

POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR SELECTING HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS FOR ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS

Gayle B. Sawyer

Executive Director, Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement – South Carolina Winthrop University; Rock Hill, SC

Belinda G. Gimbert

Assistant Professor, Educational Administration
The Ohio State University

A dramatic shift in the past fifteen years in teacher education has been the move toward people beginning their teacher preparation later in life and in their academic careers. In response, the number of alternative certification programs has increased to reduce teacher shortages in critical content areas such as mathematics, science, bilingual education, and special education, as well as teacher shortages in rural and urban schools. This research report explores the independent and interdependent processes of teacher screening and selection and, explicitly, identifies existing literature that has addressed the relationship between pre-employment decisions and post-employment outcomes for predicting alternatively certified teacher success. In addition, recent scholarship is analyzed that pertains to the use of interviews in the teacher screening process, particularly in alternative teacher preparation programs, often described as alternative routes or pathways to teacher certification. Specifically, the report affords the reader an assessment of the relative importance of three interview protocols in the selection process as the mechanism of merit that transcends the usual qualifications of degree, grade point average and test scores to discern those life experiences and intrinsic beliefs that predispose an alternative certification candidate to be an effective teacher.

Debate about teacher quality, supply, demand, and retention has been renewed in recent years by an increased concern about the high attrition rate of beginning teachers and the resulting teacher shortages. Schools in the United States are experiencing teacher shortages, especially in low-income urban and rural areas, because of increased school enrollment, teacher retirement, reduction in class size,

teacher attrition, and turnover related to low salaries, job dissatisfaction, and lack of administrative support and influence over decision-making. As the number of prospective teachers entering teacher education programs falls and the school-aged population increases, the need for additional teachers has become critical (Bassinger, 2000).

The past two decades have witnessed a tremendous growth in

alternative forms of teacher certification across the United States (Haberman, 1996; Kwiatkowski, 2001; Shen, 1999). Alternative certification programs are defined by the United States Department of Education (USDE) as “. . .teacher preparation programs that enroll non-certified individuals with at least a bachelor’s degree, offering short cuts, special assistance, or unique curricula leading to eligibility for standard teaching credentials” (Guyton, Fox & Sisk, 1991, p. 1). Alternative programs for teacher certification proliferated during the 1980s as states searched for better ways to bring people without teaching degrees into science and mathematics classrooms by providing training toward certification rather than issuing emergency certificates to teachers with little or no training or requiring prospective teachers to return to teaching institutions to complete teacher education programs (Bassinger, 2000; Dill & Stafford, 1996; Raffield, 1994). In 1996, 18 states allowed alternative certification; by 2002, 50 states and the District of Columbia established alternative certification programs. The number of teachers alternatively certified has risen from 275 in 1985-1986 to 59,000 in 2005-2006. Approximately one-third of all new teachers are entering the profession through alternative certification programs (Feistritzer, 2007).

Promotion of alternative certification by the USDE, fortified by policy and funding in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), intensified an existing quandary for school administrators: How does an employer identify those qualifications and behaviors of an alternatively certified applicant that will allow that person to be an

effective teacher while learning how to teach? This research report explores the independent and interdependent processes of teacher screening and selection and, explicitly, identifies existing literature that has addressed the relationship between pre-employment decisions and post-employment outcomes for predicting alternatively certified teacher success. In addition, recent scholarship is analyzed that pertains to the use of interviews in the teacher screening process, particularly in alternative teacher preparation programs, often described as alternative routes or pathways to teacher certification. Specifically, the report affords the reader an assessment of the relative importance of three interview protocols in the selection process as the mechanism of merit that transcends the usual qualifications of degree, grade point average and test scores to discern those life experiences and intrinsic beliefs that predispose an alternative certification candidate to be an effective teacher.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS

Of the five processes by which personnel may be certified by a state to teach—the traditional, approved college education program; direct application; emergency certificates; eminence certificates; and alternative certification, the alternative route has captured the attention of policymakers and of teacher preparation educators. Many policy makers and educators espouse that alternative certification’s innovative methods and the reasons for which alternative programs were initiated may result in an improved teacher preparation

system (Houston, Marshall, & McDavid, 1993).

Alternative certification programs emerged as a permanent force in teacher education during the 1980s as a reaction to the shortage of teachers for children who lived in areas of poverty and for the areas of special education, mathematics and sciences; to legislative efforts to reform education; and to political pressure. The public demand for better teachers increased along with a demand for jobs for mid-career changers, for service personnel leaving the military, and for persons down-sized from businesses (Feistritzer, 2003; Meisgeier & Richardson, 1996; Shen, 1999).

Alternative routes to teacher certification have evolved primarily due to the interaction of the supply and demand for teachers. Researchers listed several reasons for the growing demand for teachers. These reasons were increases in the student population, turnover in the teaching force, legislation decreasing class size, increasing numbers of teachers retiring, shortages of persons desiring to teach in specific content, and difficulty in staffing schools in urban and rural areas (Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement (CERRA), 1998; Columbia Group, 1998; Darling-Hammond, 2001; Dial & Stevens, 1993; Feistritzer, 2003; Frey, 2001; Gitomer, Latham & Ziomek, 1999; Goldhaber & Brewer, 2000; Governor's Commission on Teacher Quality, 1999; Haberman, 1991; Huldig-Austin, 1986; Ingersoll, 2001; Lockwood, 2002; Murphy & DeArmond, 2003; Pratt, 1987; Roth, 1986; Zumwalt, 1996).

Most importantly, reasons given by Shen (1999) for the increasing development of alternative certification programs are (a) to diversify the

teaching force through minority recruiting, (b) to increase staffing levels of urban schools or other settings for which staffing is difficult to achieve, (c) to provide opportunities for bringing bright college graduates into teaching without their participation in traditional teacher education programs, and (d) to recruit people who already have a broad range of experiences and the desire to teach to meet the escalating demands of a growing school population. Unlike teachers who have pursued the traditional teacher education institution route to certification, most alternative certification participants enter the teaching field from non-education professions as adults pursuing a second career (Bassinger, 2000).

Contrary to their counterparts who have pursued traditional teacher certification programs, alternative certification participants, in most cases, have not been observed in the classroom prior to being hired as a teacher-of-record. The lack of evidence of prior classroom experience historically has raised questions about predicting the effectiveness of beginning teachers who participate in alternative certification pathways. Sullivan (2001) suggested that public school district authorities may not always discern well between qualified and unqualified teacher candidates, regardless of the pathways undertaken towards certification, and concluded that alternative routes to certification provide viable options for expanding the pool of teacher applicants without sacrificing quality.

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

This research report discusses the selection of candidates who will be effective teachers and highlights the importance of teacher screening and

selection, the research on predicting teacher success, and the use of interviews in the teacher screening process. Although no panacea for selecting the most effective classroom teachers exists, school administrators must be deliberate in applying a selection process that is both reliable and valid. Without a widely accepted definition of teaching quality, each school division is encumbered to determine the essential components of the act of teaching, and subsequently use employment predictors that can accurately identify those traits. Only by utilizing selection practices that identify valid predictors of job performance can practicing administrators reliably hire highly effective classroom teachers, thus improving the educational system and teaching quality within the system.

However, very few validation studies of teacher employment success have attempted to determine any connection between candidates' pre-employment predictors and later teaching performance (Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Klein, 1999, Harvey & Gimbert, 2007; Loadman, Moore & Troyer, 2007; Moore & Richter, 2007). Often, pre-employment screening techniques form the foundation of hiring practices under the assumption that such techniques are accurate predictors of future job success. School divisions nationwide draw on the purported expertise of many different employment screeners in an attempt to employ those teachers with a proclivity to succeed in the classroom. At question is the usefulness of employment screening tools.

This issue is related to the problems many school divisions experience every year as they recruit to fill vacancies resulting from teacher

retirements, promotions, transfers, and resignations (Young & Castetter, 2004). National data has suggested that the average turnover rate is 29% for teachers who have taught for 3 years or less (Ingersoll, 2001). The responsibility for recruiting, selecting, and retaining quality classroom teachers to occupy these teaching vacancies has rested historically with school administrations (Gorton & Schneider, 1991). In response to the chronic national teacher shortage in specific content areas, and the need for a redistribution of 'highly qualified' teachers (Ingersoll, 2001), it is of utmost importance that school divisions identify and hire teachers that possess the skills to be successful in the classroom. A vexing issue for school administrators is how to identify correctly those teacher candidates that will perform well in a specific classroom environment even before they are hired, while meeting the teacher quality and student achievement mandates demanded by the federal legislation, No Child Left Behind (2001).

Although the development of standards and benchmarks for learning has been the focus of school reform efforts since the 1980s (Newman, 1996), conspicuously absent from empirical examination has been the impact of the classroom teacher in that movement. Specifically, researchers have not addressed adequately the importance of hiring those with the talents and interests necessary to succeed in the classroom. Despite the well-supported assertion that quality teachers must be recruited, selected, and retained to afford a quality education to all children (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Goldhaber, 2002; Haycock, 1998; Marzano, 2003; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996; Whitehurst,

2002), little research has been conducted to quantify the success or failure of hiring quality teachers. Because the selection of qualified classroom teachers is essential to the quality of education delivered to students, more emphasis must be placed on improving the process of identifying and selecting quality teachers. According to Danielson (1996),

The selection of teaching personnel is one of the main functions of educational administrators. The critical nature of this function may be readily seen in the development and implementation of the school educational program. Very often, the administrator's main opportunity to initiate change or strengthen certain functions of the curriculum rests with the decision made regarding the selection of teachers with necessary competencies (p. 2).

With increased pressure to hire only highly qualified teachers, educational administrators have the dual task of ensuring compliance with federal law while also leading school systems by making teacher selection decisions that affect positively the educational achievement of the students and help to achieve the overall goals of the school system. School reform movements and proficiency-driven outcomes, coupled with increased legal guidelines, make it incumbent on school administrators to develop a selection process that will ultimately benefit students, while remaining impartial and fair to all teacher applicants.

The decision as to whether or not alternative certification programs can provide students with qualified teachers depends on an emphasis on high standards for selecting those teachers (Lutz & Hutton, 1989). Traditional forms of predictive information such as years of teaching experience, certification status, and number of degrees earned have been shown to have no significant relationship to classroom performance. On the other hand, less easily quantifiable teacher characteristics such as the candidate's ability to convey knowledge and enthusiasm for the subject matter seem to be the most important criteria in making hiring decisions (Goldhaber & Brewer, 2000). "Only by utilizing selection practices that yield valid predictors of job performance can practicing administrators increase their ability to hire high quality classroom teachers" (Delli, 2000, p. 5).

Concerns about teacher quality have initiated additional changes in alternative programming. Across the nation, the top quality programs include teachers with a strong background in content, provide in-depth field experiences, and offer one or more support mechanisms for the teachers. Local, state and federal agencies more closely assess the requirements for entering and completing such programs and value ways to retain teachers in the profession. One method suggested by researchers to insure both student and teacher success is the careful selection of participants who will be effective teachers in the classroom. Emley and Ebmeier (1997) in their study of the interview process stated that one of the most important decisions made by an administrator was the selection of staff members. No other decision affected

greater consequences on students, administrators, teachers and the operation of an effective and efficient school.

One of the most important questions for a recruiter establishing an applicant pool or an administrator seeking to staff a school is whether or not the characteristics of effective teachers can be predicted. Delli (2000) suggested that school administrators must use proven predictors of job performance when hiring teachers and that more attention must be given to evaluating the predictive validity of decisions made as a result of the information determined during the employment interview. However, reviews of the literature revealed little progress since the early 20th century in determining effective predictors of an applicant's future success as a teacher, particularly the success of non-traditional teacher applicants. Most of the studies reviewed in the literature predicted the success of students entering undergraduate teacher education programs or predicted the success of graduates of teacher education programs seeking employment. The research on prediction supported the candidate's attitude and classroom behavior as major elements of success and placed ratings by student teaching supervisors as an important predictor.

In spite of a reform movement of the 1990s to identify qualitative assessment measurements of teacher success for traditionally trained or to-be-trained teachers, little research exists on predicting classroom success of alternative certification program applicants. One study of applicants in the Dallas Independent School District attempted to predict the success of

alternative certification interns. Lutz and Hutton's 1989 study used data on demographic, attitude, and personality characteristics to determine if any entry-level variable would permit the prediction of success among the intern recruits. From the 1,300 applications received, 110 applicants were selected based on basic skills test scores, four-year degree, 2.8 grade point average in the subject area, an application essay, an agreement to take six semester hours in reading instruction, a structured interview with impromptu essay, and background checks. Successful candidates were defined as those who completed all the requirements, passed the content area exam, and were recommended for certification. Unsuccessful interns were those who dropped out of the program or were assigned an additional year of internship or were not recommended for certification. No significant predictors of intern success in the alternative certification program were identified by Lutz and Hutton. The researchers stated that the lack of predictability might be accounted for by the highly selective procedures that were employed by the District in choosing the interns for the program. Conversely, the work of Haberman (1995c), aimed at predicting teaching success for applicants to alternative certification programs in urban areas, identified numerous predictors which are discussed in detail in this report.

As recommended by Delli (2000), school administrators need to know the predictors of success in the classroom and to look for those qualifications and qualities in candidates when hiring teachers. Overall, the literature predicting which candidates will be successful teachers has included the

general requirements for entering a teacher education program, but has focused more strongly on a candidate's predisposition toward teaching which Banner and Cannon referred to as "dimensions of the character and mind" (1997, p. 1) and NCATE (2002) referred to as dispositions. In addition, several researchers including Dill and Stafford (1996), Glass (2002), Haberman (2000) and Lesniak (1969) recommended observation of the teacher as a good predictor of classroom success.

IMPORTANCE AND USE OF INTERVIEWS IN THE SCREENING PROCESS

The importance of the interview process for alternative programs was recognized as early as the 1980s when the first programs began to surface. The Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) document, *Alternative Certification for Teachers* (1986) cited a reference to a 1984 report from the New Jersey Commission on Alternative Certification which stated:

Before taking the state subject test and being offered employment, the provisional teaching candidate will be screened through a local interview process which must be thorough and focus on the evaluation of academic and experiential background and, in particular, those personal/ethical qualities identified as critical to the profession of teaching. (p. 4)

Additionally, Lutz and Hutton (1989) stressed that alternative certification programs could serve as a means to provide schools with qualified teachers

only if the employer maintained high standards for selection.

The scholarship presented a number of reasons for the wise use of the interview process by all employers and by teacher education providers, alternative or traditional. For example, Delli (2001) reported that interviews were the most popular predictor used for hiring teachers. He gave three reasons for the entrenchment of the interview in the hiring process. First, administrators perceived the interview as the best means of assessing how a candidate will fit with the needs of a school district. Second, school districts supporting collaborative decision-making often utilized a multifaceted interview process with several stakeholder groups represented in the process. Third, most school administrators expected to meet teacher candidates face to face.

On the other hand, Pratt (1987) added that prediction of success is only one rationale for selecting a sound policy design regarding interviews and other strategies for selecting candidates for pre-service teacher education. Other rationale were to uphold the image of the hiring entity in the eyes of the profession, to require the interviewers to reflect on the criteria for quality teaching and for teaching potential, and to demonstrate accountability on the part of the interviewers in searching for quality applicants and selecting them fairly.

Other researchers stated that the interview was the most important factor in predicting who should teach because it might be the only available method to evaluate affective characteristics (Edson & Wilk, 1958; Shoemaker, 1974). For example, in Emley and Ebmeier's 1997 study of the employment interview, principals were able to differentiate between strong and weak teachers, based

on teaching ability, efficacy, commitment, job satisfaction, and morale. The authors found that the initial interview was “probably the most important of all evaluations” (p. 41) because errors made in the selection process had direct impact on individual students, administrators, and teachers as well as the entire school. Emley and Ebmeier’s results supported the inclusion of the interview in the selection process and the researchers suggested the use of self-evaluative methods completed by the teacher prior to the interview to supplement the interview questions.

Within certain limitations, principals are clearly able to use the information gathered from these interviews to distinguish poor from good teachers. Additionally, gathering print view data through surveys, tests, and inventories may effectively serve to reduce the number of questions that need to be asked during the selection interview, leaving more time for more probing or complex questioning strategies. (p. 40)

While research supported that the interview was the most widely used procedure for selecting applicants and that the interaction of interviewer was essential to the identifying the candidates most likely to be successful, many researchers added that the structured interview and the use of interview teams were the most valid mechanisms for selecting the best teaching applicants (Baskin, Ross & Smith, 1996; Delli, 2000; Emley & Ebmeier, 1997; Frey, 2001; Haberman, 1995a).

SELECTED INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

Three structured interview instruments were considered for this research report —The Teacher Perceiver Interview (The Gallup Organization), Project EMPATHY (the Omaha, Nebraska, Public Schools), and the Star Teacher Selection Interview (The Haberman Educational Foundation). These three protocols appeared most often in the literature and, also, were discovered as examples of protocols through personal correspondence in February 2002, from representatives of NCATE, American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) and several state department of education representatives.

The Teacher Perceiver and Project EMPATHY were developed concurrently in Nebraska during the 1970s. The Perceiver is a commercially designed and structured interview procedure developed through a “hiring science that is predictive of success” (Gallup, 2002, p. 2). The instrument, developed in 1971 by Selection Research Incorporated, uses research from early studies examining the correlation between the performance of teachers during interviews and subsequent performance in the classroom (Delli, 2000). The Gallup Organization bases its instrument on the assumption that schools should focus on building the strengths of teachers rather than improving their weaknesses and that the instrument can identify certain life themes that predict which teachers will be successful.

The Teacher Perceiver Interview uses 60 open-ended questions that are designed to allow interviewees the opportunity to respond in a manner that

indicates their suitability for teaching. The interview requires 45 minutes to administer and has 12 themes: mission, empathy, rapport drive, individualized perception, listening, investment, input drive, activation, innovation, gestalt, objectivity, and focus. The instrument requires one interviewer who must undergo more than 100 hours of training at a designated Gallup training location. To be certified to use the instrument, the interviewer must demonstrate consistently an 85% item-by-item scoring agreement with Gallup analysts (Gallup, 2002).

Four independent studies of the Teacher Perceiver Interview failed to support the publisher's claim of predicting success. First, Delli's 2000 study of 124 classroom teachers in a mid-western school district compared teacher performance ratings by building level principals to the scores achieved on the Perceiver. He found that "Very little variance, in general, is shared between any of the twelve themes measured by the T.P.I. and the performance ratings provided by building principals" (p. 140) and that the Perceiver presented a lack of internal consistency. He concluded that school districts, in using a pre-employment test to help identify teachers with the necessary qualities to help students learn, give careful consideration to using the Perceiver with other predictive sources of relevant employment information.

Second, Kanipe (1996) used the Perceiver in a study of 233 teachers in the Knox County School System, Knoxville, Tennessee. She found a positive correlation between the teachers' scores on the interview and the principals' ratings of the teachers' effectiveness but not at a significant level. The researcher recommended that

the system continue to use the interview as an identifier of teacher talents but that a variety of other sources of information be considered with the Perceiver in determining the employment of the candidate.

Likewise, two additional studies of the Perceiver, by Mauser (1986) and by Buresh (2003) found no significant correlation between the Perceiver scores and the administrator's rating of the teacher's performance. No predictive validity of teacher effectiveness was found in either study.

The second protocol considered for this report, Project EMPATHY (Emphasizing More Personalized Attitudes Toward Helping Youth) developed in the mid-seventies in the Omaha Public School System, uses 32 questions and eight life-style themes which describe an outstanding teacher as identified by the students and principals who contributed to the study—relationship, democratic orientation, rapport drive, empathy, student orientation, acceptance, student success, and work and professional orientation (Thayer, 1978). Wise, Darling-Hammond, and Berry (1987) pointed out that the interview does not focus on pedagogical skills or on subject matter knowledge and Thayer (1978) stated, "EMPATHY is a supplementary tool to help administrators know more about the potential of a candidate and where to place a teacher who is hired" (p. 442).

EMPATHY was developed during a period of time when the Omaha Public Schools had eight times as many applicants as positions and was experiencing change in the climate and composition of its schools. It is a copyrighted protocol owned by the school district and developed with federal funds from 1972 to 1975. The

purpose of the instrument was to select the best teachers and to place them at the school and grade level in which they would be most effective. In validation studies, the predictive ability of the instrument was a consistent 85% based on student evaluation of the teacher and 91% based on the principal evaluation of the same teachers (Thayer, 1978). More recent reliability or validity studies are not available.

The third instrument reviewed was the Star Teacher Selection Interview developed by Dr. Martin Haberman of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and administered by a non-profit organization, The Haberman Educational Foundation. The instrument is intended to identify alternative certification candidates as teachers for children in poverty and/or at-risk for other reasons and for districts in which a majority of the students receive free and reduced-lunch. Haberman began work on the process in the early 1960s to encourage retention of teachers in urban schools.

By observing 124 student teachers from 1958 to 1961 in New York City schools, Haberman identified 18 "Stars" and 14 "Failures." Stars were described during the first few weeks of teaching by supervisors and cooperating teachers as equal or better in performance than satisfactory experienced teachers. Failures were defined by the same category of supervisors as those interns who should not be teaching. Comparing the behaviors of the teachers in each category, Haberman identified 14 mid-range functions. Mid-range functions are clusters or groups of "teaching behavior that encompass a number of interrelated actions and simultaneously represent beliefs or commitments that predispose these teachers to act" (1995a, p.2). Beginning in 1962, Haberman refined

the mid-range teacher functions and formulated for seven of them interview questions designed to elicit answers that would cause the applicant to exhibit or not exhibit the mid-range function. Over a period of three years, 108 Milwaukee Public School alternative certification interns, who had been accepted to the program, were interviewed and followed through their first year of teaching. The interns' supervisors evaluated the new teacher's first year performance and the ratings were compared to the interview ratings. In 1966 the Urban Teacher Selection Interview was used to select college graduates for the intern program which became the foundation for the National Teacher Corps. The Urban Teacher Selection Interview was later renamed the Star Teacher Selection Interview.

The seven predispositions assessed in the Interview are persistence, protection of learning and the learner's freedom to learn, ability to move from theory to practice (generalization), a viable approach to at-risk students, a personal and professional orientation to students that is child-centered, a healthy response to bureaucracy and burnout, and a tolerance for fallibility. An additional seven functions for which Haberman (2000) said he has not been able to develop interview questions are organizational ability, physical stamina, emotional stamina, teaching style, explanations of success, basis of rapport, and readiness.

The protocol consists of a 14-question, scenario-based interview designed around the seven dimensions or mid-range functions of successful teaching. These questions are designed to give a clear picture of a candidate's behavior in the classroom and lead to the selection of those predisposed to

behaviors of effective teachers, in other words, select teachers who can function at satisfactory levels while they are learning to teach, a form of on-the-job training (Haberman, 1995b). A detailed description of each of the mid-range functions of star teachers follows.

Mid-range Function 1: Persistence

Haberman (1995a) compares persistence to problem solving and relates it to creativity and commitment. Star teachers demonstrating persistence believe that they are responsible for finding ways to engage the interest and involvement of their students in learning, for meeting the needs of the individual student regardless of diversity of learning ability, and for “finding what works” with problem children (p. 21-22).

Persistence consists of two teacher behaviors. The first is that the teacher persists in trying to resolve a seemingly unending problem. The second is that the teacher appears to believe that persistent creativity and problem-solving behavior is a normal expectation of the daily work of the teacher (Haberman Education Foundation, Incorporated, 2000, pp. 6-7).

Mid-range Function 2: Protecting the Learner and the Learning

Teachers who protect the learner and the learning seek out and capitalize on “. . . problems, questions, discrepant events, current crises and emergencies. . .” by bringing them into the classroom and using them to involve students in learning (Haberman, 1995a, p. 29). These teachers are aware of current events that capture the attention of children and they are willing to share

their own interests, hobbies, and avocations with their students. These learning activities transcend curriculum and textbooks. The teachers’ dedication to turning students on to learning may bring them into noncompliance with school bureaucracies which may not approve of latitude within the traditional curriculum. Thus, they may find themselves in conflict with a school administrator or a school policy. Teachers who are quitters and failures perceive the professional response to be immediate compliance. On the other hand, Haberman (1995b) says, “Star teachers try to resolve their struggles with bureaucracy patiently, courteously, and professionally. They seek to negotiate with authority” (p. 4). Their commitment to protecting the learning of their students and enhancing their students’ involvement in learning activities is their priority; they attempt to resolve conflicts with bureaucracy in the best interest of the learner.

Protecting learners and learning consists of two teacher behaviors. The first occurs when the teacher has selected an activity that is not approved by someone in authority. “Does the teacher have the skill to reconcile this difference of opinion with the authority figure in some way that is not undermining a worthwhile learning experience for the students” (Haberman Educational Foundation, Incorporated, 2000, pp 8 – 9)? The second behavior is the professionalism of the teacher if he/she is required to stop the activity. “Does the teacher assume authority and responsibility for ending the experience or does he/she seek favor with the students by blaming others” (Haberman Educational Foundation, Incorporated, 2000, p. 9)?

Mid-range Function 3: Application of Generalizations—Theory and Practice

The purpose of this category is to assess the degree to which the respondent is able to move back and forth between generalizations of learning theory and specific applications of theory. Haberman (1995a) states that successful teachers have the ability to take principles and concepts from a variety of sources (such as courses, workshops, books, and research) and translate them into practice. Likewise, they are able to connect activities and materials that interest their students to what they hope to accomplish and why they are in the classroom. These teachers comprehend the difference between information and knowledge and see the relationship between important ideas and their students' daily practice.

Mid-range Function 4: Approach to At-risk Students

Haberman (1995b) states that the applicants' beliefs about at-risk students are the most powerful predictor of their future success with urban students in poverty. Furthermore, he explains that star teachers not only can name the most commonly known reasons why students are at-risk such as poverty, lack of parent support for education, violence, dysfunctional families, handicapping conditions, lack of health care, et cetera, but also the star teachers can “. . . cite irrelevant school curricula, poor teaching, and overly bureaucratic school systems as additional causes” (p. 5). These teachers do not blame the child and believe that the teacher bears a primary responsibility for inspiring

students to learn regardless of the environment in which the student lives.

Mid-range Function 5: Professional versus Personal Orientation to Students

Star teachers expect that they may not be able to love all the children in their classrooms but they expect to be able to teach them. They also know that not all their students will love the teacher, but they expect those students to learn from the teacher. Stars appreciate the love or affection of their students and will use terms such as caring, respect, and concern in reference to their relationship with these students but do not consider love as a prerequisite for learning. Their reason for becoming teachers is not to receive the adulation of their students and they do not see the students' misbehavior as a personal affront (Haberman, 1995b).

Mid-range Function 6: Burnout

Successful teachers recognize that teachers can burn out if subjected to constant stress. They learn how to function within the bureaucracy of the schools so that the negative effects are minimized. They establish networks, collaborate, team teach, or find other support systems for emotional and professional security. They do not allow the paperwork, rules, interruptions, lack of resources, large classes, pressure over test scores, lack of time, or other such stresses to exhaust them and drive them from the profession (Haberman, 1995b).

Mid-range Function 7: Fallibility

Mistakes are a part of learning. Haberman's research shows that teachers

who have the ability to admit their own mistakes are more likely to accept the mistakes of students. Successful teachers recognize that they may make mistakes involving significant issues to others, are willing to admit that they have made a mistake, and will use serious errors to improve human relationships and to establish friendship and trust. By showing acceptance of their own fallibility, teachers are teaching children that mistakes are inevitable and can be turned into learning experiences (1995).

To ensure that the instrument is properly used and that the interviewers understand the questions and the scoring, only certified interviewers trained by representatives of the Haberman Foundation may administer The Star Teacher Selection Interview which is copyrighted by the Foundation. Two interviewers are required for the process and results are determined by consensus. The interview takes 35 minutes to administer and approximately 10 minutes to score and tabulate. The interviewers are considered a reliable interview team after six joint interviews in which each interviewer scored an interview within four points of a possible 45 points in 80% of the interviews. After the six qualifying interviews, the interviewers are predicted to pass or fail the same applicants in 95% of the interviews (Haberman Educational Foundation, Incorporated, 2000).

The Foundation purports a 95% success rate in predicting which teachers will stay in the classroom and succeed and which ones will fail or quit. Additional information from the Foundation reports an instrument reliability of 93% ($r = .93$) and an interview team reliability of 95% ($r =$

.95) (Haberman Foundation, Incorporated, 2000, pp. 30-31).

These statistics are based on the Milwaukee Public School intern studies in the mid 1960s and on two subsequent studies by Haberman. The first is a 1966 study in Chicago in which Haberman and Associate Superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools Evelyn Carlson followed approximately 1,000 college graduates who were hired for Chicago schools on probationary licenses due to a shortage of certified teachers. In May of 1967, only 167 of the teachers remained in the program. Carlson and Haberman interviewed the teachers using the Urban Teacher Selection Interview (predecessor of the Star Teacher Selection Interview) and compared the results of the interviews to the ratings of supervisors of the teachers. The researchers found less than 5% error between the two rankings (Haberman, 1995c). No statistical proof is offered in the write up.

Haberman refers to the second study in 1993 as the Milwaukee Trials. This study followed two groups of interns in the Metropolitan Multicultural Teacher Education Program. The participants were college graduates who served as paraprofessionals but were pursuing an alternative certification program. Group A consisted of 19 individuals who were selected from a pool of 43 applicants and Group B consisted of 19 individuals who were selected from a group of 162 applicants. Both groups were screened with the Urban Teacher Selection Interview. Because of differences in the teacher education training of both groups, the individuals were compared only with individuals in the same group were ranked against other members of their own group in terms how well the two

interviewers predicted they would function in the classroom. The rankings of prediction were compared to rankings of performance by the teachers' supervisors. Group A yielded a rank order correlation of $r = .87$; Group B results were $r = .79$. A caveat of the research as stated by Haberman was that applicants who failed the interview were not hired; therefore, the results could not identify whether or not the interview identified incompetence. Two and a half years after the study, Haberman reported that all members of Group A were still employed in the Milwaukee schools; he proposed, based on teacher attrition projections, that if teachers from traditional programs were placed in these schools, 50% of them would have left within that time period.

Research by others on the Star Teacher Selection Interview and Haberman's work produces mixed results. In Baskin and Ross' 1993 correlational study of 33 candidates for alternative licensure at Memphis State University, findings indicated a reasonable internal validity regarding intercorrelations between the two questions for each function and that 8 of 14 items on the interview correlated significantly with the final ranking of candidates which was developed from scores on standardized tests, grade point average, principals' recommendations, and a writing sample. The sub question for Application of Generalization, Part 1, emerged as a significant predictor of ranking. Candidates who scored highly on that item placed higher in the final ranking. In a following 1996 study, Baskin, Ross and Smith compared results of the Urban Teacher Selection Interview with Tennessee student teaching evaluations for 68 participants to determine whether interview scores

were closely related to on-the-job performance. The study found a limited predictive validity for the interview.

Another study (Chesek, 1998) found a high correlation between outstanding teachers identified by the Interview and characteristics that administrators identified as common to gentle teachers. Gentle teachers de-escalated violence and aggression and provided students with a classroom setting which promoted non-threatening, accepting, risk-taking interaction. "These teachers have a high sense of self, moral duty, and ethical obligation" (p. 75). Chesek studied 12 teachers who were described by their principals as escalators or de-escalators. He found a high correlation between high scoring teachers in the interview and characteristics that administrators find common to teachers who de-escalate violence and aggression. None of the teachers labeled as escalators passed the interview.

In a different type of study, Frey (2001) examined a teacher selection process in Buffalo, New York, which at that time required teachers to be employed from ordered hiring lists. The interview process consisted of a writing sample and the Haberman Interview. In following for two years the employment record of the 66 English teachers in the sample, Frey found a high correlation (.931) between teachers continuing to work in the district and their rank on the eligible list.

Storey (1995) applied a modified Haberman interview to measure the teaching success of 58 physical therapy faculty members in Texas on the technical college level. She stated the assumption that the successful teacher regardless of grade level demonstrated a basic philosophical orientation. Storey

recorded a significant correlation between the constructs of burnout, fallibility, and authority with aspects of job satisfaction, a significant correlation between burnout and a question on propensity to leave the job, and statistically significant predictive capability for persistence, generalizability, likeability, and fallibility in student and peer ratings.

A final, qualitative study by Peacock (2001) using the Star Teacher Selection Interview focused on the beliefs and teaching techniques of six teachers working with First Nations (native Indian) students in British Columbia, Canada. He found that teachers who work successfully with First Nations students needed to be persistent in solving unending problems and in protecting their students from the bureaucracy of the system.

Although the Star Teacher Selection Interview originated as a screening tool for alternative certification program teachers in urban areas, Storey's (1995) statement of a basic philosophical orientation possessed by successful teachers applies to the Interview's use to identify teachers in urban, suburban, and rural areas. Haberman describes the interview which resulted from his research as most useful for urban school districts particularly in states with alternative certification "to help select college graduates without teacher training as beginning teachers. This is the population and purpose for which the interview was developed and its most appropriate use" (Haberman, 1995a, p. 28). Although the instrument has been validated in only the urban setting, the instrument is being used in rural and suburban areas.

CONCLUSION

The rationale for using an interview protocol is to provide administrators with as much information as possible to enable them to make wise hiring decisions so that the faculty they select will be of the highest quality and will affect student learning in a positive manner. Teacher effectiveness is the greatest factor in student achievement (Sullivan, 2001). Therefore, selecting staff members is one of the most important decisions made by an administrator, influencing not only the students, the administration, and the teachers, but also the operation of an effective and efficient school (Emley & Ebmeier, 1997). The report's descriptions are useful to policymakers, school district and division administrators, and professional organizations in assessing current selection practices and in determining the employment criteria to consider when tailoring their own selection practices and protocols, specifically for the recruitment and selection of nontraditionally prepared prospective teachers.

The three interview protocols considered for this report were the Teacher Perceiver Interview, the Project EMPATHY Interview, and the Star Teacher Selection Interview. The three instruments are similar in that all three use a structured interview to identify effective teacher behaviors and have established reliability and validity studies. Also, each interview process reflects historical and modern research that supports the importance of a teacher's affective qualities in supporting student success.

The only instrument of the three, however, designed for use with alternative certification teachers is the

Star Teacher Selection Interview. The development and testing have been performed in a research university setting by well-known researchers in alternative certification and teacher training. Furthermore, the Star Teacher Selection Interview has two other unique features. First, it encourages reliability by using two interviewers who score the candidate individually and then by consensus. Second, its questioning process is interactive because the interviewers are allowed to probe for answers thus assessing the depth of the candidate's reaction to the behavioral concepts presented by the questions. In addition, training for and distribution of the instrument are managed by a non-profit organization that lowers the cost to the trainee, a practical concern in addressing the possible feasibility of training future teams to administer the instrument.

A final note, Darling-Hammond (2001) has suggested that a proactive measure of improving teacher practice is to improve the caliber of teachers entering the field. This can be accomplished through a rigorous employment screening process where only those applicants identified as highly qualified teachers are offered teaching positions. The search for variables that support quality teacher selection and accurately predict effective teacher performance should continue.

REFERENCES

- Banner, J., & Cannon, H. (1997). *The elements of teaching*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Baskin, M., & Ross, S. (1993). *The Urban Teacher Selection Interview: Internal validity*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 365716)
- Baskin, M., Ross, S., & Smith, D. (1996). Selecting successful teachers: The predictive validity of the Urban Teacher Selection Interview. *The Teacher Educator*, 32, 1– 21.
- Bassinger, J. (2000, January 14). Colleges widen alternate routes to teacher certification. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46(19), A18-A19.
- Buresh, R. (2003). The predictive validity of the Teacher Perceiver Interview in selecting effective elementary teachers in a mid-sized midwestern school district. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of North Dakota, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64 (08A), 2714.
- Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention and Advancement (CERRA). (1998). *Strengthening the profession that shapes South Carolina's future—teaching*. Rock Hill, SC: Author.
- Chesek., F. (1998). *Teachers for Chicago: Status Report*. Unpublished Report.
- Columbia Group. (1998). *Teachers and teaching in the southeast—A special Columbia Group report*. [On-line]. Available: www.columbiagroup.org/index.htm
- Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2001). The challenge of staffing our schools. *Educational Leadership*, 58 (8), 12-17.

- Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A. E., & Klein, S. P. (1999). *A license to teach: Raising standards for teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Delli, D. (2000). *The predictive validity of the Teacher Perceiver Interview on the teaching performance of classroom teachers*. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus. UMI Dissertation Services.
- Delli, D. (2001, Fall). Criteria for adopting commercial interviews for teacher elections. *The AASA Professor*, 25(1), 30-33.
- Dial, M. & Stevens, C. (1993, November). Introduction: The context of alternative teacher certification. *Education and Urban Society*, 26(1), 4-17.
- Dill, V., & Stafford, D. (1996). *Alternative teacher certification: History, handbook & how to*. Houston, TX: The National Center for Alternative Teacher Certification Information, The Haberman Educational Foundation.
- Edson, W., & Wilk, R. (1958). *An experimental study of the admissions interview in teacher education for predicting success in teaching*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, College of Education, Conducted under a grant from the Cooperative Research Program, United States Office of Research.
- Emley, K., & Ebmeier, H. (1997, April). The effect of employment interview format on principals' evaluations of teachers. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 11(1), 39-56.
- Feistritzer, E. (2003). *Alternative routes to teacher certification: An overview*. National Center for Education Information. [On-line]. Available: www.ncei.com/2003/overview.htm
- Feistritzer, E. (2003). "Preparing teachers for the classroom: The role of The Higher Education Act and No Child Left Behind." Testimony before the Subcommittee on Higher Education, Lifelong Learning and Competitiveness, United State House of Representatives. [On-line]. Available: www.teach-now.org/newsdisp.cfn?newsid=262
- Frey, P. (2001). *The Urban Teacher Selection Interview as a segment of the 1999 Buffalo teacher selection procedure and its ability to identify English teachers who are likely to be retained in the Buffalo public schools*. Unpublished manuscript, Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ.
- Gallup Organization. (2002, March). *Proposal for the Darlington County School District*. Lincoln, NE: Author.
- Gitomer, D., Latham, A., & Ziomek, R. (1999). *The academic quality of prospective teachers: The impact of admissions and licensure testing*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Glass, G. (2002). Teacher characteristics. In A. Molnar (Ed.), *School Reform Proposals: The Research Evidence* (Chapter 8). [On-line]. Available: www.asu.edu/educ/eps1/EPRU/documents/EPRU%202002-101/Chapter%2008-Glass-Final.pdf

- Goldhaber, D. (2002). The mystery of good teaching. *Education Next*, 2(1), 50-55. [On-line]. Available: www.educationnext.org/20021/50.pdf
- Goldhaber, D., & Brewer, D. (2000). Does teacher certification matter? High school teacher certification status and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22(2), 129-145.
- Gorton, R. A., & Schneider, G. T. (1991). *School-based leadership: Challenges and opportunities*. Dubuque, IA: W. C. Brown.
- Governor's Commission on Teacher Quality. (1999). *Preliminary report of the Governor's Commission on Teacher Quality*. Columbia, SC: Author.
- Guyton, E., Fox, M., & Sisk, K. (1991, Summer). Comparison of teaching attitudes, teacher efficacy, and teacher performance of first year teachers prepared by alternative and traditional teacher education programs. *Action in Teacher Education*, 8(2), 1-9.
- Haberman Educational Foundation, Incorporated. (2000). *Star teacher selection interview*. Houston, TX: Author.
- Haberman, M. (1991). The rationale for training adults as teachers. In C. Sleeter (Ed.), *Empowerment Through Multi-Cultural Education* (pp. 275-286). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Haberman, M. (1993). Predicting the success of urban teachers: (The Milwaukee trials). *Action in Teacher Education*, 15(3), 1-5.
- Haberman, M. (1995a). *Star teachers of children in poverty*. West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.
- Haberman, M. (1995b). Selecting star teachers for children and youth in urban poverty. *Pi Delta Kappan*, 76(10). [On-line]. Available: <http://web3.infotrac.galegroup.com>
- Haberman, M. (1995c). *A brief review of the history and development of the Urban Teacher Selection Interview*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee.
- Haberman, M. (1996). Selecting and preparing culturally competent teachers for urban schools. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. (pp. 747-760). New York: The Association of Teacher Educators.
- Haberman, M. (2000). *What makes a teacher education program relevant preparation for teaching diverse students in urban poverty schools? The Milwaukee Teacher Education Center Model*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 442 745)
- Harvey, Falcia., & Gimbert, Belinda, G. (Spring 2007). Evaluation of Non-Traditionally and Traditionally Prepared Teachers' Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Practice Using Performance-based Evidence. *Journal of National Association for Alternative Certification* 2 (1), 42-65.
- Haycock, K. (1998, Summer). Good teaching matters. *Thinking K-16*, 26(1) Washington, DC: The Education Trust.
- Huling-Austin, L. (1986). Factors to consider in alternative certification programs: What can be learned from teacher induction research?

- Action in Teacher Education*, 8, 51-58.
- Houston, R., Marshall, F., & McDavid, T. (1993, November). Problems of traditionally prepared and alternatively certified first-year teachers. *Education and Urban Society*, 26(1), 78-89.
- Ingersoll, R. (2001, January). *Teacher Turnover, Teacher Shortages, and the Organization of Schools*. Seattle: University of Washington, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.ctpweb.org>
- Kanipe, M. L. (1996). A study of the predictive validity of the Urban Teacher Perceiver Interview in the Knox County School System. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58 (06A), (University Microfilms No. AA19-735805)
- Kwiatkowski, M. (2001, February). *Debating alternative teacher certification: A trial by achievement*. [On-line]. Thomas B. Fordham Foundation. Available: www.edexcellence.net/better/tchrs/15.htm
- Lesniak, R.J. (1969). *Predicting classroom behavior of urban teacher candidates through use of a classroom behavior task*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University.
- Loadman, W., Moore, R., & Troyer, M. (April, 2007). *Examining the psychometric properties of Praxis III: Statewide results*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Lockwood, A. (2002, February). *Who prepares your teachers: The debate over alternative certification*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Lutz, F., & Hutton, J. (1989, Fall). Alternative teacher certification: Its policy implications for classroom and personnel practice. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11(3), 237-254.
- Marzano, R. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Design.
- Mausser, P. (1986). The predictive validity of the Teacher Perceiver Interview to teacher effectiveness. (Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1986). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48 (01A), 21.
- Meisgeier, C., & Richardson, R. (1996, Summer). Personality types of interns in alternative teacher certification programs. *The Educational Forum*, 60(4), 350-360.
- Moore, R., & Richter, D., (April, 2007). *What do teacher licensure tests tell us? The interrelationship between praxis II and praxis III?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Murphy, P., & DeArmond, M. (2003, July). *The teacher shortage and implication for recruitment policy*. Seattle: University of Washington, Center on Reinventing Public Education, Daniel J. Evans School of Public Affairs. [On-line]. Available: www.crpe.org/pubs/introTeacherShortage.shtml

- National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC). (2001). *Manual on the preparation and certification of educational personnel*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF). (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York: Author.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). 2002. *Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools, Colleges and Departments of Education*. [On-line]. Available: www.ncate.org/2000/unit_stnds_2002.pdf
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2004). *Alternative routes to licensure*. [On-line]. Available: www.nacate.org/accred/list_institutions/alternate_route_programs.htm
- Newman, F. M. (1996). *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. PL 107-110, 107th Cong., 1st Sess. [On-line]. Available: www.ed.gov/print/policy/elsec/leg/esea02
- Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI). (1986). *Alternative certification for teachers*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. (ERIC Document No. ED 266 137)
- Peacock, R. M. (2001). First Nations students: What some teachers do that make them successful. (Doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62 (10A), 3286.
- Pratt, D. (1987). Predicting career success in teaching. *Action in Teacher Education*, 7(4), 25-34.
- Raffield, K. (1994). A study of alternatively and traditionally certified teachers in South Carolina. Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1994. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 55(07A), 1919.
- Roth, R. (1986). Alternate and alternative certification: Purposes, assumptions, implications. *Action in Teacher Education*, 8, 1-6.
- Shen, J. (1999, Fall). Alternative certification: math and science teachers. *Educational Horizons*, 78(1), 44-48.
- Shoemaker, J. (1974). The development of a teacher selection interview system to be productive to certain criteria in predicting teacher success. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 36(02A), 656.
- Storey, R.S. (1995). Utility of the modified Haberman interview in higher education. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56 (06A), 2137.
- Sullivan, C. (2001). *Into the classroom: Teacher preparation, licensure, and recruitment. Elements of teacher effectiveness*: Alexandria, VA: National School Boards Association.
- Thayer, V. (1978). Project EMPATHY- An alternative way to hire teachers. *North-Central Association Quarterly*, 52(4), 438-442.
- U. S. Department of Education (USDE). (1991). *Alternative certification for*

teachers: A new career for you. (USDE Brochure No. ED/OIIA91-1). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Whitehurst, G. (2002). *Research on teacher preparation and professional development.* Paper presented at the White House Conference on Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers. Washington, DC. [On-line]. Available: www.ed.gov/inits/preparingteachersconference/whitehurst.html

Wise, A., Darling-Hammond, L., Berry, B. (1987, January). *Effective teacher selection from recruitment to retention—case studies.* Report prepared for the National Institute of Education. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. [On-line]. Available: www.rand.org/publications/R/R3462

Young, I. P., & Castetter., W. B. (2004). *The personnel function in educational administration.* Columbus, OH: Prentice Hall.

Zumwalt, K. (1996, November). Simple answers: Alternative teacher certification. *Educational Researcher*, 25(8), 40-42.