as those areas in which teachers should have at least a minimum degree of competence: (a) knowledge of subject matter, (b) instructional competence, (c) assessment competence, (d) professionalism, and (e) other duties to the school and community. Following each area or domain were subareas or descriptors of those teacher behaviors which better defined the specific domain and on which the teachers in the study were to be evaluated. Using a Likert-type scale ranging from one to six, principals were directed to circle the number best indicating the overall level of performance of the specific teacher on each of the subareas listed (see Appendix C for a copy of this questionnaire).

Scriven's (1988, 1991, 1993, 1994) Duties of the Teacher (DOTT) list, on which the Teacher Job Performance Questionnaire was based, was first published in 1988. The DOTT list was circulated in the United States and Australia and comments were solicited from teachers, administrators, parents, students, and legal professionals. Based on these
comments, the list was revised and republished at least 50 times with requests for additional comments (Scriven, 1991, 1994). Scriven's work was partially supported by funding from the Teacher Evaluation Models Project, a component of the Center for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation (CREATE). Staff from this project also reviewed the list and suggested modifications (Scriven, 1993).

The DOTT list serving as the primary source for the Teacher Job Performance Questionnaire developed for use in this study was Scriven's 1994 version. The list included 5 domains and over 100 subareas in which teachers should have at least a minimum degree of competence. While still undergoing revision, the DOTT represented "a normative list . . . of what teachers can legitimately be held responsible for knowing and doing" (Scriven, 1994, p. 156). As noted by Scriven (1991), the DOTT represented a list of what teachers are responsible for knowing and doing rather than a list of "what they in fact do and know" (Scriven, 1991, p. 2).

Determination of content validity. In order to further ensure content validity, a panel of judges reviewed the Teacher Job Performance Questionnaire. The panel included (a) two directors of personnel, (b) two assistant superintendents or directors of instruction, (c) two university professors experienced in the field of teacher evaluation, and (d) five principals or assistant principals.
Panel review procedures. The panel of judges reviewed the job performance questionnaire to determine if the performance areas or dimensions listed were the primary areas in which teachers should have at least a minimum degree of competence and if any additional areas should be included. Panelists also reviewed the entire questionnaire for readability, clarity, and ease of completion and made suggestions for wording or structural changes.

An 80% coefficient of agreement was established for panel responses. Any items accepted without modification by at least 80% of the panel members were identified as appropriate. Items having less than an 80% agreement rate were modified and the final version of the survey instrument was developed.

Panel recommendations resulted in the deletion of one item and minor wording changes in four items. In addition, a sixth category of response, "not observed," was added to the Likert-type scale on which principals were to evaluate the performance of teachers.

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was designed to measure an individual's satisfaction with several different aspects of the job environment. The questionnaire has two forms and was developed as part of the Work Adjustment Project studies at the University of
Minnesota's Industrial Relations Center (Guion, 1978; Weiss, Davis, England, & Lofquist, 1967).

The long-form of the questionnaire includes 20 scales of job satisfaction and 100 items each requiring a response on a Likert-type rating scale. The short-form, which was used to measure the job satisfaction of teachers in this study, consists of the 20 items most highly correlated with the 20 scales in the long-form (Guion, 1978; Weiss et al., 1967). Using a Likert-type rating scale ranging from one to five, respondents were asked to rate how they felt about each statement in relation to their jobs as teachers in Chesapeake Public Schools (see Appendix C for a copy of this questionnaire).

**Determination of content validity.** Much of the evidence for the validity of the short-form of the MSQ has been inferred from studies validating the long-form of the same questionnaire. Such studies have included construct validation studies of the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire and other construct validation studies based on the Theory of Work Adjustment (Weiss et al., 1967). The Theory of Work Adjustment states that job satisfaction or work adjustment depends on how well an individual's abilities and needs correspond with work requirements and reinforcers in the work environment. The validation studies in which the MSQ was used as a measure of job satisfaction indicated that the
MSQ measured job satisfaction in accordance with the expectations of this theory (Weiss et al., 1967).

Concurrent validity of the long-form of the MSQ was established by a study of the differences in job satisfaction among 25 occupational groups. Based on results of a one-way analysis of variance and Bartlett's test of homogeneity of variance, Weiss et al. (1967) concluded that the MSQ can be used to differentiate degrees of job satisfaction among groups.

Content validity of the long-form was established by performing a factor analysis on intercorrelations of the 21 MSQ scales for 14 norm groups. Results indicated that half of the variance in the common MSQ scale score could be attributed to extrinsic satisfaction with intrinsic satisfaction accounting for the remaining variance. Content validity was further established by data on the Hoyt reliability coefficients for the MSQ indicating that 83% of the 567 coefficients were .80 or higher with only 2.5% lower than .70 (Weiss et al., 1967).

In addition to that inferred from the long-form, other evidence for the validity of the short-form of the MSQ includes results of studies of occupational group differences and studies of the relationship between satisfaction and satisfactoriness. Studies of occupational groups using the short-form of the MSQ indicated that mean satisfaction scores were significantly different among
groups and that group differences in variability were not statistically significant. These results were similar to results obtained when the long-form of the MSQ was used to measure job satisfaction among different groups. Results of studies of the relationship between satisfaction and satisfactoriness, using the short-form as the measure of satisfaction, also supported the validity of the MSQ by establishing that satisfaction and satisfactoriness are independent variables (Weiss et al., 1967).

Validity of the MSQ was also supported by Robert Guion (1978) writing in The Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook. Guion concluded that, "Clearly, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire gives reasonably reliable, valid, well-normed indications of general satisfaction at work and of 20 aspects of that satisfaction, collapsible into intrinsic and extrinsic components" (p. 1679).

Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected using three questionnaires developed and utilized for purposes of this study, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, and archival data maintained by the Chesapeake Public Schools. The questionnaires were used to collect information related to the recruitment practices of Virginia public school divisions and the recruitment source and job performance of selected teachers in Chesapeake Public Schools. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire provided data on the
job satisfaction of the same group of teachers. Archival records were reviewed to gather data on the absenteeism and retention rates of teachers recruited from different sources during selected years.

Survey Data from Virginia Public School Divisions

The Survey of Teacher Recruitment Practices of Virginia Public School Divisions was mailed to the 133 school divisions in the Commonwealth during the first week of May of 1995. Each survey was accompanied by a cover letter explaining the study and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope. The first mailing resulted in the return of 63 (47%) of the questionnaires. Four weeks later, follow-up letters along with additional copies of the survey were sent to those who had not responded to the first mailing. The follow-up mailing resulted in the receipt of 43 additional questionnaires for a total of 106 questionnaires returned and a total return rate of 80%. The correspondence accompanying each questionnaire is included in Appendix A. The questionnaire used for this portion of the study is included in Appendix C.

Survey Data from Teachers in Chesapeake Public Schools

During the third week of May 1995, 744 packets of questionnaires were mailed to individuals in Chesapeake Public Schools identified as classroom teachers who were newly employed in the school system between 1989 and 1994, inclusively, and who remained on the payroll as of September
1994. Each packet included a cover letter explaining the study and the contents of the packet, copies of the Recruitment Source Survey and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, the Teacher Recruitment Study Release Form, and a sample copy of the Teacher Job Performance Questionnaire (see Appendices A-C for copies of these documents).

Teachers were asked to return the two questionnaires along with the release form if they were willing to participate in the study. Participants were assured that the Teacher Job Performance Questionnaire was designed to ensure that information received would not identify the specific teacher, would have no impact on the teacher's future evaluations or employment with Chesapeake Public Schools, and would not be entered into the teacher's personnel file. They were also informed that the instrument included a preprinted label identifying the teacher whose job performance was to be assessed by the principal and an identification number assigned to the teacher at the outset of the study. Directions both at the beginning and the end of the questionnaire reminded principals to tear off the label bearing the teacher's name prior to returning the questionnaire to the researcher. Assurances were given that all information would be recorded and reported using the teacher identification number. In addition, teachers were asked to sign a release form
granting the researcher permission to seek information on their job performance in the manner described and to review their attendance records.

Following the initial mailing, it was determined that 15 individuals had been incorrectly identified as classroom teachers and that four other individuals had moved to non-teaching positions after September 1994. These individuals were removed from the sample, decreasing the sample size to a total of 725 possible respondents.

The first mailing in May resulted in 433 responses. Three weeks later a follow-up letter was sent to those teachers who had not responded. This mailing resulted in 88 additional responses for a total of 521 persons responding to the survey and a total return rate of 72%.

Archival Data

Retention rate. To determine the retention rate of teachers recruited from different sources, as required by Hypothesis II.1., it was necessary to retrieve and compare archival data from the Personnel Department, Chesapeake Public Schools. The data necessary included a list of teachers employed in 1989, 1990, 1992, and 1993 and a list of all teachers still on payroll as of September 30, 1994. By comparing these lists, it was possible to determine that of the 692 teachers employed during the four years, 124 were no longer employed in Chesapeake Public Schools. Data collected from either the records of the 692 teachers or
from data supplied by teachers in the group who completed the Recruitment Source Questionnaire revealed from which of three sources (campus recruitment other than Career Commitment, Career Commitment, and all other sources) each teacher was recruited into Chesapeake Public Schools. The number of teachers recruited from each source who had resigned were subtracted from the total number hired from the same source and a percentage retention rate for each of the three recruitment sources was calculated.

Absenteeism records. Hypothesis II.4. of this study related to the relationship between the sources from which teachers were recruited into Chesapeake Public Schools and the attendance rates of those teachers. To address this hypothesis, information was collected from the Chesapeake Public Schools School Payroll System Year to Date Register for each teacher who agreed to participate in the study on the total number of days of absence during the teacher's tenure in the school division. For purposes of comparison, the number of days of absence for each teacher was subtracted from the total number of work days possible and a percentage attendance rate was calculated.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were employed to analyze data collected on the recruitment practices of Virginia Public School Divisions (Research Question I.1.). Percentages and frequency distributions were used to describe data on school
system demographics, recruitment practices, recruitment sources, recruiters, and recruitment schedules. In addition, mean scores and standard deviations were calculated for each item related to recruitment practices and recruitment sources.

To test Hypothesis II.1, a group retention rate was calculated for each recruitment source. A chi-square test was then employed to determine if the retention rates differed significantly from each other. In addition, demographic data on the number of teachers recruited from each source for each year identified was computed and subjected to a chi-square test to analyze the difference in the number of teachers recruited from each source by year. This step was necessary to account for the variability in the sizes of the recruitment pools for the years included in the study.

Data collected to test Hypotheses II.2-4. were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including percentages, frequency distributions, mean scores, and standard deviations. Group mean scores and standard deviations were computed for measures of job performance, job satisfaction, and absenteeism for teachers recruited from different recruitment sources. An analysis of variance was performed for each measure on all groups to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference
(p<.05) in the job performance, job satisfaction, and absentee rates of teachers who were recruited from different sources.

Ethical Safeguards

The participants in this study were fully informed of all aspects of the study by means of transmittal letters accompanying questionnaires. Participants were informed in writing that only summary responses would be reported and that in no instances would individual school systems or individual respondents be identified. In addition, respondents were given an opportunity to request a copy of survey results. These results were forwarded to them at the conclusion of the study.

Because of the investigator's role of authority in Chesapeake Public Schools, special attention was given to respecting the rights and anonymity of teachers participating in the study. Each teacher received a release form requesting the teacher's permission to collect data on his or her job performance and use of sick leave. A teacher was only included in those portions of the study related to job performance or attendance rate if a signed release form was received. A statement on the form assured teachers that information would be reported anonymously, would have no effect on evaluation, and would not be made part of the personnel file. Teachers were also assured that participation in the study was not required and that they
could withdraw from the study at any time. A copy of the signed release form was sent to the principal along with the questionnaire on which the principal was to assess the teacher's job performance.

To further protect the teachers and to assure them that information collected would have no negative impact on their evaluations or employment, each teacher was assigned a number at the outset of the study. Returned questionnaires included the teacher's identification number rather than the teacher's name. All information was recorded using the identification number. The number was used to identify a name only in those cases in which a questionnaire was not returned and it was necessary to send a follow-up letter. In these cases, an individual other than the investigator identified non-respondents and prepared follow-up mailings.
CHAPTER 4
Analysis of Results

Introduction

The current study investigated the recruitment practices of the public school divisions in Virginia and the relationship between recruitment sources used in Chesapeake Public Schools and measures of personnel effectiveness: specifically, retention rates, job performance, job satisfaction, and attendance of teachers newly employed in Chesapeake between 1989 and 1993, inclusively. Research data were collected using three questionnaires designed for the study, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, and archival records maintained by Chesapeake Public Schools.

The investigation was conducted in two phases. Phase I was designed to answer the following research question: What are the predominant practices that guide the recruitment process in Virginia public school divisions? Phase II included four research hypotheses. Hypotheses II.1. related to the retention rates of teachers in Chesapeake Public Schools. Hypotheses II.2., II.3., and II.4. related to differences in job performance, job satisfaction, and attendance rates of teachers currently employed in Chesapeake Public Schools who were recruited
from different sources. The research data for the study will be presented and analyzed in this chapter.

**Phase I Respondents**

Phase I of the study required the use of a questionnaire to identify the predominant recruitment practices of Virginia's public school divisions. A review of the related literature revealed no survey instrument which would provide adequate data; therefore, a survey instrument was developed. The Survey of Teacher Recruitment Practices of Virginia Public School Divisions was sent to the superintendents of the 133 school divisions in the Commonwealth of Virginia as identified in the 1994-1995 *Virginia Educational Directory* published by the Virginia Department of Education.

**Return Rate**

Within three weeks of the initial mailing, 63 (47%) of the questionnaires were returned. A follow-up mailing resulted in the receipt of 43 additional questionnaires, for an overall return rate of 80% (n = 106). Of the questionnaires returned, 105 were usable. One school system returned an incomplete questionnaire noting that the school division did not maintain data in the format requested. The return rate for the Phase I questionnaire is summarized in Table 3.
Table 3

Questionnaire Return Rate: Virginia Public School Divisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey of Recruitment</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>79.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Practices of Virginia Public School Divisions

Demographic Information: Virginia Public School Divisions

The Survey of Teacher Recruitment Practices of Virginia Public School Divisions included four questions on school system demographics. Information was requested on the following topics: (a) student enrollment, (b) number of full-time, non-administrative personnel, (c) number of non-administrative, professional vacancies, and (d) total annual operating budget. Directions on the questionnaire indicated that all information provided should be for the 1994-1995 school year. In addition, it was specified that data on enrollment, number of personnel, and number of vacancies should be reported as of September 30, 1994. Demographic information for responding school divisions is presented in Table 4.
Table 4

Demographic Analysis by Student Enrollment, Professional Personnel, Operating Budget: Virginia Public School Divisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Minimum Reported</th>
<th>Maximum Reported</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Enrollment</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>138,500</td>
<td>9,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time, Non-Administrative, Professional Personnel</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10,350</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Budget</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
<td>$886,903,307</td>
<td>$49,255,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Budget</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$50,210</td>
<td>$5,285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 105

Of the 105 responding school divisions, 80% indicated that they had student enrollments of less than 10,000. The smallest school system responding reported a student enrollment of 610 and the largest an enrollment of 138,500. The mean enrollment for all school divisions reporting was 9,170.

The number of full-time, non-administrative, professional personnel reported by responding school systems ranged from a low of 45 to a high of 10,350. The mean response was 670. A majority (84%) of the school divisions reported having less than 1,000 employees in this category. Only two divisions indicated that they had more than 5,000 full-time, non-administrative, professional personnel.
Ninety-three percent of the school divisions answered the question related to the number of professional vacancies; however, a review of the data indicated that a large number of the respondents may have misunderstood the question. At least one-half appeared to have reported the number of vacancies as of September 30 rather than the number of vacancies filled for the 1994-1995 school term using September 30 as the cut-off date. Therefore, data for this question were not included in the report of findings of this study.

School divisions reported annual operating budgets ranging from a low of $3,200,000 to a high of $886,903,307, with a mean of $49,255,205. Over one-half (55%) of the divisions indicated that their budgets were less than 25 million dollars and only one system reported a budget greater than 500 million dollars. Only 63 (60% of the responding school divisions) indicated that they had funds specifically allocated to recruitment.
Data on the size of the personnel department and the types of personnel assigned were also requested. As can be noted in Table 5, 48% (n = 50) of the school divisions indicated that they had a personnel department which included an assistant superintendent for personnel or the equivalent. A similar number (n = 51) indicated that their personnel departments included a director of personnel or the equivalent. In addition, 41% (n = 43) reported having non-clerical support personnel such as a wage and salary specialist, computer specialist, or investigator assigned to the personnel office. The category of personnel reported as being assigned to most personnel departments was clerical personnel. Eighty-two percent (n = 86) of the school
divisions indicated that they had clerical assistance in the personnel office. When asked to identify other administrative personnel assigned to the department, the positions reported most often were supervisory or administrative positions such as personnel administrator, coordinator, supervisor, or assistant.

Two recruitment-specific questions were included in the section of the questionnaire designed to collect information on school system demographics. These questions related to whether the reporting divisions had a written policy addressing teacher recruitment and a formal process for evaluating the recruitment process on an annual or biennial basis. As was indicated by the research reviewed in Chapter 2, it was not surprising that less than one-half of the divisions reported having either a policy or an evaluation plan. Specifically, 38% (n = 40) responded that they had a written policy addressing teacher recruitment. The number of divisions (n = 22) reporting that they had a formal procedure for evaluating the recruitment process was even lower and represented only 21% of the responding school divisions.

**Phase II Respondents**

Phase II of the study required the use of three questionnaires for data collection. The Recruitment Source Survey provided information on the sources from which teachers in the study were recruited. This information was
necessary to stratify teachers by recruitment source in order to test Hypotheses II.2., II.3. and II.4. Recruitment Source Surveys were mailed to 744 classroom teachers who were identified by the Personnel Department as having been employed in Chesapeake Public Schools between 1989 and 1994, inclusively, and as remaining on the payroll as of September 1994. Teachers were asked to return the surveys and a release form granting permission for their individual principals to complete the Teacher Job Performance Questionnaire. As the completed Recruitment Source Surveys and release forms were returned, the principals of the schools to which the respondents were assigned were sent copies of the Teacher Job Performance Questionnaire to be completed and returned to the researcher. The Teacher Job Performance Questionnaire provided data necessary to investigate Hypotheses II.2. To provide data for Hypotheses II.3., the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was mailed to the same 744 classroom teachers who received the Recruitment Source Survey.

Return Rate

Following the initial mailing of the Recruitment Source Survey (n = 744), it was determined that 15 individuals had been incorrectly identified as classroom teachers by the Personnel Department and that four additional individuals had moved to non-teaching positions after September 1994; therefore, these individuals were
removed from the sample decreasing the sample size to a total of 725 possible respondents. The first mailing resulted in the return of 433 or 60% of the questionnaires and release forms. A follow-up mailing resulted in 88 additional responses for a total return rate of 72% (n = 521).

Teacher Job Performance Questionnaires were sent to the principals of the 521 teachers who returned release forms. Of these questionnaires, 513 were returned for a response rate of 98%.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaires were mailed to the same 744 teachers as the Recruitment Source Survey; therefore, the same individuals were removed from the sample decreasing the sample size to a total of 725 respondents. Four of the returned Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaires were incomplete and unusable resulting in a return of 517 usable questionnaires. As is noted in Table 6, the final return rate was 72%.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Source Survey</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>71.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>71.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Job Performance Questionnaire</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>98.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic Information: Chesapeake Teachers

The Recruitment Source Survey included seven questions designed to provide demographic information on the responding teachers. The following information was requested: (a) current work setting, (b) current work assignment, (c) employment year, (d) years teaching prior to employment in Chesapeake Public Schools, (e) age at time of employment, (f) gender, and (g) race.

Of the 521 teachers completing the Recruitment Source Survey, the largest number \( n = 141 \) was hired in 1991 and the smallest number \( n < 72 \) in 1990. General education teachers represented 431 of the respondents while 90 were special education teachers. The majority \( n = 231 \) were assigned to elementary schools with 13 assignments at the preschool level, 145 at the middle school level, and 132 at the high school level.

The majority of the respondents \( (54\%) \) had no previous teaching experience at the time of employment. The respondents ranged in age at the time of employment from 20 to 61 with a mean age of 31.5. Not unexpectedly, females outnumbered males by 3 to 1. Seventy-seven percent of the respondents were white which reflected the percentage of white teachers employed in the school system. Additional demographic information is presented in Table 7.
Table 7

**Demographic Data: Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Setting</strong></td>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>44.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle/Jr. High</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>27.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>25.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>521</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Assignment</strong></td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>82.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>17.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>521</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Year</strong></td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>27.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>21.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>22.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>521</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Previous</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>54.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>20.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>over 20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>517</td>
<td>99.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age at Employment</strong></td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>35.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>14.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>over 45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>498</td>
<td>95.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Phase II Archival Data

To determine the group retention rate of teachers recruited from each of three sources (Hypotheses II.1.) and the attendance rates of individual teachers (Hypotheses II.4.) it was necessary to review archival data maintained by Chesapeake Public Schools.

Retention data

Retention records were reviewed to provide data necessary to test Hypotheses II.1. By comparing a list of all teachers employed in 1989, 1990, 1992, and 1993 to a list of all teachers on payroll as of September 30, 1994, it was determined that of the 692 teachers newly employed during the four years, 124 were no longer employed in Chesapeake Public Schools. Data collected from the
Recruitment Source Survey and from the files of those teachers who did not complete the questionnaire or who were no longer employed in the school system indicated from which of three sources (campus recruitment other than Career Commitment, Career Commitment, and all other sources) each teacher was recruited. By subtracting the number of teachers recruited from each source who had resigned from the total number hired from the same source, the number of teachers remaining in the school system was determined and a percentage retention rate for each of the three recruitment sources was calculated. The retention data for each source is presented in Table 8.

Table 8

**Teacher Retention by Source**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Recruiting</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>75.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Commitment</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>78.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Sources</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>83.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>82.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Absenteeism Data**

Using the Chesapeake Public Schools School Payroll System Year to Date Register, the number of days of absence during the teacher's tenure in the school system was determined for those teachers who returned a release form. Using the number of days of absence and the total number of
work days possible, a percentage attendance rate was calculated for each teacher. Due to missing data or errors in the reporting system, attendance data could not be calculated for 10 of the respondents, resulting in a total population of 511 for this portion of the study.

**Findings for Research Question and Research Hypotheses**

The study was conducted in two phases: specifically, (a) Phase I: Identification of recruitment practices of public school divisions in Virginia and (b) Phase II: Relationship between recruitment sources and measures of personnel effectiveness. Phase I investigated one research question and Phase II investigated four research hypotheses. The results will be presented by addressing the research question and hypotheses in each phase of the study.

**Research Question for Phase I: Identification of Recruitment Practices of Public School Divisions in Virginia**

1.1. What are the predominant practices that guide the recruitment process in Virginia public school divisions?

**Recruitment practices.** Based on a review of the current literature and research on teacher recruitment, a list of 23 recruitment practices was developed. Using a Likert-type scale with a range of from one to four indicating responses of not used, seldom used, often used, and regularly used, participating school divisions were asked to circle the number which best indicated the extent to which the practice was used in the school division. A
list of recruitment practices as presented in the Survey of Teacher Recruitment Practices is provided in Table 9.

School division responses were analyzed by calculating a frequency distribution, mean score, and standard deviation for each practice. Means and standard deviations for recruitment practices, are presented in Table 9.

Table 9
Means and Standard Deviations for Recruitment Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey No.</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Recruited out of state</td>
<td>2.9428</td>
<td>1.0268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Recruited in-state at least 50 miles from division</td>
<td>3.5809</td>
<td>.7693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Used a recruitment brochure</td>
<td>3.4368</td>
<td>.9463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Used audio-visual materials</td>
<td>1.6601</td>
<td>.9450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Advertised on radio</td>
<td>1.1238</td>
<td>.3309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Advertised on television</td>
<td>1.1619</td>
<td>.4828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Collaborated with the business community</td>
<td>1.8446</td>
<td>.7765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Involved the community</td>
<td>1.8557</td>
<td>.8409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Involved currently employed teachers</td>
<td>2.4174</td>
<td>.9447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Involved retired teachers</td>
<td>1.7647</td>
<td>.8226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Involved principals</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td>.9828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Paid bonuses to new teachers</td>
<td>1.0480</td>
<td>.2561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Provided incentives</td>
<td>1.1634</td>
<td>.5234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Paid expenses for applicant visits</td>
<td>1.2596</td>
<td>.5573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
As can be noted in Table 9, a limited number of recruitment practices were reported as "often" or "regularly used" by responding school divisions. Four practices, recruited out-of-state colleges or universities; recruited in-state colleges or universities at least 50 miles from the school division; used a recruitment brochure or other written materials designed for recruitment; and involved principals in recruitment activities, had mean scores of 2.6 or higher indicating that the majority of responses fell into the two categories indicating frequent use. Conversely, 19 of the 23 practices (83%) were identified by school divisions as falling into the "not used" or "seldom
used" categories. In 11 cases the majority of the school divisions indicated that the practices were not used in their divisions. The eleven cases included the following practices: (a) recruited internationally, (b) used audio-visual materials designed for recruitment, (c) advertised on radio, (d) advertised on television, (e) paid bonuses to new teachers for signing contracts, (f) provided incentives such as apartment discounts, moving expenses, or discounted interest rates to new teachers for signing contracts, (g) paid expenses for applicants to visit the division, (h) provided scholarships to students in the division who planned to pursue a career in teaching, (i) offered bonuses to new teachers licensed in hard-to-find subject areas, (j) worked with a Teacher Cadet program or Future Educator's Club to encourage students to pursue teaching as a career, and (k) collaborated with the teacher association in recruitment activities.

Recruitment sources. In addition to recruitment practices, 13 commonly used recruitment sources were identified in the literature. Using a Likert-type scale with a range of from one to four indicating responses of not used, seldom used, often used, and regularly used, participating school divisions were asked to circle the number which best indicated the extent to which each recruitment source was used in the school division. A list
of the recruitment sources as presented in the Survey of Teacher Recruitment Practices is provided in Table 10.

School division responses were analyzed by calculating a frequency distribution, mean score, and standard deviation for each source. Means and standard deviations for recruitment sources, prioritized by level of use in participating school divisions, are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations for Recruitment Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey No.</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Self-referrals</td>
<td>3.2761</td>
<td>.6863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Employee-referrals</td>
<td>3.0288</td>
<td>.7167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>College/university placement offices</td>
<td>3.4666</td>
<td>.6055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Campus visits/job fairs</td>
<td>3.2115</td>
<td>.9417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Employment agencies</td>
<td>1.7619</td>
<td>.6867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Student teachers</td>
<td>3.0288</td>
<td>.8179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Clerical or support personnel</td>
<td>2.2211</td>
<td>.8355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Newspaper ads</td>
<td>2.9523</td>
<td>1.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Television ads</td>
<td>1.1428</td>
<td>.4258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Radio ads</td>
<td>1.1047</td>
<td>.3077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Advertising in professional publications</td>
<td>2.1153</td>
<td>.8955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Substitutes</td>
<td>2.7788</td>
<td>.8238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Professional meetings</td>
<td>2.3653</td>
<td>.8132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be noted by comparing Tables 9 and 10, more consistency was found among school divisions in the use of specified recruitment sources than in the use of recruitment practices. For example, over 50% of the school divisions indicated that they either "often" or "regularly used" seven of the thirteen sources to attract individuals to the organization. These sources included self-referrals, employee referrals, college/university placement offices, campus visits/job fairs, student teachers, newspaper advertisements, and substitutes in the school division. The two sources (television advertisements and radio advertisements) having the lowest mean scores (1.1428 and 1.1047) also had the lowest variability and were cited as "not used" by 93% and 94% of the school divisions, respectively.

The recruiter. Three recruiter-related questions were included in the Survey of Teacher Recruitment Practices. Specifically, Virginia school divisions were asked (a) to identify the individual in the school system who was delegated the primary responsibility for recruitment activities, (b) to indicate if special training was provided to recruiters, and (c) if training were provided, to identify those topics which were included in the training.

Of the 105 school systems completing questionnaires, 93 responded to the question related to recruitment responsibility. Thirty-seven indicated that the personnel
director was delegated the primary responsibility for conducting recruitment activities. Another 37 responded that this responsibility was assigned to the assistant superintendent. Of the nineteen systems that marked the "other" category, 17 indicated that recruitment was the responsibility of an administrator or supervisor assigned to the Personnel Department. One system responded that recruitment was the responsibility of the deputy superintendent and one system indicated that a recruitment specialist was assigned this task (see Table 11).

Consistent with the literature, only 52 (49%) of the participating school divisions responded that they provided training to recruiters. The top four training topics identified were school division demographics, interviewing skills, information on salaries and fringe benefits, and information about the community. The topic identified by the fewest school divisions as one in which training was offered was counseling skills. Additional information on school system responses to recruiter-related questions is presented in Table 11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Responsibility</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel Dir.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ass't. Sup't.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Training</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Topics</td>
<td>Listening Skills</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation Skills</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling Skills</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Division</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>86.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>86.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewing Skills</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>86.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>76.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salaries/Benefits</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>84.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[n = 105\]

\[^a^\text{Two school systems marked two answers each.}\]

\[^b^\text{Multiple answers were permitted.}\]

\[^c^\text{n = 52 = the number of school systems providing training.}\]
Recruitment schedule. Two questions were included on the Survey of Teacher Recruitment Practices which were designed to determine the time relationship between recruitment and employment activity. Participating divisions were asked to identify the three months in which the most recruitment activity was conducted and the three months in which the most newly hired teacher personnel were employed. As is shown in Figure 1, the three months identified most often as those in which recruitment activity was conducted were February (n = 53), March (n = 75), and April (n = 70). The three months in which the largest newly hired teachers were employed were June (n = 89), July (n = 85), and August (n = 57).
Figure 1. Comparison of three highest months of recruitment and hiring activity as identified by Virginia public school divisions.

**Research Hypotheses for Phase II: Relationship Between Recruitment Sources and Measures of Personnel Effectiveness:** Specifically, Retention Rates, Job Performance, Job Satisfaction, and Attendance Rates

Analyses of data for Research Hypotheses II. 1.: Retention rates of teachers in Chesapeake Public Schools.

The population for this portion of the study was identified from a list of teachers obtained from the Personnel Department and included all teachers with employment dates of 1989, 1990, 1992, and 1993 (n = 692), including those who were no longer employed in the school system. The
population for whom retention data were obtained was stratified according to three categories of recruitment source: Career Commitment recruiting, other campus recruiting, and other sources. A group retention rate was calculated for each recruitment source by year and for the total four years. This information is summarized in Table 12 and Figure 2.

Table 12

**Teacher Retention Rates by Employment Year and Recruitment Source**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hired</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Retention Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Commitment</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>89.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Year Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>78.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Recruiting</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Year Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>75.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>77.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>88.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>91.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Year Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>492</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>83.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. Teacher retention rates by employment year and recruitment source.

A chi-square test was employed to determine if the group retention rates differed significantly from each other. A type I error risk was pre-established at the .05 level. A chi-square value of .176 at this level of significance indicated that no statistically significant difference existed in the group retention rates of teachers employed during the specified years who were recruited from the three sources (Career Commitment, campus recruiting other than Career Commitment, and other sources); therefore, there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. Table 13 contains the information regarding this analysis.
Table 13

Chi-Square Analysis of Teacher Retention by Recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.47911</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.17560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.33734</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.18850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantel-Haenzel test for linear association</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.33801</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.12625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Expected Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic data on the number of teachers recruited from each source for each year identified was also subjected to a chi-square test to analyze the difference in the number of teachers recruited from each source by year. This step was necessary to account for any variability in the sizes of the recruitment pools for the years included in the study. No significant difference was found in the number of teachers recruited from each source during the four years specified. This analysis is reported in Table 14.

Table 14

Chi-Square Analysis of Teachers Hired by Year and Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>12.42988</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.05304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>12.01313</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.06168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantel-Haenzel test for linear association</td>
<td>5.04638</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Expected Frequency</td>
<td>13.260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyses of data for Hypotheses II, 2-4. Using data provided by the Recruitment Source Questionnaire, teachers were stratified according to recruitment source. Of the ten sources listed on the original questionnaire, nine sources were identified by teachers as the means by which they were recruited into the school division. The only source not identified was "advertisement in professional publications"; therefore, this source was not included in the analyses of data. The number of teachers recruited from each source ranged from 7 to 176 (see Table 15).

Table 15

Recruitment Sources Identified by Teachers: Chesapeake Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Recruitment Interview</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Commitment Candidate</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Job Fair</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement in Newspaper</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral by an Employee in CPS</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>23.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Initiated Contact</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>33.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral by Friends or Relatives Familiar with CPS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehire</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 521
Hypothesis II. 2. There is no significant difference (p<.05) in the job performance of teachers who were recruited from different sources and who were employed in Chesapeake Public Schools between 1989 and 1993, inclusively. Using the Teacher Job Performance Questionnaire, data were collected from the principals of 513 teachers. The instrument employed a Likert-type scale to measure the principal's assessment of the individual teacher's overall level of performance and a range of from one to six indicating responses of unacceptable, needs improvement, satisfactory, above average, excellent, and not observed. Individual scores were calculated using a weighted average and ranged from one to five.

Mean performance scores and standard deviations were calculated for teachers recruited from each of nine recruitment sources.

Table 16

Means and Standard Deviations for Teacher Performance Scores by Recruitment Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Recruitment Interview</td>
<td>4.214</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>35a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Commitment Candidate</td>
<td>4.321</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Job Fair</td>
<td>4.071</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement in Newspaper</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral by an Employee in CPS</td>
<td>4.290</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>124b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
As can be noted in the Table 16, mean scores for all groups were relatively high ranging from 4.0 to 4.5. In addition, a one-way analysis of variance was employed to test the null hypothesis. A P value of .338 indicated that there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. No statistically significant difference was indicated in the performance of teachers recruited from different sources during the specified years. Table 17 contains the information regarding this analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Initiated Contact</td>
<td>4.190</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral by Friends or Relatives Familiar with CPS</td>
<td>4.431</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehire</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.242</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n = 521 \)

a One performance questionnaire was not received for a teacher recruited from this source. b One performance questionnaire not received. c Three performance questionnaires not received. d Three performance questionnaires not received.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum-of-Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean-Square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>4.064</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>225.561</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypotheses II. 3. There is no significant difference (p<.05) in the job satisfaction of teachers who were recruited from different sources and who were employed in Chesapeake Public Schools between 1989 and 1993, inclusively. Data on job satisfaction were collected using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. The questionnaire employed a Likert-type scale with a range of from one to five indicating responses of very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job, satisfied, and very satisfied. Individual scores ranged from 20, indicating a high degree of job dissatisfaction, to 100, indicating a high degree of job satisfaction. Although questionnaires were received from 521 teachers, five were eliminated because they were either incomplete or completed incorrectly; therefore 516 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Mean satisfaction scores and standard deviations were calculated for teachers recruited from each of the nine recruitment sources. As can be noted in table 18, mean satisfaction scores for all groups were relatively high ranging from 80.92 to 92.14. The lowest mean score was for those teachers recruited as Career Commitment candidates and the highest mean score was for those teachers recruited through newspaper advertisements. It should be noted, however, that the latter source had the smallest population with an N of only 7. Further analysis of the data revealed
ten outlier scores. The outlier scores ranged from 27 to 58 and represented four different recruitment sources. There was no indication that the outlier scores significantly affected the results of further data analyses.

Table 18

**Means and Standard Deviations for Job Satisfaction Scores by Recruitment Source**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Recruitment Interview</td>
<td>81.08</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Commitment Candidate</td>
<td>80.92</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Job Fair</td>
<td>82.92</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement in Newspaper</td>
<td>92.14</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral by an Employee in CPS</td>
<td>82.30</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>124a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Initiated Contact</td>
<td>81.54</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>175b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral by Friends or Relatives Familiar with CPS</td>
<td>83.53</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehire</td>
<td>81.14</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>82.75</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>41c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 521

*One participant in this category did not complete job satisfaction questionnaire. *One participant did not complete questionnaire. *Two participants did not complete questionnaire.

A one-way analysis of variance was employed to test the null hypothesis. A P value of .330 indicated that there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. No statistically significant difference was indicated in the job satisfaction of teachers
recruited from different sources during the specified years. Information on this analysis is contained in Table 19.

Table 19

One-Factor Analysis of Variance of Difference in Teachers' Job Satisfaction Scores by Recruitment Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum-of-Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean-Square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>972.288</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>121.536</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>53754.068</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>105.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis II. 4. There is no significant difference (p < .05) in the attendance rates of teachers who were recruited from different sources and who were employed in Chesapeake Public Schools between 1989 and 1993, inclusively. Using absenteeism records maintained in the Chesapeake Public Schools School Payroll System Year to Date Register percentage attendance rates were calculated for 511 teachers. Mean attendance rates and standard deviations for teachers in each of the nine recruitment sources were also calculated.

As can be noted in Table 20, mean attendance rates ranged from a low of .964 for advertisement in the newspaper to a high of .975 for other recruitment sources. Five outlier scores were identified representing three sources. These scores were included in the further analyses of data.
Table 20

Means and Standard Deviations for Attendance Rates by Recruitment Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Recruitment Interview</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Commitment Candidate</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Job Fair</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement in Newspaper</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral by an Employee in CPS</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>122a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Initiated Contact</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>170b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral by Friends or Relatives Familiar with CPS</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehire</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 521

\(^a\)Attendance data not available for three participants in this category. \(^b\)Attendance data not available for six participants. \(^c\)Attendance data not available for one participant.

A one-way analysis of variance resulted in a P value of .743 indicating that there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. No statistically significant difference was indicated in the attendance rates of teachers recruited from different sources during the specified years. Information on this analysis is presented in Table 21.
**Table 21**

**One-Factor Analysis of Variance of Difference in Teachers' Attendance Rates by Recruitment Source**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum-of-Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean-Square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Findings**

In response to the research question regarding the predominant practices that guide the recruitment process in Virginia public school divisions, the superintendents of the 133 public school systems in Virginia were surveyed. Eighty percent (n = 106) of the school divisions responded to the questionnaire which was designed specifically for this study. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The findings are summarized as follows:

1. Less than one-half (38%) of the responding school divisions indicated that they had a written policy addressing teacher recruitment.

2. Only 21% of the responding school divisions reported having a formal process for evaluating the recruitment process on an annual or biennial basis.

3. Of the 23 recruitment practices identified, only four (10, 11, 12, and 20) had mean scores of 2.6 or higher indicating that they were reported as "often" or "regularly used" by the majority of responding school divisions.
4. Of the 23 practices identified, 11 (9, 13, 14, 15, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29, and 30) were reported as "not used" by the majority of responding school divisions.

5. Over 50% of the school divisions indicated that they either "often" or "regularly used" seven (32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 39, and 43) of the 13 recruitment sources identified.

6. Two sources (40 and 41) were cited as "not used" by 93% and 94% of the school divisions, respectively.

7. The personnel director and the assistant superintendent were the personnel most often identified as having the primary responsibility for conducting recruitment activities.

8. Recruiter-training was provided by 49% (n = 52) of the responding school divisions. The top four training topics identified were school division demographics, interviewing skills, information on salaries and fringe benefits, and information about the community.

9. The three months most frequently identified as those in which the most recruitment activity was conducted were February, March, and April.

10. The three months most frequently identified as those in which the largest number of newly hired teachers were employed were June, July, and August.

To test the research hypothesis regarding the retention rates of teachers recruited from three different
sources, a group retention rate for a four-year period was calculated for each source. A chi-square test indicated that at the .05 level of significance no statistically significant difference existed in the group retention rates of the teachers.

Hypotheses II. 2-4, which were related to the job performance, job satisfaction, and attendance rates of teachers recruited from different sources over a five-year period, were tested using a one-way analysis of variance. In each case, there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance; therefore, the findings were as follows:

1. No statistically significant difference was found in the performance of teachers recruited from different sources during the specified years.

2. No statistically significant difference was found in the job satisfaction of teachers recruited from different sources during the specified years.

3. No statistically significant difference was found in the attendance rates of teachers recruited from different sources during the specified years.
Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions, Discussion, and Implications

A summary of the study and findings are presented in this chapter along with conclusions and implications drawn from the conclusions. Recommendations for further research are also presented.

Summary

The significance of recruitment as it relates to the staffing process and to school effectiveness has been well established in the literature; therefore, it is essential that studies be conducted which add to the literature describing recruitment practices. In addition, if the primary goal of recruitment is to provide a pool of applicants to match with jobs within the organization so that both the needs of the individual and the needs of the organization are met, then hiring follow-up studies must be conducted to determine if this goal is being achieved. Such studies generally measure recruitment source effectiveness by measuring employee success in terms of post-hire outcomes such as employee retention, job performance, job satisfaction, and attendance. With these goals in mind, this study was conducted with two major purposes: (a) to describe the recruitment practices of the public school
divisions in Virginia and (b) to examine the relationship between recruitment sources used in Chesapeake Public Schools and four measures of personnel effectiveness (retention rates, job performance, job satisfaction, and attendance).

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings of this study:

1. Most Virginia public school divisions do not have a written policy addressing teacher recruitment or a plan for regularly evaluating the recruitment process.

2. Four recruitment practices are often or regularly used by Virginia public school divisions. These practices, prioritized by degree of use, include (a) recruiting at in-state colleges or universities at least 50 miles from the school division, (b) using a recruitment brochure or other written materials designed for recruitment, (c) involving principals in recruitment activities, and (d) recruiting at out-of-state colleges or universities.

3. Most of the recruitment practices recommended in the literature are seldom if ever used by Virginia public school divisions. The five least used practices include: (a) providing incentives, (b) advertising on television, (c) offering bonuses to teachers in hard-to-find subjects, (d) advertising on radio, and (e) paying bonuses to new teachers for signing contracts.
4. Seven recruitment sources are often or regularly used by Virginia public school divisions. These sources, prioritized by degree of use, include (a) college/university placement offices, (b) self-referrals, (c) campus visits/job fairs, (d) employee-referrals, (e) student teachers, (f) newspaper advertisements, and (g) substitutes in the school divisions.

5. Most Virginia public school divisions never use television or radio advertising as sources for teachers.

6. In Virginia, the personnel director or the assistant superintendent for personnel is most often assigned the primary responsibility for conducting school division recruitment activities.

7. Almost one-half of Virginia public school divisions provide formal training to recruiters. Most training is in the areas of school division and community demographics, interviewing skills, and salaries and fringe benefits. Little training is provided in listening skills, presentation skills, counseling skills, communication skills, and interpersonal skills.

8. Most Virginia school divisions conduct the majority of their recruitment in the months of February, March, and April and the majority of their hiring in the months of June, July, and August; therefore, the time between recruitment and hiring ranges from two to six months.
9. No statistical difference exists in the retention rates, job performance, job satisfaction, or attendance rates of teachers in the study who were recruited from different recruitment sources.

Discussion

Data collected using four questionnaires and archival records maintained by Chesapeake Public Schools and a subsequent analyses of the data supported the conclusions noted above. Further discussion of these conclusions with an emphasis on issues identified in the research is included in this section.

Recruitment Practices

Several major conclusions were drawn from Phase I of this study which was related to the recruitment practices of Virginia school divisions. Each of these conclusions is discussed in detail below.

Written recruitment policies and program evaluation.

Two earlier studies of school system recruitment, one nationwide (Schleicher, 1989/1990) and the other in Nebraska (Wollman, 1987/1988), also addressed the issues of written recruitment policies and evaluation of recruitment programs. As was concluded in the current study, both of these studies indicated that most school systems had no written recruitment policies; however, the one study that investigated evaluation programs indicated that a much higher percentage of Nebraska school systems conduct a
regular evaluation of their recruitment programs than do Virginia systems.

The absence of written recruitment policies and evaluation procedures in Virginia school divisions may indicate a lack of understanding among upper-level school administrators of the importance of recruitment in establishing a viable pool of applicants and locating badly needed minority and other shortage area teachers. School leaders tend to formulate policy for and evaluate those programs or procedures which are valued by the school division.

This unplanned and informal approach to recruitment may have costly implications for Virginia school divisions. According to Castetter (1992), for example, such informal approaches may result in "problems such as position-person mismatches, ineffective performance, undue supervision, absenteeism, lateness, turnover, antiorganization behavior, unwarranted tenure, and personal litigation" (p. 112). In addition, Stanton (1977) pointed out that there may be hidden costs of poor recruitment planning such as "low quality of work performed, internal disorganization and disruption that the employee may cause, and poor public relations that may be generated" (p. 44).

For those divisions in which school leaders value recruitment programs or find recruitment necessary to staff vacant positions, failure to develop written policies and
conduct formal evaluations may have implications for school board or public support of recruitment efforts. In these times of tight budgets, school divisions wishing to maintain or expand programs must be willing to develop clearly stated policies and collect the evaluation data necessary to convince school boards and taxpayers that those goals are being met.

**Frequently used recruitment practices.** The four recruitment practices identified in this study as practices regularly used by Virginia school divisions were also identified in other studies as practices often used in the recruitment of teachers (Blankenship, 1970; G’Fellers, 1992/1993; Schleicher, 1989/1990; Vanderheiden, 1981/1982). In comparing the results of the current study to the results of Blankenship's earlier study of the recruitment practices of Virginia school divisions, it was interesting to note that recruiting at in-state and out-of-state colleges and universities and using written recruitment brochures were also commonly used practices in Virginia as early as 1970.

More significant than the finding that four recruitment practices are often or regularly used in Virginia is the finding that most of the recruitment practices recommended in the literature are seldom if ever used by Virginia school divisions. For example, participating school divisions indicated that the following practices were never used in the recruitment of teachers:
(a) recruited internationally, (b) used audio-visual materials designed for recruitment, (c) advertised on radio, (d) advertised on television, (e) paid bonuses to new teachers for signing contracts, (f) provided incentives for signing contracts, (g) paid expenses for applicants to visit the school division, (h) provided teaching scholarships to students in the system, (i) offered bonuses to new teachers in hard-to-find subject areas, (j) worked with a Teacher Cadet Program or Future Educators' Club, and (k) collaborated with the teachers' organization. Instead of using these new approaches, school divisions continue to depend on more traditional approaches such as recruiting at in-state and out-of-state colleges and universities, developing inexpensive recruitment brochures which can be printed in school system printing departments, and using available personnel such as principals in the recruitment effort. The end result is that school systems find themselves competing with similar systems for the same narrow field of candidates. These efforts are not enhanced when recruitment brochures offer nothing different to attract candidates and recruiters are trained as school administrators rather than as human resource professionals.

Limiting the recruitment practices used to in-state or out-of-state campus recruitment not only limits the number of applicants in the applicant pool but also may limit the types of applicants available in terms of race, age, gender,
experience, and subject-area endorsement. If, as the research indicates, the effectiveness of selection depends upon the effectiveness of recruitment, the applicant pool must be large enough and diverse enough that some applicants will be selected and others will not.

**Frequently used recruitment sources.** In the current study, the two recruitment sources identified as those regularly used by the largest number of Virginia school divisions were college/university placement offices and self-referrals. These same sources were identified as the most used sources in studies by Nuckolls (1993/1994), Schleicher (1989/1990), Vanderheiden (1981/1982), and Wollman (1987/1988). Blankenship's (1970) study listed five sources as those most frequently used by Virginia school divisions in the recruitment of teachers. Three of the five sources, candidate-initiated contacts, student-teacher programs, and employee referrals, were also found to be three of the five most frequently used sources in the current study. The implications of these findings are the same as the implications of the findings related to recruitment practices. School systems that find it necessary to limit the recruitment practices used or the sources from which teachers are recruited also limit their ability to attract a well-trained, diverse pool of teacher applicants to meet their many needs.
Recruiter training. One of the most interesting findings of this study, when compared to the findings of studies in business and industry, was that slightly less than one-half of Virginia school divisions provided formal training to recruiters. Research in business and industry, however, indicated that a primary factor affecting applicant attraction was the recruiter and that recruiter-training was an essential component of successful recruitment programs (Alderfer & McCord, 1970; Fisher et al., 1979; Harn & Thornton, 1985; Harris & Fink, 1987; Herriott & Rothwell, 1981; Liden & Parsons, 1986; Maurer, et al., 1992; Powell, 1984; Rogers & Sincoff, 1978; Rynes & Miller, 1983; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987; Turban & Dougherty, 1992). The three recruiter characteristics mentioned most often as attracting applicants to the organization were (a) knowledge of the organization and the job, (b) recruiter personality and behaviors, and (c) personal characteristics. Knowledge of the organization and the job and appropriate recruiter behaviors can only be learned through well-designed training activities.

Organizations that fail to properly train recruiters not only limit their effectiveness in terms of attracting applicants, they also limit their success in employing the most desirable applicants. Therefore, school divisions, like business and industry, must train recruiters to be more than purveyors of information. They must also train them to
be knowledgeable, effective interviewers who can sell the organization while practicing effective listening, presentation, counseling, communication, and interpersonal skills.

**Relationship between recruiting and hiring decisions.**

The months identified in this study as the three months in which the most recruitment activity was conducted were February, March, and April. These same three months were identified in Blankenship's (1970) earlier study. This is especially interesting when compared with studies outside of the state of Virginia in which April, May and June were listed as the months in which the most recruiting activity was conducted (Schleicher, 1989/1990; Vanderheiden, 1981/1982).

The two- to six-month delay between the recruitment and hiring phases in Virginia school divisions may have serious implications not only for the types and quality of teachers employed but also for the quality of candidates attracted to the school systems in general. At least two earlier studies (Rynes et al., 1991; Wise et al., 1987) addressed the importance of reducing the time between recruiting and hiring. The study by Rynes et al. suggested that delays not only result in the loss of the best candidates to other jobs, delays also result in inferences by the most marketable job seekers that there must be something wrong with the organization. An additional finding was that job
seekers share negative information related to delays with other job seekers and that this information may limit interest in the organization as a possible employer.

Wise et al. (1987) not only stressed the importance of a tight coupling between recruitment and hiring decisions, but also emphasized that such a coupling requires effective planning on the part of school divisions. If school systems are going to offer jobs in a timely manner, they must accurately project the number and types of vacancies expected. This requires effective communication between central office and the schools in determining what vacancies can be expected. In addition, if a tight coupling is going to occur, school divisions must be willing to offer open contracts to future teachers early in the year with school placement at a later date. For this plan to be effective, school principals and central office administrators must be in agreement on needs and selection criteria.

Chesapeake Public Schools is an example of a school system that has successfully practiced the concept of tight coupling between recruiting and hiring decisions through the Career Commitment Program discussed earlier in this paper. By recruiting in October and November and offering contracts in early January, Chesapeake has increased the likelihood of hiring more minorities and teachers in hard-to-find subject areas such as special education because the school system
has actually hired teachers before other school divisions have even begun to recruit.

The success of the program in Chesapeake has been due to careful planning in terms of determining the number and types of vacancies expected. For example, each spring personnel administrators meet with principals and special education staff to determine the needs for the next year. In addition, the Personnel Department maintains a record of the number of teachers hired in each subject area for the previous five years. This information is carefully reviewed by personnel administrators before decisions are made as to whom early contracts will be offered. The program's success has also been dependent upon the involvement of principals in the recruiting process. In addition, principals are invited to meet candidates at a reception prior to the time that contracts are offered and candidates are taken on a tour of the schools during which they have the opportunity to meet the principals and other members of the school staff.

Recruitment Source Effectiveness

Phase II of this study included four research hypotheses. Each hypothesis related to recruitment source effectiveness as measured by one of the following criteria: retention, job performance, job satisfaction, and attendance. No statistically significant differences were found in the retention, performance, satisfaction, and
attendance of teachers recruited from different sources during the five years specified. Several factors may have contributed to the lack of a finding of any statistical significance among some of the four hypotheses investigated. These factors are discussed below.

Teacher job performance. Findings of this study indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the performance of teachers recruited from different recruitment sources over a five-year period. Principals rated teachers assigned to their buildings using the Teacher Performance Questionnaire designed specifically for this study. The mean scores for principals' performance ratings of teachers hired from each source ranged from a low of 4.0 to a high of 4.5 or in the above average range on a five-point scale. No outlier scores were identified. Although these findings would indicate that, overall, teachers hired during the five-year period were rated as performing at an above average level, it should be noted that the consistency of these ratings may have resulted from any of three factors: (a) the tendency of principals to rate teachers alike on the evaluation instrument they regularly use; (b) the lack of training for principals in using this instrument; and (c) the researcher's role in the school division.

The Chesapeake Public Schools Teacher Evaluation Instrument includes only four ratings, Meets Expectation,
Below Expectation, Unsatisfactory, and Not Applicable. An annual review of completed teacher evaluations indicates that most principals consistently rate most teachers as meeting the expectation. Principals do not tend to differentiate among ratings unless there is a serious problem and they are preparing documentation for dismissal or nonrenewal. In addition, little or no opportunity for differentiation between ratings is provided by the instrument itself, especially if the teacher exceeds the expectation.

Although this type of instrument may be easier for the principal to use, the similarity of ratings calls into question the validity of the evaluation instrument. In addition, the question arises, that if the purpose of evaluation is improved instruction, how can teachers make necessary changes when the majority are being told that their performance meets the expectations of the organization?

Because principals currently use an evaluation system which encourages little differentiation in the performance evaluations of teachers, training in the use of an instrument providing for greater differentiation among ratings may have been an important step that was not followed in this study. As was noted earlier, principals in Chesapeake Public Schools rate most teachers the same; therefore, additional training in the purpose of evaluation
and the use of evaluation instruments may be needed in general.

In addition to the issues related to the principals' use of the instrument, it should also be noted that teachers who knew that their performance ratings would be low may not have elected to participate in the study. Participants were made aware in the initial mailing that the researcher in this project was also the assistant superintendent for personnel. Although teachers were assured that steps were being taken to protect their identities and that no information collected in this study would be included in their files or used as part of their evaluations, they may not have wanted their performance closely scrutinized by someone who was in a position to recommend the termination of their employment.

Teacher job satisfaction. Findings of this study also indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the job satisfaction of teachers recruited from different sources. Two factors may have contributed to this result. First, the results of the study could have been influenced by who chose to participate. Those teachers who were dissatisfied with the system may have decided to express their dissatisfaction by not completing a questionnaire. In addition, they may not have wanted the researcher to be made aware of their dissatisfaction. Second, because this study only included teachers who are
still employed, it is possible that those teachers who were dissatisfied may have already left the school system.

**Attendance rates.** An investigation of attendance rates also resulted in findings indicating that there was no statistically significant difference in the attendance rates of teachers recruited from different sources. As with other findings, these results may have been affected by who chose to participate. Teachers with poor attendance may not have wanted their attendance reviewed by the researcher because of the researcher's role in the school division.

**Retention rates.** The fact that no statistically significant difference was found in the retention rates of teachers in Chesapeake Public Schools who were recruited from different sources during specified years supports the findings of this study related to job performance and job satisfaction. If a significant number of teachers recruited from a specific source had performed poorly or had experienced job dissatisfaction, then this should have been reflected by a lower retention rate among teachers recruited from that source.

Although several factors may have contributed to the lack of a finding of any statistical significance among the four hypotheses investigated, the fact remains that recruitment source did not make a difference in teacher effectiveness as measured by four post-hire outcomes. What do these results imply for school systems that rely on a
variety of recruitment efforts in the belief that recruiting makes a difference?

The majority of school divisions participating in this study indicated that they used four primary recruitment practices (recruiting at out-of-state colleges or universities, recruiting at in-state colleges or universities at least 50 miles from the school division, using a brochure or other materials designed for recruitment, and involving principals in recruitment activities). In addition, they indicated that they recruited regularly from seven recruitment sources (self-referrals, employee referrals, college/university placement offices, campus visits/job fairs, student teachers, newspaper advertisements, and substitutes in the school division). To engage in these recruitment efforts, school systems must expend resources in terms of both money and personnel. If the source from which teachers are recruited makes no difference in teacher effectiveness, it would imply that school divisions should shift their resources to recruiting efforts which would attract more applicants regardless of the source. Such efforts could include paying bonuses to teachers in hard-to-find subject areas and providing incentives such as a month's free rent or moving costs to new teachers who move to the school division. Other efforts could include those strategies that may make the system more attractive to teachers such as increasing
starting salaries, improving teaching conditions, and improving teacher benefits.

A second implication is that school systems could spend their resources more effectively by concentrating their efforts on programs that would prepare individuals currently within the school system for teaching careers. Money and personnel used for recruitment may be better spent in developing Teacher Cadet Programs and Future Educator's Clubs, and offering scholarships to students and non-teaching personnel who may wish to pursue teaching as a career.

Encouraging students and non-teaching employees from the school division to select teaching in the system as a career is supported by the realistic information hypothesis, one of two theories addressing the causes of differential source effectiveness (Breaugh, 1981; Breaugh & Mann, 1984; Kirnan et al., 1989; Quaglieri, 1982; Schwab, 1982; Taylor & Schmidt, 1983). The realistic information hypothesis suggests that using recruitment sources that provide more accurate information about the job will result in employees who perform better, are more committed to the organization, and achieve greater job satisfaction. It would be difficult to find individuals who have more information about a school division than the students and employees who experience the culture of the organization on a daily basis.
Results of this study also have implications for school systems in terms of the need to evaluate their recruitment efforts. A survey of Virginia school divisions indicated that only 21% formally evaluated their recruitment programs on an annual or biennial basis. At the same time, however, most divisions indicated that they regularly employed one or more recruitment practices. Based on these data, it appears that Virginia school systems conduct recruitment efforts but have no empirical data to support their effectiveness.

Findings of this study indicating that in at least one large Virginia school division recruitment source effectiveness is questionable should encourage other systems to look more closely at their recruitment programs. In a time of tight budgets, school systems cannot afford to continue recruiting without evidence that recruiting is achieving the desired results. School systems need to carefully assess why they are recruiting and develop good measures to determine if their recruitment goals are being met.

If school divisions are going to effectively measure their recruitment efforts, then this study, indicating that principals in at least one school system tend to rate all teachers the same in terms of their effectiveness, also has implications for teacher evaluation. An effective system of evaluation which allows principals to carefully
differentiate among performance ratings will be necessary to
determine if there is a difference in the performance of
teachers who come to the school system as a result of
various recruitment efforts. In addition, principals must
be carefully trained in the evaluation system so that they
can identify what makes one teacher's performance better
than another's.

Another implication of this study is in terms of
recruiter selection and training. Although the study did
not address recruiter effectiveness, the question must be
asked, could the quality of the recruiters in Chesapeake
Public Schools, rather than the recruitment source, have
resulted in the lack of differences found in the
effectiveness of teachers recruited from a variety of
sources?

Regardless of the source from which they were
recruited, teachers employed in Chesapeake over the five-
year period investigated were interviewed, screened, and
recommended for employment by the same group of personnel
administrators. These administrators were selected for
their jobs in personnel as a result of their experiences in
other administrative positions instead of their expertise in
the fields of recruitment and selection. In addition, they
have received little or no training in those skills which
are suggested in the research as skills necessary for
recruiter effectiveness. As school divisions evaluate the
effectiveness of their recruitment efforts, they cannot afford to overlook the quality of the recruiter as a key element in the quality of the personnel selected as a result of those efforts. There is much in the research to suggest that the recruiter, as the individual responsible for conducting the recruitment interview and providing the applicant with knowledge of the job, can make an impression on the applicant which is transferred to the organization and which can influence the applicant's employment decisions (Alderfer & McCord, 1970; Fisher et al., 1979, Harn & Thornton, 1985; Harris & Fink, 1987; Herriott & Rothwell, 1981; Liden & Parsons, 1986; Maurer et al., 1992; Powell, 1984; Rogers & Sincoff, 1978; Rynes & Miller, 1983; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976; Turban & Dougherty, 1992).

Summary and Recommendations

A review of the conclusions of this study presents a major question remaining to be answered: If there are no differences in the retention rates, job performance, job satisfaction, and attendance rates of teachers recruited from different sources, why spend the time, personnel, and money on recruitment efforts? To consider an answer to this question it is first necessary to review the definitions of recruitment and selection. Recruitment refers to those activities of the organization which are designed to attract potential applicants who can carry out the work of the organization. Selection refers to those activities of the
organization which are designed to choose the best qualified individual for each job from those recruited (Castetter, 1992; Erickson & Shinn, 1977; Lipsett et al., 1972).

Clearly, recruitment and selection are connected. The effectiveness of the selection step depends on the effectiveness of the recruitment step. As was stated by Stanton (1977), "It is obvious that the only people we will be able to hire are those who have been attracted to our organization - in essence, recruited as a result of our efforts" (p.44). Because of the close connection between recruitment and selection, it would appear that to accurately measure the effectiveness of recruitment, in terms of job effectiveness outcomes, it would be necessary to compare the performance, job satisfaction, attendance, and retention of all candidates in the recruitment pool whether they were hired or not. This of course would be impossible; therefore, the next best thing would be to look at the overall job performance, job satisfaction, attendance, and retention of those candidates actually selected or hired to determine if both the needs of the organization and the need of the individuals are being met. If those applicants selected are at least meeting the expectations of the organization, remaining on the job, attending regularly, and expressing satisfaction with the job, it would seem to indicate that the recruitment step is
producing applicants in sufficient numbers to affect the overall quality of those finally selected.

Although the purpose of this study was to look at recruitment source effectiveness specifically, results of the study, although not indicating a statistically significant difference in recruitment source effectiveness, provide significant data to support the importance of recruitment efforts in general. This support for recruitment lies in the fact that principals consistently rated the job performance of teachers recruited from all sources as above average, that teachers recruited from all sources consistently indicated that their job satisfaction was in the satisfactory range, that recruitment sources produced an overall retention rate of 80%, and that teachers from all sources had an overall attendance rate above 96%. If Castetter's (1981) major assumptions about recruitment are true, that recruitment methods influence the number of applicants and the number of applicants affects the caliber of those finally selected, then applicants must have been recruited into Chesapeake Public Schools in sufficient numbers to allow quality applicants to be selected or hired. The argument can be made that without planned, ongoing recruitment efforts the quality of personnel selected to teach in Chesapeake Public Schools would not be as good as was suggested by this study.
In addition to producing applicants in large enough numbers that quality personnel can be selected, recruitment is also necessary in producing applicants to meet the diverse needs of the school division. As was stated by Fielder (1993), "If you want to build a staff that represents the ethnic and racial diversity of your student population, you have to take active steps, not just sit back and wait for applicants to knock on your door" (p.33). This is especially true today when school systems nationwide are competing for the same small pool of minority applicants. For example, it is not unusual to recruit at an historically black college in Virginia and to be seated next to recruiters from California.

Because of better opportunities in business, the number of new teachers produced by historically black colleges decreased 47% between 1979 and 1984 (Steuteville-Brodinsky et al., 1989). In addition, a significant number of minority teachers retired in the 1980s and 1990s. Consequently, school systems have developed more aggressive minority recruitment strategies. A school system can no longer afford to visit the historically black colleges within a 50-mile radius and find enough minority teachers to meet the needs of an increasing minority population. Aggressive recruitment strategies such as Chesapeake's Career Commitment Program or Akron, Ohio's Business
Education Collaboration of Minorities in Education are not only justified but have become essential.

Not only are such aggressive recruitment strategies essential in locating minority teachers, they are also essential in locating teachers in hard-to-find endorsement areas such as special education. In Chesapeake, which has just been named the eighth fastest growing city in the United States, for example, the special education student population is growing at a rate seven times faster than the regular education student population. The school system has to recruit more aggressively, recruit in more states, recruit earlier, offer early contracts, and advertise in newspapers and professional journals just to keep up with the increased number of special education classes. Studies by Choy, Henke, Alt, Medrich, and Bobbitt (1993) and G'Fellers (1992/1993) have indicated that the trend toward having difficulty in staffing certain specialized positions such as those in special education is not only a trend in Chesapeake but is also a trend nationwide. Again, it appears that recruitment is not only justified, it is essential.

A fourth reason for recruitment, although not as important as ensuring a sufficient number of teachers from which to select the best qualified, locating minority teachers, or locating teachers in hard-to-find endorsement areas, is to ensure diversity among the teaching force in
terms of bringing new ideas and different perspectives into the community. In today's world in which people easily move from place to place and seldom spend their lifetimes in one community, it is important that children be exposed to diversity not only in terms of race, ethnic background, and gender, but also in terms of divergent thinking. Teachers from different areas of the state or country bring a perspective to the community to which children might not otherwise be exposed.

Why should school systems spend the time, money, and personnel on recruitment? The answer is because recruitment, if for no other reason, is necessary to find teachers in large enough numbers to meet the personnel needs of the school system, to meet the diverse needs of students, and to fill vacant positions in hard-to-find areas. School systems can no longer afford to sit back and let teachers who live within a 50-mile radius find them. School systems must aggressively seek out teacher candidates.

Keeping in mind the results of this study and the review of the literature which the study includes, the following recommendations are made:

1. School divisions should develop well planned recruitment efforts which are designed to increase the number and quality of teachers in the applicant pool, to improve the diversity of the applicant pool, and to meet the
needs of the school system in terms of the number and types of positions needed.

2. School divisions should develop written recruitment policies which clearly state the reasons for recruitment, specify who will be responsible for the recruitment effort, and incorporate an evaluation system to determine if recruitment goals are being met.

3. School divisions should develop an effective evaluation system which allows for careful differentiation among the ratings that teachers are given so that the quality of teacher personnel hired can be more accurately determined.

4. School divisions should develop an applicant tracking system so that data are available regarding from what sources teacher applicants are recruited and hired. Such a system is essential to an accurate evaluation of recruitment and selection.

5. School boards should appropriate the resources necessary to conduct innovative recruitment efforts that go beyond the traditional methods of recruiting and the traditional recruitment sources. This is especially true when systems need minority candidates or candidates in hard-to-find subject areas.

6. School division personnel departments should work closely with school principals to determine early the types and numbers of positions that will be available so that
recruitment decisions and hiring decisions can be closely coupled.

7. School divisions should involve principals in the recruitment process so that selection criteria are clearly understood by all personnel affected by the hiring process and that hiring can be handled early in the year with placement at a later date.

8. School divisions should develop training programs for all recruiters. These programs should include training in listening, presentation, counseling, communication, and interpersonal skills.

9. Exit interviews should be conducted with teachers leaving the system to determine their reasons for leaving. This data should be used in evaluating the success of recruitment efforts.

10. School divisions should closely examine their teacher evaluation systems to identify whether or not teacher performance is accurately being measured.

Implications for Further Study

Based on the previous discussion, the following implications for further research are suggested:

1. A more extensive study of recruitment practices could be conducted which would not only provide descriptive information on the recruitment practices of school divisions but also data on the effectiveness of such practices. It cannot be assumed that because a majority of school
divisions use a practice, it is the most effective. Information on effectiveness would provide school divisions with practical data on which to base decisions about which practices to employ.

2. It would be useful to conduct a study on the relationship between teacher job performance and recruitment source in a school division in which principals have been trained in the use of a performance evaluation instrument which requires a high degree of differentiation among ratings.

3. The portions of this study related to recruitment-source effectiveness could be replicated by an independent researcher who has no role in the school system. This would alleviate the concern that the researcher's role may have influenced the study's results, specifically in the areas related to teacher job satisfaction and job performance.

4. The portions of this study related to recruitment-source effectiveness could be replicated using a population of teachers including teachers who are no longer employed in the school division. This would alleviate the concern that those teachers who have left the system may have done so because of poor job performance or low job satisfaction.

5. Because of the possible similarities among teachers who are within their first five years of teaching, it would be useful to replicate this study using a random sample of all teachers in the school division rather than
using a sample limited to teachers with a given number of years of experience.

6. Although demographic data were collected on school systems participating in the study, no attempt was made to determine if there was a difference in the recruitment practices of school systems according to school system demographics (e.g., student population, location). A study investigating the relationship would provide information which would be helpful to school divisions in selecting the recruitment strategies that have worked for divisions having similar characteristics.

7. Although demographic data were collected on teachers participating in this study, no attempt was made to determine if there was a difference in the types of teachers (e.g., gender, race, endorsement area) recruited from different sources. A study investigating these relationships would provide information that would be helpful to school divisions in selecting the recruitment strategies that would best meet their needs.

In conclusion, Phase I of this study resulted in findings which were representative of the population of school divisions surveyed. The results provide important information on assignment of recruiter responsibilities, recruiter training, the time frame in which recruiting and hiring are conducted, recruitment practices, and recruitment sources. These findings may be useful to school systems as
they develop and refine their recruitment policies and procedures in order to select the most qualified teachers for the school division.

Phase II, although resulting in no finding of any statistical significance among the four hypotheses investigated, has the following implications for school systems:

1. School divisions need to evaluate their recruitment efforts to determine if the resources they are currently spending would be better spent on efforts to attract teachers to the school system, regardless of source. Such efforts could include increasing teacher salaries, improving teaching conditions, improving teacher benefits, providing incentives to new teachers, and paying bonuses to teachers in shortage areas.

2. School divisions need to evaluate their recruitment efforts to determine if the resources they are currently spending would be better spent on efforts to encourage students and non-teaching employees already in the system to pursue teaching as a career and to return to the system once they have completed their professional education.

3. School divisions need to carefully analyze why they are recruiting and develop effective evaluation measures to determine if their recruitment goals are being met.
4. School divisions need to develop effective systems for the evaluation of teachers so that they can accurately measure the performance of teachers not only to improve the quality of teaching for students but also to determine how the best teachers were attracted to the school division.

5. School divisions need to improve the quality of recruiter selection and training to ensure that the recruiter is not having a negative influence on the number and quality of applicants attracted to the school system.
Appendix A

Correspondence Accompanying Questionnaires
Dear

As a doctoral candidate at the College of William and Mary, I am conducting a study of teacher recruitment. The study will be completed in two phases and has two purposes: (a) to describe the recruitment practices of public school divisions in Virginia and (b) to examine the relationship between recruitment sources and measures of personnel effectiveness: specifically, retention rates, job performance, job satisfaction, and attendance. Your completion of the enclosed questionnaire will assist me in collecting the information necessary to complete the first phase of the study.

The questionnaire takes approximately ten minutes to complete and should be returned to me in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope within ten days. If your school division has a director of personnel or a teacher recruitment officer, you may wish to ask that individual to complete the questionnaire. Confidentiality of responses will be maintained and the responses of your school division will not be reported in an identifiable manner. A summary of survey results will be provided to you at your request.

Thank you for taking time from your busy schedule to give attention to this request. Your response is important. If you have any questions regarding the survey, please contact me at (804) 547-0280 (home) or (804) 547-4101 (office), or contact my advisor, Dr. James H. Stronge, at (804) 221-2339 (office). Again, thank you in advance for your assistance with this project.

Sincerely,

Linda Duffy Palombo
Assistant Superintendent

James H. Stronge, Ph.D
Associate Professor

Enclosures
Dear

Recently I wrote to you asking you to complete a questionnaire on teacher recruitment practices in your school division. Data from your school division would be most helpful to ensure the completeness of survey results. If you have already returned the questionnaire, please disregard this request. If you have not returned the questionnaire, I am enclosing another copy along with a stamped, self-addressed envelope for your convenience.

The questionnaire takes less than ten minutes to complete. If your division has a director of personnel or a teacher recruitment officer, you may ask that individual to complete the questionnaire. All responses will be treated in a confidential manner and will not be reported by individual school division.

I realize that this is a busy time of the year for you, but I hope you will take a few minutes to assist me in this important endeavor. I will be glad to provide you with a copy of survey results at your request.

If you have any questions regarding the survey, please do not hesitate to call me at (804) 547-0280 (home) or (804) 546-4101 (office). Thank you in advance for your assistance with this project.

Sincerely,

Linda Duffy Palombo
Assistant Superintendent

apf
Enclosures

Teacher
Dear:

As a doctoral candidate at the College of William and Mary, I am conducting a study of teacher recruitment. I am interested in determining if there is a difference in the job performance, job satisfaction, retention rate, and attendance rate of teachers employed in Chesapeake Public Schools who were recruited from different sources. I am defining recruitment source as the means by which an individual is attracted to or referred to an organization for possible employment (e.g., Career Commitment, campus recruiting, job fairs, advertising, self-referrals, referrals by friends or relatives, and employee referrals).

In order to complete this study, I NEED YOUR HELP. It will be necessary for me to collect four pieces of information about you: (a) data on the source from which you were recruited into the school system, (b) data on your job satisfaction, (c) data on your job performance, and (d) data on the number of days you have been in attendance since you were employed in Chesapeake Public Schools. Data on the source by which you were recruited and on your job satisfaction will be collected using the Recruitment Source Survey and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire which are enclosed. Data on attendance will be collected from information maintained in the Accounting Department, Chesapeake Public Schools.

To collect data on your job performance, your principal will be asked to complete the Teacher Job Performance Questionnaire designed specifically for this study. A copy of the questionnaire is enclosed for your information. Because of my role in the administration of Chesapeake Public Schools, I want to ensure you that information on your job performance will be used for purposes of this study only; therefore, I plan to include the following safeguards:

1. No information on your performance will be collected unless you sign the enclosed release form.

2. A copy of the signed release form will be sent to your principal.

3. Your principal's response to the questionnaire will be returned to me bearing a teacher identification number rather than your name.

4. All information will be recorded and reported using the teacher identification number.

5. The completed questionnaire will be destroyed at the conclusion of the study.
6. As you know, Chesapeake Public Schools has a very specific procedure for the evaluation of teachers including an instrument and a process specified in policy. Any information on your performance gathered outside of the guidelines established by policy cannot and will not affect your employment with Chesapeake Public Schools or your evaluation. In addition, no such information can or will be made part of your file.

Please complete the enclosed Recruitment Source Survey, release form, and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and return them to me via the PONY in the enclosed self-addressed envelope within ten days. The questionnaires should take you less than ten minutes to complete. Participation is not required and you may terminate participation at any time.

Your response is important to me. Thank you for taking time from your busy schedule to give attention to this request. If you have any questions regarding the study or the enclosed surveys or would like a copy of the completed study, please call me at (804) 547-0280 (home) or (804) 547-4101 (office), or call my advisor, Dr. James H. Stronge, at (804) 221-2339 (office).

Sincerely,

Linda Duffy Palombo

James H. Stronge, Ph.D.
Professor of Education

apf

Enclosures
Dear

Recently I sent you a letter asking you to complete two short surveys and to agree to participate in a study of recruitment source effectiveness in Chesapeake Public Schools. Also enclosed was a release form for your signature permitting me to collect information on your job performance and use of sick leave.

Your response is important to me. If you have already returned the surveys and release form, please disregard this request. If you have not, please complete the survey, sign the release form, and send them to me via the PONY within one week. Your participation in this study will not only strengthen the overall results, but will add to the body of research on teacher recruitment.

Sincerely,

Linda Duffy Palombo
Assistant Superintendent

apf

Enclosures
Dear Colleague:

As a doctoral candidate at the College of William and Mary, I am conducting a study of teacher recruitment. I am interested in determining if there is a difference in the job performance, job satisfaction, retention rate, and attendance rate of teachers employed in Chesapeake Public Schools who were recruited from different sources. I am defining recruitment source as the means by which an individual is attracted to or referred to an organization for possible employment (e.g., Career Commitment, campus recruiting, job fairs, advertising, self-referrals, referrals by friends or relatives, and employee referrals).

One or more of the teachers included in the study is assigned to your building; therefore, I need your assistance. Please complete the enclosed questionnaire(s) which will provide information on the job performance of the teacher identified on the label attached to each questionnaire. Each questionnaire takes less than ten minutes to complete and should be returned to me via the PONY in the enclosed self-addressed envelope at your earliest convenience. Also enclosed is a release form, signed by the teacher, giving me permission to seek information on his or her job performance. The teacher has been assured that the performance information will be reported using a teacher identification number rather than a name and that the questionnaire results will not affect the teacher's evaluation or be included in his or her file. Therefore, please tear off the preprinted label bearing the teacher's name before returning the questionnaire.

I know that this is a busy time of the year for you and that I am adding to your already overburdened schedule. I apologize, but your response is necessary for the completion of this study. Please ask your assistant principal(s) to assist you in completing the questionnaire(s). Thank you for taking time from your busy schedule to give attention to this request.

If you have any questions regarding the questionnaire, please contact me at (804) 547-0280 (home) or (804) 547-4101 (office), or contact my advisor, Dr. James H. Stronge, at (804) 221-2339 (office). Again, thank you for your assistance with this project. Hopefully, someday I can return the favor.

Sincerely,

Linda Duffy Palombo
Assistant Superintendent

James H. Stronge, Ph.D.
Professor of Education

Enclosure(s)
Dear

Recently I wrote to you asking you to complete a questionnaire on the job performance of a teacher(s) assigned to your school. Your response is important to the accuracy of a study I am conducting on teacher recruitment.

If you have already returned the questionnaire, please disregard this request. If you have not returned the questionnaire, I am enclosing a copy along with the original letter and a self-addressed envelope for your convenience. Please complete the questionnaire and return it to me via the PONY within one week.

I realize that this is a busy time of the year for you, but I hope you will take a few minutes to assist me. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at (804) 547-0280 (home) or (804) 547-4101 (office). Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Linda Duffy Palombo
Assistant Superintendent

apf

Enclosures
Appendix B

Release Form
TEACHER RECRUITMENT STUDY
Release Form

I give permission for my principal to complete the Teacher Job Performance Questionnaire. I understand that the information on the questionnaire will be reported anonymously, will have no effect on my evaluation, and will not be made part of my file. In addition, I give permission to the researcher to review the records related to my use of sick leave while employed by Chesapeake Public Schools. I understand that no data collected will be reported in an identifiable manner. I further understand that I am not required to participate in this study and that I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time.

________________________________________
Teacher’s Signature

________________________________________
Date
Appendix C
Questionnaires
SURVEY OF TEACHER
RECRUITMENT PRACTICES OF VIRGINIA
PUBLIC SCHOOL DIVISIONS

The purpose of this survey is to obtain information which will be useful in describing the practices used by Virginia public school divisions in the recruitment of teacher personnel. Recruitment is defined as those activities which are designed to attract potential applicants who can carry out the work of the organization.

I. School System Demographics - Please complete the following statements for your school division using data for the 1994-1995 school year.

1. The September 30 student enrollment was __________________________.

2. The number of full-time, non-administrative, professional personnel (as of September 30), expressed as full-time equivalents, was ____________.

3. The number of non-administrative, professional vacancies (as of September 30), expressed as full-time equivalents, was ____________.

4. The school division's total annual operating budget for 1993-1994 was $_________.

5. A budget of $_________ was specifically allocated for recruitment activities during the 1993-1994 school year.

6. The school division has a written policy specifically addressing teacher recruitment.
   ____ Yes  ____ No

7. The school division has a formal process for evaluating the recruitment process on an annual or biennial basis.
   ____ Yes  ____ No

8. The school division has a department of personnel including the following staff (please specify number for each position):
   a. ____ assistant superintendent for personnel or equivalent
   b. ____ director of personnel or equivalent

(OVER)
c. non-clerical support personnel (e.g., wage and salary specialist, computer specialist, investigator)

d. clerical personnel

e. other administrative personnel

Please specify by number and type (e.g., recruiter, benefits coordinator, personnel administrator).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Recruitment Practices - Please read the following statements describing teacher recruitment practices. Circle the number which best indicates the extent to which the practice is used in your school division.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Used</th>
<th>Seldom Used</th>
<th>Often Used</th>
<th>Regularly Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Recruited internationally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Recruited out-of-state colleges or universities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Recruited in-state colleges or universities at least 50 miles from the school division</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Used a recruitment brochure or other written materials designed for recruitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Used audio-visual materials designed for recruitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Advertised on radio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Advertised on television</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Collaborated with the business community in recruitment efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Involved the community in recruitment efforts (e.g., PTA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Involved currently employed teachers in recruitment activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Involved retired teachers in recruitment activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Involved principals in recruitment activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Paid bonuses to new teachers for signing contracts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Provided incentives such as apartment discounts, moving expenses, or discounted interest rates to new teachers for signing contracts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Paid expenses for applicants to visit the division | 1 2 3 4
24. Provided division-wide tours for potential applicants | 1 2 3 4
25. Provided scholarships to students in the division who planned to pursue a career in teaching | 1 2 3 4
26. Offered bonuses to new teachers licensed in hard-to-find subject areas | 1 2 3 4
27. Increased starting salaries to attract new teachers | 1 2 3 4
28. Used special programs or incentives to attract minority candidates | 1 2 3 4
29. Worked with a Teacher Cadet program or Future Educator's Club to encourage students to pursue teaching as a career | 1 2 3 4
30. Collaborated with the teacher association in recruitment activities | 1 2 3 4
31. Offered early commitments or contracts to potential teachers | 1 2 3 4

III. Recruitment Source - Please read the following list of recruitment sources. A recruitment source is defined as the means by which an individual is attracted to or referred to an organization for possible employment. Circle the number which best indicates the extent to which each recruitment source is used in your school division.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment Source</th>
<th>Not Used</th>
<th>Seldom Used</th>
<th>Often Used</th>
<th>Regularly Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. Self-referrals (walk-ins, write-ins, call-ins)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Employee-referrals</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. College/university placement offices</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Campus visits/job fairs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Employment agencies or search firms</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Student teachers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Clerical or support personnel in the school division</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Newspaper advertisements</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Television advertisements</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Radio advertisements</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Advertising in professional publications</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Substitutes in the school division</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Professional meetings or conventions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. The Recruiter - Please respond to the following questions regarding those who conduct recruitment activities in your school division.

45. Who is delegated the PRIMARY responsibility for planning and scheduling teacher recruitment in your school division? Check only one.

____ superintendent
____ assistant superintendent
____ personnel director
____ principal
____ other (please specify) _______________________________________________________

(OVER)
46. Is special training provided to recruiters in your school division?

____ Yes  ____ No

If the answer is yes, please identify with a check those topics which are included in the training.

____ listening skills  ____ interviewing skills
____ presentation skills  ____ interpersonal skills
____ counseling skills  ____ information about the community
____ communication skills  ____ information on salaries and fringe benefits
____ information on school division demographics

____ other (please specify) ______________________________________________

V. Recruitment Schedule - Please respond to the following questions by checking the appropriate response.

47. Identify the three months in which your school division personnel conduct the most recruitment activity.

____ Jan  ____ Feb  ____ Mar  ____ Apr  ____ May  ____ June
____ July  ____ Aug  ____ Sept  ____ Oct  ____ Nov  ____ Dec

48. Identify the three months during which the largest numbers of newly hired teacher personnel are employed.

____ Jan  ____ Feb  ____ Mar  ____ Apr  ____ May  ____ June
____ July  ____ Aug  ____ Sept  ____ Oct  ____ Nov  ____ Dec

________________________________________________________

Name of individual completing survey

________________________________________________________

Title

Would you like a copy of survey results?

____ Yes  ____ No

Thank you for completing this survey. Please return it in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope to:

LINDA DUFFY PALOMBO
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT FOR PERSONNEL
CHESAPEAKE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
P.O. BOX 15204
CHESAPEAKE, VIRGINIA 23328
RECRUITMENT SOURCE SURVEY

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine the source from which you were recruited into Chesapeake Public Schools. Personal information about you has also been requested to determine the characteristics of teachers recruited from each source. Confidentiality of responses will be maintained and no individual responses will be reported.

Part I: Teacher Demographics - Please fill in the information requested below.

1. Current Work Setting:
   - ___Pre-school  ___Elementary  ___Middle/Jr High  ___Senior High

2. Current Work Assignment:  ___General Education  ___Special Education

3. Employment Year:

4. Years Teaching Prior to Employment in Chesapeake Public Schools:
   - ___0  ___1 to 5  ___6 to 10  ___10 to 20  ___over 20

5. Age at Time of Employment: _____

6. Gender:  ___Male  ___Female

7. Race:  ___Black (Non-Hispanic)  ___White (Non-Hispanic)  ___Hispanic
   - ___Asian or Pacific Islander  ___American Indian or Alaskan Native

Part II: Identification of Recruitment Source - Listed below are the sources from which teacher applicants are most frequently recruited for employment. Please identify the method by which you were recruited for Chesapeake Public Schools. If you feel that more than one source is appropriate, please mark with a check the source which was most significant in your decision to apply to Chesapeake Public Schools. CHECK ONLY ONE.

   ___Campus Recruitment Interview (other than Career Commitment)
   ___Career Commitment Candidate
   ___Campus Job Fair
   ___Advertisement in Newspaper
   ___Advertisement in a Professional Publication
   ___Referral by an Employee in Chesapeake Public Schools
   ___Self-initiated Contact (walk-in, phone-in, write-in)
   ___Referral by Friends or Relatives Familiar with Chesapeake Public Schools
   ___Rehire (previously employed in Chesapeake Public Schools)
   ___Other (please specify) __________________________

Thank you for completing this survey. Please return it in the enclosed self-addressed envelope to Linda Duffy Palombo, Assistant Superintendent for Personnel, School Administration Building, Chesapeake Public Schools.
PLEASE NOTE

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire
Pages 192-193

University Microfilms International
TEACHER JOB PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this survey is to obtain information on the job performance of the teacher identified on the attached label. Please read the following statements describing the areas in which teachers should have at least a minimum degree of competence (Scriven, 1994). Circle the number which best indicates the overall level of performance of the specific teacher on each of the descriptors listed. Please differentiate carefully between ratings in order to provide an accurate evaluation of the teacher's performance. This information will be reported by teacher identification number only, will not affect the teacher's formal evaluation, and will not be made part of the teacher's personnel file.

A. Knowledge of Subject Area

1. The teacher demonstrates current, correct, and comprehensive knowledge of topics covered in the curriculum sufficient to:
   - Select or prepare materials appropriate to the curriculum.
   - Explain subject area content to students.
   - Assess student understanding.
   - Correctly answer student questions.

2. The teacher demonstrates knowledge in across-the-curriculum subjects such as communication skills, study skills, personal/social skills, and computer skills.

B. Instructional Competence

1. The teacher communicates valuable learning to the students by:
   - Making effective classroom presentations.
   - Maintaining a sensitivity to learner comprehension.
   - Maintaining student attention.

2. The teacher communicates effectively with peers, parents, supervisors, and other members of the school community.

3. The teacher manages classroom behavior so that learning is possible for all students.

4. The teacher paces instruction appropriately by covering the required content and maintaining an appropriate level of student understanding.

5. The teacher manages emergency situations in the classroom (e.g., fires, student illness, and classroom violence).
6. The teacher develops appropriate lesson plans.  
7. The teacher selects and creates current, correct, and comprehensive teaching materials.  
8. The teacher uses available resources (e.g., library, field trips, audiovisuals, and resource specialists).

C. Assessment Competence
1. The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the appropriate uses of different types of tests (e.g., multiple choice, short answer, and essay).  
2. The teacher demonstrates a knowledge of the different purposes of tests (e.g., summative, formative, and diagnostic).  
3. The teacher uses his or her knowledge of assessment to create or select and properly administer suitable tests.  
4. The teacher demonstrates competence in the use of acceptable grading/ranking/scoring practices in recording and reporting student achievement.

D. Professionalism
1. The teacher practices ethical standards appropriate to the profession.  
2. The teacher demonstrates a professional attitude.  
3. The teacher participates in a continuous process of professional development.  
4. The teacher serves the profession by demonstrating a knowledge of the teaching profession, helping beginners and peers, participating in professional organizations, and contributing to the knowledge base on teaching.  
5. The teacher demonstrates a knowledge of the school and the community which the school serves.

E. Other Duties to the School and the Community
1. The teacher serves on school committees.  
2. The teacher attends required after-school activities and meetings.  
3. The teacher supervises students outside of the classroom.  
4. The teacher complies with administrative directives, individual school guidelines, and school board policy.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please tear off the preprinted label bearing the teacher's name and return this questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to:

Linda Duffy Palombo  
Assistant Superintendent for Personnel  
Chesapeake Public Schools  
P.O. Box 15204  
Chesapeake, VA 23328
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