DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 236 777 EA 016 163

AUTHOR Schmitt, Neal; And Others
TITLE Validity of Assessment Center Ratings for the Prediction of Performance Ratings and School Climate of School Administrators.
PUB DATE Aug 83
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (91st, Anaheim, CA, August 26-30, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; Administrator Qualifications; *Administrators; *Administrator Selection; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation; *Placement; Students; Teachers; Validity
IDENTIFIERS *Assessment Centers

ABSTRACT

This study evaluates the assessment center approach applied in an educational setting to the selection of secondary and elementary school administrators. The performance criteria used included performance ratings by three different groups (supervisors, teachers, and support staff) and school climate ratings from three different groups (teachers, students, and support staff). The results show a significant relationship between the assessment center placement recommendations and the supervisor, teacher, and support staff ratings. The school climate ratings (by group) did not significantly correlate with the assessment center ratings. The author notes that the data in this study represent the first validation of the use of assessment center technology in the selection of school administrators and suggests that assessment centers should be useful selection devices in most educational settings. The report includes a list of references and six tables. (MD)

Validity of Assessment Center Ratings for the Prediction of Performance Ratings and School Climate of School Administrators

Neal Schmitt, Raymond A. Noe, Romni Meritt, and Michael P. Fitzgerald

Michigan State University

Running Head: Assessment Center Validity

Direct Correspondence to:

Neal Schmitt
Department of Psychology
Psychology Research Building
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824

Abstract

The research described in this paper was directed to the validation of an assessment center used to select school administrators. Criteria included ratings on behaviorally anchored rating scales by supervisors, teachers, and support staff and measures of seven school climate dimensions provided by teachers, students, and support staff. Results indicated a significant relationship between an overall assessment center placement recommendation and supervisory, teacher, and support staff ratings on most dimensions. Climate measures were significantly related to few assessment center ratings regardless of the source of the climate measure. Of primary importance is the fact that assessment center ratings proved valid in a new setting, though the use of performance ratings as opposed to promotion or salary increase criteria has implications for the Klimoski and Strickland criticism of assessment center validation research.

Assessment centers are extraordinarily popular among professionals and practitioners involved in the selection of managerial personnel. This popularity is reflected in a large number of published papers (e.g., Finkle, 1976; Huck, 1976; Klimoski & Strickland, 1977), the publication of standards and ethical considerations involved in assessment center operations (Task Force on Development of Assessment Center Standards, 1977), and the unusual support of the Federal courts (Byham, 1979). This enthusiasm has been generated to a great extent by the positive research findings concerning the validity of the assessment center. Huck (1976) reviewed over 50 studies all of which reported positive findings concerning the relationship between assessment center ratings and subsequent job performance. Klimoski and Strickland (1977) reviewed over 90 studies finding that validities were positive and high (median = .40) with advancement criteria (number of promotions), and that very few additional studie had been done after 1972 indicating general acceptance of the validity of assess ment center methodology.

Studies concerning the internal validity of the assessment center (Huck, 1976; Mitchel, 1975; Schmitt, 1977; Schmitt & Hill, 1977) indicate that inter-rater reliability is high and that overall assessment judgments are indeed highly correlated with performance on individual assessment dimensions (Sackett & Hakel, 1979; Schmitt, 1977). Sackett (1982) has raised a number of issues concerning the degree of understanding we have of the rating process and has indicated that a mechanical combination of ratings to produce an overall rating might be more practical than the consensus discussions usually employed (Sackett & Wilson, 1982). However, these possible problems relate more to the mechanics of operation of a center than they do to the psychometric quality and external validity of assessment center ratings.

Validity studies have generally been sound in that they are longitudinal and that assessment center ratings have been withheld from organizational

personnel who might later influence the candidates' promotions, thus diminishing, if not eliminating, the possibility of criterion contamination. The research presented in this paper represents an evaluation of the assessment center approach applied in an educational setting to select secondary and elementary school administrators. While there have been previous educational applications of the assessment center, there are no previously published empirical reports of the validity of the technique in this context. Most previous studies of assessment center validity have employed promotions or salary progress as criteria (Klimoski & Strickland, 1977). In this study, the criteria of performance included ratings by three different groups of people as well as school climate ratings collected from three different groups. The research, then, represents an extension of currently available information in two respects: educational administrators and extension to new performance criteria.

Method

Sample. The sample included 153 school administrators who had participated in an assessment center between the spring of 1976 and the spring of 1981. These people were candidates for promotion to assistant principal or principal in elementary, junior high, middle, or high schools in seven different school districts throughout the country. Sixty of these individuals were subsequently promoted to either assistant principal or principal. The remaining 93 already held assistant principalships and were included for several reasons. First, they were performing as administrators and therefore criterion data could be collected. Second, they were actual candidates for promotion hence their motivational set in center participation would be similar to any other candidate. Third, the assessment cneter ratings were used to select people in all seven districts; these 93 individuals represented a group who were not necessarily the best performing people; consequently, restriction of range effects resulting from the use of ratings to select should be less important. General

demographic description of the subjects is presented in Table 1. As a minimal qualification, all candidates for administrative positions had completed some graduate work in educational administration; most had masters degrees. While total sample size was 153, sample size for many reported correlations was substantially less because rater respondents felt unable, or were unwilling, to give ratings on a particular dimension.

Insert Table 1 about here

Assessment Center Dimensions and Use. The assessment center was developed for the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) with the voluntary help of the APA Division of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (see Jeswald, 1977; Moses, 1977). Since that time NASSP has provided a staff consultant to provide advice and assessor training to interested school districts. A job analysis conducted prior to the development of the center indicated that twelve dimensions of behavior were important for successfully working school administrators. It was felt that these dimensions could be assessed in an assessment center. These dimensions and their descriptions are listed in Table 2. Three of these dimensions (Personal Motivation, Range of Interests, and Educational Values) were included for personal self development not as skill measures.

Insert Table 2 about here

In addition, a summary Placement Recommendation was also made. This was an overall rating made at the conclusion of the assessors' integration session and represented the assessors' overall appraisal of the candidates' potential as school administrators. Assessing these dimensions involved the use of two inbaskets, a semi-structured interview, a fact-finding and decision-making simulation with an oral presentation, and an analysis and group discussion of a case study. All ratings were made on Likert-type five point scales. Consensus ratings of the skill dimensions as well as the Placement Recommendation were completed after a two day discussion of candidates by the assessor team. These consensus ratings were used as predictors of job performance and school climate ratings

Assessment center ratings were used by the personnel departments in all districts to make recommendations concerning promotion. In no instance, however, were actual assessment ratings provided to any individual who subsequently provided performance data. A total of 425 persons were assessed during this period in all the districts of whom only 60 were promoted. Since assessment center ratings were used in making these promotions there was severe range restriction. Fortunately, 93 additional assessment center candidates held administrative positions (assistant principals) and these persons were also included in the validation sample as indicated above. The remaining 272 candidates did not hold administrative jobs at the time performance data were collected, hence could not be included in the validation study.

Criterion Measures. Job analysis interviews were conducted in thirteen school districts throughout the country. These interviews included principals, students, parents, teachers, support staff personnel, and superintendents. The pertinent outcome of these job analysis interviews for this study was the development of fifteen behaviorally anchored rating scales. These scales (see Table 3 for brief titles) plus an overall rating were used as one set of criterion measures. These measures were administered to the supervisor of each of the 153 administrators as well as two teachers and two support staff personnel in the administrator's school. Raters were directed to decline to make a rating on any scale about which they felt they did not have sufficient information. This option was frequently used by the support staff personnel because of their lack of opportunity to observe the principal's performance on various dimensions.

During the job analysis interviews, various groups were asked about critical aspects of the principal's job. Many responded that the principal's primary responsibility was the establishment of a "good" school climate. In operationalizing this construct, we developed seven climate measures for different job performance dimensions. Specifically, two teachers, two support staff, and four students in each school were asked to describe the school

climate relating to Curriculum issues, Student Activities, Support Services, Staff Selection, Evaluation and Development, Community Relations, School Plant Maintenance, and Structured Communication. Examples of items in these scales which referred to conditions at the school include "I feel informed about the school organization, operation, and rules" and "It is easy to get by with cheating at this school." Since they referred to conditions at the school as a whole, the climate measures were not simply alternate measures of performance ratings. Responses to the 55 items were made on a scale with five options: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Disagree, 4 = Strongly disagree, and 5 = No opinion/no experience. Student leaders, teachers and support staff completed the climate questionnaire, and teachers, support staff, and the administrator's supervisor completed the performance ratings. District personnel administrators chose the support staff, teacher, and student raters. The researchers instructed them to choose "experienced and informed" individuals who would be familiar with the principal's work and who carried out their daily activity within the participant principal's school building. Finally, it is important to note that different groups of people supplied performance and climate ratings thus avoiding the possibility that similar response sets contaminated both measures.

All responses to performance ratings and climate questionnaires were returned to the personnel administrator in charge of the project in each district, and then mailed, unopened, to the research group at Michigan State University.

Results

Performance Ratings. As stated above, performance ratings were made by three separate groups: Supervisor, teachers, and support staff. While the two teacher ratings and the two support staff ratings were intercorrelated at a level supporting their combination, it was felt that correlations across the

three rater groups indicated they were perceiving performance in a significantly different way. The intercorrelations of the performance ratings from different rater groups as well as the validities of these performance ratings against the Placement Recommendation are presented in Table 3. Since the Placement Recommendation was used to make promotion decisions only correlations with the Placement Recommendation are presented. Correlations of performance ratings with all assessment center ratings as well as the intercorrelations of the ratings are available from the senior author. The Placement Recommendation was significantly

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 3 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

related to all but two (Supervision of Student Activities and Interpersonal Effectiveness) of the performance dimensions as rated by supervisors. The Placement Recommendation was also correlated to teacher ratings of performance with three exceptions. Two of these (Fiscal Management and Maintenance of School Plant) may be dimensions which are more important to supervisors. Support staff ratings of performance were not as highly related to Placement Recommendations but significant relationships were observed for seven of the sixteen performance ratings. Most correlations with all three sets of ratings were in the .20 to .35 range.

Those assessment center dimensions most highly and consistently correlated with job performance were Leadership, Oral Communication, Organizational Ability, Decisiveness, Judgment and Problem Analysis. Correlations of ratings on Sensitivity, Stress Tolerance, Educational Values, Range of Interests, and Personal Motivation with various job performance ratings are lower and, for the most part, nonsignificant.

Climate Ratings. All seven of the climate measures were assessed by multiple items and multiple raters; hence, both interitem and interrater consistency were evaluated. Interitem consistencies were in the .70's and .80's, but interrater correlations were very low (frequently less than .30) especially

across rater groups. Consequently, student, teacher, and support staff climate ratings were computed for each of the seven scales and these were correlated with the assessment center ratings. Interdimensional correlations were high relative to the interitem consistencies suggesting a large general climate factor, though each conceptual dimension was identified by some specific variance. Tables containing internal consistencies, interrater reliabilities and scale intercorrelations are contained in Schmitt and Noe (1982) and are also available upon request from the senior author. The correlations between the assessment center consensus skill ratings and student, teacher, and support staff perceptions of the school climate are presented in Tables 4-6. Correlations are all generally low and nonsignificant regardless

Insert Tables 4-6 about here

of the source of climate information and skill dimension considered.

Post hoc consideration and interpretation of significant correlations given the large number computed is certainly questionable, but the following statements are offered as possible testable hypotheses in any future effort to relate skill and climate variables. Range of Interests was significantly correlated with student perceptions of School Plant Maintenance, Curriculum and the extent to which the principal Structures Communications. It may be that a person with a large range of experiences and interests can better deal with the variety of demands faced by an administrator. Further, it may be that the memos, announcements, and bulletin boards used by the administrator to communicate reflect the diversity of her/his interest and ability. For teacher responses, a climate stressing student activities was significantly related to three assessment center ratings--Educational Values, Personal Motivation, and Range of Interests. Again, a post hoc interpretation might be that teachers are sensitive to the breadth of an administrator's interest, values, and motivation as they are reflected in the programs and involvement in student activities.

Table 6 illustrates the correlations between the consensus ratings and support staff ratings of school climate. Written communications is related to support staff climate ratings of Student Activities, Support Services, and Staff Selection Evaluation and Development. Support staff personnel are greatly involved in administrative work (typing memos, filing, running errands) which is delegated to them by the principal. Their jobs involve direct contact with the principal's written work. Therefore, their perceptions of the principal's involvement in student activities, directing support services, and staff selection, evaluation and development are likely to be directly related to the ability of the principal to express ideas clearly in writing, in a manner appropriate for students, administrators, parents, and teachers. However, our original hypothesis that an administrator's skill would be related to the establishment of a climate for specific types of behaviors in a school (i.e., behavior related to curriculum consideration, school maintenance, student activities, etc.) is certainly not strongly supported by the data in Tables 4-6.

Discussion and Conclusions

There are several reasons why the data presented in this study are important and interesting. They represent, to our knowledge, the first validation of the use of assessment center technology to the selection of school administrators. The positive validation results using a sample from widely distant geographic areas and schools/districts of differing sizes and levels as well as the job analysis results indicate little difference in job responsibilities and tasks across various districts. It suggests that assessment centers should be useful selection devices in most, if not all, educational settings.

The items comprising the climate questionnaire did not call for evaluations of the administrator, but rather evaluation of the school. They indicate that the skills of the principal (as measured by the assessment center) are

generally not related to overall school functioning as perceived by students, teachers, or support staff. This may be due to the fact that the principal alone is not responsible for the school's functioning. The skills of district level personnel in receiving monetary assistance from state government and the attitude of community members toward the school and their involvement in its functioning may be factors which have greater influence on the school climate than the skill level of the principal. These situational factors may be directly responsible for the lack of validity between the climate ratings and the principal's skills as measured by the assessment center.

The validity of the assessment center ratings extends across more dimensions of the principal's job performance for teacher and supervisory ratings than for support staff ratings. Post hoc, the explanation may be that some of the performance dimensions involved aspects of the administrator's job which were indirectly observed or for which the support staff had only information from other people. Many of the support staff chose not to make ratings on several dimensions, but even those who did may not have been informed raters.

The data presented in this paper are also relevant to the criticism that assessment center ratings are simply expensive ways to capture an organization's promotion policy (Klimoski & Strickland, 1977) since most validation studies have employed promotion or salary increase criteria. Significant validities were observed for most performance dimensions provided by supervisors, teachers, and support staff. This suggests that assessment centers are valid predictors of job performance not merely indicators of an individual's ability to survive within an organization. Because ratings of performance are also judgmental, they may be susceptible to the same criticism Klimoski and Strickland raised concerning these more traditional criteria in assessment center validation research. However, the subordinate ratings collected in this study would seem less susceptible to this problem.

The study has some limitations, which probably did serve to decrease the size of the observed validities. First, average job tenure of the promoted participants was only thirteen months. While tenure for those who were already administrators at the time of assessment was much longer, there was a substantial portion of the group who had been administrators for a relatively brief period of time. Performance for administrators probably does not level off until much later (Schmitt & Schneider, 1983), and the raters (particularly supervisory raters in this study) may not have had a great deal of opportunity to observe the participants' behavior in a year's time. Restriction of range resulting from the use of the center ratings was not a significant problem because of the inclusion of individuals who had been lower level administrators but who had not been promoted as a result of the center. The standard deviations of the Placement Recommendation for selected and unselected groups were .77 and .85 respectively. Use of these standard deviations in the correction for restriction of range yielded corrected validity coefficients about .03 higher than the observed coefficients. Perhaps the most severe limitation of the study lies in the unreliability of the climate ratings alluded to above, especially for support staff and teachers.

More work should be done using performance criteria such as turnover and absences, grievances filed, and achievement of management objectives in the validation of assessment centers. While we do not advocate a naive search for some ultimate criterion, the use of these criteria would increase current knowledge concerning the construct validity of the assessment center ratings, particularly in determining behavior-criteria relationships. Because of the overreliance on promotion and salary growth as the sole criterion in establishing assessment center validity, much potentially useful information concerning assessment center behavior and job behavior has not been forthcoming.

References

Byham, W.C. Review of legal cases and opinions dealing with assessment centers and content validity. Pittsburgh, PA: Development Dimensions, 1979.

Finkle, R.B. Managerial assessment centers. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. New York: Rand McNally, 1976.

Huck, J.R. Assessment centers: A review of the external and internal validities. Personnel Psychology, 1973, 26, 191-212.

Huck, J.R. The research base. In J.L. Moses and W.C. Byham, (Eds.), Applying the assessment center method. New York: Pergamon, 1976.

Jeswald, T.A. A new approach to identifying administrative talent. NASSP Bulletin, 1977, 61, 79-83.

Klimoski, R.J., & Strickland, W.J. Assessment centers--valid or merely prescient. Personnel Psychology, 1977, 30, 353-361.

Mitchel, J.O. Assessment center validity: A longitudinal study. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 573-579.

Moses, J.L. Developing an assessment center program for school administrators. NASSP Bulletin, 1977, 61, 76-79.

Sackett, P.R. A critical look at some common beliefs about assessment centers. Public Personnel Management, 1982, 11, 140-147.

Sackett, P.R., & Hakel, M.D. Temporal stability and individual differences in using assessment information to form overall ratings. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1979, 23, 120-137.

Sackett, P.R., & Wilson, M.A. Factors affecting the consensus judgment process, in managerial assessment centers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1982, 67, 10-17.

Schmitt, N. Interrater agreement and dimensionality and combination of assessment center judgments. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1977, 62, 171-176.

Schmitt, N., & Hill, T.E. Sex and race composition of assessment center groups as a determinant of peer and assessor ratings. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1977, 62, 261-264.

Schmitt, N., & Noe, R.A. Final validation results: NASSP Assessment Center. E. Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, Psychology Department, 1982.

Schmitt, N., & Schneider, B.J. Current issues in personnel selection. In K.M. Rowland and G.D. Ferris, Research in personnel and human resources management. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press Inc., 1983.

Task Force on Development of Assessment Center Standards (Chair: J.L. Moses) Standards and Ethical Considerations for Assessment Center Operations. The Industrial Psychologist, 1977, 14, 41-45.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Validity Study Participants

Sex	
Male	91
Female	62
Race	
White	129
Other	24
School at time of assessment	
Elementary	65
Jr. High/middle	24
Senior High	60
District Staff	4
Position at time of assessment	
Teacher	43
Counselor/Ed. Specialist	25
Assistant Principal	81
Unknown	4
Number of participants who have been promoted	60

Table 2

Assessment Center Dimensions and Descriptions

1. Problem Analysis. Ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information to determine the important elements of a problem situation; searching for information with a purpose.

2. Judgment. Skill in identifying educational needs and setting priorities; ability to reach logical conclusions and make high-quality decisions based on available information; ability to critically evaluate written communications.

3. Organizational Ability. Ability to plan, schedule, and control the work of others; skill in using resources in an optimal fashion; ability to deal with a volume of paper work and heavy demands on one's time.

4. Decisiveness. Ability to recognize when a decision is required and to act quickly. (Without an assessment of the quality of the decision.)

5. Leadership. Ability to recognize when a group requires direction, to get others involved in solving problems, to effectively interact with a group, to guide them to the accomplishment of a task.

6. Sensitivity. Ability to perceive the needs, concerns, and personal problems of others; tact in dealing with persons from different backgrounds; skill in resolving conflicts; ability to deal effectively with people concerning emotional issues; knowing what information to communicate and to whom.

7. Range of Interests. Competence to discuss a variety of subjects (educational, political, economic, etc.); desire to actively participate in events.

8. Personal Motivation. Showing that work is important to personal satisfaction; a need to achieve in all activities attempted; ability to be self-policing.

9. Educational Values. Possession of well-reasoned education; philosophy; receptiveness to change and new ideas.

10. Stress Tolerance. Ability to perform under pressure and opposition; ability to think on one's feet.

11. Oral Communication Skill. Ability to make a clear oral presentation of ideas and facts.

12. Written Communication Skill. Ability to express ideas clearly in writing; to write appropriately for different audiences--students, teachers, parents, other administrators.

Table 3

Interrater Reliability of Performance Ratings and Validity of Placement Recommendation

	Supervisor Teacher Correlation	Supervisor Support Staff Correlation	Teacher Support Staff Correlation	Supervisor Ratings: Validity	Teacher Ratings: Validity	Support Staff Ratings: Validity
Curriculum Objectives	.46	.29	.33	.31* (114)	.27* (118)	.07 (104)
Curriculum: Individual Progress	.34	.33	.35	.30* (105)	.19* (106)	.25* (82)
Student Activities: Supervision	.18	.34	.26	.11 (102)	.13 (111)	.15 (94)
Student Activities: Participation	.33	.29	.38	.21* (113)	.18* (116)	.16 (106)
Support Services	.37	.29	.27	.34* (107)	.19* (109)	.16* (110)
Directing Student Behavior	.37	.22	.40	.18* (114)	.25* (120)	.06 (117)
Staff Evaluation	.39	.32	.34	.26* (114)	.19* (120)	.08 (111)
Developmental Activities	.36	.29	.46	.17* (111)	.29* (118)	.29* (105)
Community Relations	.28	.41	.34	.29* (105)	.21* (108)	.29* (100)
Interpersonal Effectiveness	.30	.35	.34	.14 (118)	.34* (120)	.00 (112)
Community Relations: Parents	.33	.36	.44	.24* (106)	.28* (111)	.26* (105)
Coordination with Districts	.17	.30	.32	.31* (107)	.23* (98)	.25* (94)
Fiscal Management	.07	.22	.26	.30* (88)	.07 (90)	.23* (84)
Maintenance of School Plant	.19	.33	.27	.29* (114)	.10 (117)	.07 (112)
Structures Communications	.38	.45	.39	.18* (113)	.30* (118)	.07 (112)
Overall Rating	.41	.36	.62	.25* (118)	.29* (119)	.09 (116)

*p<.05

Table 4

Correlation Between Assessment Center Consensus Ratings and Student Ratings of School Climate

	Curriculum	Student Activities	Support Services	Staff Selection, Evaluation, Development	Community Relations	School Plant Maintenance	Structures Communications
Problem Analysis	.06 (49)	.17 (49)	.29* (49)	-.01 (49)	.15 (49)	.24* (49)	.00 (49)
Judgment	-.06 (49)	.08 (49)	.03 (49)	-.20 (49)	-.03 (49)	.12 (49)	-.13 (49)
Decisiveness	-.07 (47)	-.08 (47)	.08 (47)	-.05 (47)	.02 (47)	.11 (47)	.06 (47)
Leadership	.00 (46)	-.09 (46)	.10 (46)	.04 (46)	-.02 (46)	.27* (46)	-.04 (46)
Sensitivity	-.07 (46)	-.12 (46)	-.04 (46)	-.04 (46)	-.03 (46)	.18 (46)	-.05 (46)
Educational Values	.00 (48)	-.01 (48)	.00 (48)	.00 (48)	.04 (48)	.24* (48)	-.01 (48)
Stress Tolerance	.11 (47)	.06 (47)	.17 (47)	-.15 (47)	.07 (47)	.23 (47)	.27* (47)
Oral Communications	.06 (48)	-.07 (48)	.08 (48)	.02 (48)	-.13 (48)	.06 (48)	-.04 (48)
Written Communications	.12 (49)	.20 (49)	.15 (49)	.02 (49)	.14 (49)	.16 (49)	.12 (49)
Organizational Ability	.03 (46)	.14 (46)	.03 (46)	.07 (46)	.07 (46)	.13 (46)	.00 (46)
Range of Interests	.30* (46)	.21 (46)	-.02 (46)	.05 (46)	.16 (46)	.36* (46)	.24* (46)
Personal Motivation	.34* (48)	.22 (48)	.00 (48)	.05 (48)	.01 (48)	.17 (48)	.18 (48)
Placement Recommendation	.02 (68)	.06 (68)	.05 (68)	-.09 (68)	-.14 (68)	-.07 (68)	-.05 (68)

*p<.05

Table 5

Correlation Between Assessment Center Consensus Ratings and Teacher Ratings of School Climate

	Curriculum	Student Activities	Support Services	Staff Selection, Evaluation, Development	Community Relations	School Plant Maintenance	Structures Communications
Problem Analysis	.03 (80)	.15 (80)	.11 (80)	-.01 (80)	.01 (80)	.11 (80)	.04 (80)
Judgment	-.06 (78)	.06 (78)	.00 (78)	-.18 (78)	-.15 (78)	.03 (78)	-.14 (78)
Decisiveness	-.08 (79)	-.08 (79)	-.05 (79)	-.13 (79)	-.20* (79)	.01 (79)	-.16 (79)
Leadership	.09 (78)	.06 (78)	.06 (78)	.02 (78)	-.08 (78)	.07 (78)	.07 (78)
Sensitivity	.09 (77)	.06 (77)	-.09 (77)	-.12 (77)	.01 (77)	.07 (77)	-.01 (77)
Educational Values	.01 (79)	.24* (79)	.11 (79)	.05 (79)	.02 (79)	.08 (79)	.10 (79)
Stress Tolerance	.12 (78)	.08 (78)	.04 (78)	.01 (78)	-.05 (78)	.20* (78)	.04 (78)
Oral Communications	.15 (81)	-.06 (81)	.00 (81)	-.03 (81)	-.09 (81)	.06 (81)	-.13 (81)
Written Communications	.25* (81)	.05 (81)	-.09 (81)	-.03 (81)	.01 (81)	.06 (81)	-.09 (81)
Organizational Ability	.07 (75)	.07 (75)	.09 (75)	.08 (75)	.01 (75)	.14 (75)	.00 (75)
Range of Interests	.08 (76)	.21* (76)	-.06 (76)	-.02 (76)	-.04 (76)	.12 (76)	.05 (76)
Personal Motivation	.17 (81)	.20* (81)	.09 (81)	.05 (81)	.05 (81)	.15 (81)	.09 (81)
Placement Recommendation	.04 (113)	.05 (113)	.04 (113)	-.08 (113)	-.01 (113)	.04 (113)	-.07 (113)

*$p < .05$

Table 6

Correlation Between Assessment Center Consensus Ratings and Support Staff Ratings of School Climate

	Curriculum	Student Activities	Support Services	Staff Selection, Evaluation, Development	Community Relations	School Plant Maintenance	Structures Communications
Problem Analysis	.00 (80)	.17 (79)	.10 (80)	.10 (80)	-.08 (79)	.07 (79)	.04 (80)
Judgment	.13 (79)	.20* (78)	.15 (79)	.16 (79)	.01 (78)	-.02 (78)	.13 (79)
Decisiveness	-.07 (80)	.07 (79)	-.04 (80)	.03 (80)	-.23* (79)	.03 (79)	-.07 (80)
Leadership	-.02 (78)	.00 (77)	.00 (78)	.13 (78)	-.14 (77)	-.05 (77)	-.16 (78)
Sensitivity	-.03 (78)	.12 (77)	.13 (78)	.22* (78)	.10 (77)	.24* (77)	.09 (78)
Educational Values	-.03 (80)	.17 (79)	.02 (80)	.12 (80)	.00 (79)	.08 (79)	-.06 (80)
Stress Tolerance	.00 (79)	.08 (78)	.03 (79)	.03 (79)	-.14 (78)	-.02 (78)	-.07 (79)
Oral Communications	.00 (81)	.02 (80)	-.01 (81)	.04 (81)	-.13 (80)	-.09 (80)	-.11 (81)
Written Communications	.09 (81)	.31* (80)	.22* (81)	.22* (81)	.09 (80)	.16 (80)	.12 (81)
Organizational Ability	-.07 (76)	.00 (75)	-.04 (76)	.05 (76)	-.11 (75)	-.02 (75)	-.12 (76)
Range of Interests	-.12 (76)	.03 (75)	-.09 (76)	.00 (76)	-.09 (75)	.00 (75)	-.09 (76)
Personal Motivation	.07 (81)	.21* (80)	.09 (81)	.18* (81)	-.02 (80)	.08 (80)	-.05 (81)
Placement Recommendation	-.03 (110)	.06 (109)	.00 (110)	.04 (110)	-.13 (109)	-.09 (109)	-.13 (110)

* $p < .05$