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Librarians and other professional people are finding themselves in increased contact with civil service systems. Although "civil service" in principle and in practice embraces so many different operations that it cannot easily be viewed as a whole, nevertheless its general goals and particular techniques for reaching them can be described. It is the purpose of this paper to show some of the advantages, as well as some of the disadvantages, of civil service by describing and analyzing one governmental operation, the recent examination for Director of the Chicago Public Library.

Early in 1950 the Chicago Civil Service Commission, after consulting with the Board of Directors of the Chicago Public Library, decided to hold an examination to fill the position which had been vacated by Mr. Carl B. Roden, who retired after 30 years as Director. The first step in this selection process was to determine who would be eligible to compete for the examination. Recruitment was nationwide in 1909 and 1918, when the two previous civil service examinations for the Director's position had been held, and in 1944 when the last Assistant Librarian's examination was given. In 1950, as before, the Library's Board of Directors wanted the selection to be made from the best available talent throughout the country. To make the competition nationwide it was necessary to hold the examination as an original entrance examination and not as a promotional examination, and to waive customary civil service residence requirements. In civil service terminology, an original entrance examination is one which may be taken by anyone, inside or outside of the present group of employees, who meets the minimum qualifications established for this particular examination; a promotional examination is one which can be taken only by persons already occupying a civil service position whose occupants specifically are designated as eligible for this examination.

To secure nationwide recruitment it was necessary for the Illinois state legislature to pass an act defining eligibility for this examination. Otherwise, one or more of the four persons eligible to take the examination on a promotional basis (the three Assistant Librarians of the Chicago Public Library, and the Municipal Reference Librarian) might have raised legal objections, contending that the Commission should hold a promotional examination, with the competition limited to these four. Although the legislature accepted the Library Board's desire to make the examination an original and not a promotional, it refused to accept the request for nationwide eligibility. Instead, the legislature opened the examination only to residents of the state of Illinois, and (in contrast to the Chicago Commission's customary requirement of one year's residence in Chicago) imposed the restriction of two year's state residence before the date of examination (1). The usual requirement, imposed
by state law, of a 5 point veteran's preference further restricted merit selection. Though the Illinois library law specifies that in cities of over 500,000 population the library board "shall have the power to appoint a suitable librarian and necessary assistants, and fix their compensation, and shall also have power to remove such appointees" (2), this power of the library board is controlled by the requirement that the civil service commission "shall certify to the appointing officer the name and address of the candidate standing highest upon the register" (3). However, the appointing power may specify sex; thus, when persons of different sex pass an examination, the appointing power may select the person at the top of the list or the first person of the opposite sex who makes a passing grade even though that person ranks well down the list.

The next step was to secure consultants to assist the Commission in constructing and administering the test. Not only was national recognition in the field of librarianship required of the consultants, but consideration also had to be made for their geographical distribution and diversity in their experience and background. Moreover, no one could serve as a consultant if a person associated with him decided to compete in this examination.

Dr. Leon Carnovsky (Professor of Library Science at the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago), together with Dr. C. B. Joeckel, had made a case study of the Chicago Public Library (4); he was asked by Mr. Joseph B. Fleming (President of the Board of Directors of the Chicago Public Library) to suggest the names of three specialists who would be qualified to assist the Commission. Dr. Carnovsky suggested Robert E. Downs (Director of the University of Illinois Library and Library School), Ralph Munn (Director of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh), and Ralph Ulveling (Director of the Detroit Public Library). Mr. Fleming recommended these men to Mr. Stephen E. Hurley (President of the Chicago Civil Service Commission) who invited them to serve as consultants. In accepting the appointment, these distinguished librarians volunteered their services and assisted the Commission fully at every stage of the selection process, which required the out-of-town consultants to make two trips to Chicago. The Commission, speaking for the people of Chicago as well as for itself, is deeply grateful for the generous public-spirited cooperation of its librarian consultants.

Planning the Examination

Before the consultants were brought together, both the Commission's President and its Director of Test Construction met with Dr. Carnovsky to talk over general examination problems and sources for examination material. At that time Dr. Carnovsky showed the group an objective-type examination that had been given by another civil service commission for the directorship of a metropolitan library system. On the basis of the Chicago Commission's experience and after examining this multiple-choice test, it was decided tentatively that no further effort would be made to develop a traditional civil service multiple-choice test, but that some other measures of ability would be required. This decision developed out of the unanimous opinion of the group that the position under consideration was a top level administrative post, which should be occupied only by a librarian with high administrative qualifications—as contrasted with high qualifications of narrowly technical nature. Although the multiple-choice test is the Chicago Commission's major selection device for most positions in the classified service, it was felt that it was not the best possible selection device by which to rank a small number of candidates for such a responsible position.

Two of the consultants (Messrs. Munn and Ulveling), Dr. Carnovsky (acting unofficially as an adviser), and the Director of Test Construction met for the first time early in March of 1950. The third consultant, Mr. Downs, was unable to
be present at this conference. Following preliminary discussion of the role of a library director in a metropolitan community, the group reviewed a draft of an announcement for the examination. Consideration was given to law suits initiated by unsuccessful candidates for responsible positions in other jurisdictions, with particular attention paid to the fact that in litigation over the scope of an examination, courts generally have upheld civil service commissions where their announcements specifically have covered the subject areas and personality traits to be tested. The group decided that it would not recommend that the Commission set minimum qualifications for filing applications for this position. The second item on the agenda, on which agreement also had to be reached before the announcement could be published, was a decision as to the type of examination to be held. Measures of ability commonly used by public jurisdictions for high-level personnel selection include: (a) training and experience, (b) a written test (either short answer or essay), and (c) an oral interview. Accepting the pre-conference decision, the group decided to use all of the above measures other than a short answer test. After some discussion, weights (indicated in the announcement below) were assigned to each of the three parts of the examination. With agreement reached on the content of the examination announcement, it had only to be rewritten in final form, as follows, and was released on April 24, 1950.

THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO

Announces an Examination to be Held on July 12, 1950, for the Position of
LIBRARIAN (Director of the Chicago Public Library)

The Civil Service Commission of the city of Chicago will hold the following examination in its examination room, 54 West Hubbard Street (450 North Dearborn Street), Chicago, Illinois, at 9:00 A.M. on the date thereof. The Commission reserves the right under the subjects, duties or experience, or otherwise, to impose tests of physical qualifications and health.

LIBRARIAN (CHICAGO PUBLIC LIBRARY), BRANCH III, CLASS L, GRADE 7,
For original entrance........$11,700 a year........July 12, 1950.
SCOPE - Duties (written test) 5; Oral Examination 3; Experience 2.
Fee: $3.00

DUTIES:

Summary

Exercises administrative control over all activities and operations of the Chicago Public Library system, subject to the policies and rules of the Board of Directors.

Typical Duties

Makes recommendations to the Board of Directors regarding the policies, regulations, and financial and business problems of the Library, the purchase of books and equipment, the purchase or rental of real estate for Library purposes, extension of services, etc.

Assists the Board in drafting bills for the legislature and presents supporting data on these and other matters to the public through the media of press and radio, and in appearances before civic and professional organizations.

Prepares and submits an annual report to the Board; prepares annual reports for the Illinois State Library, American Library Association, and U.S. Office of Education.
Experimentally and continuously reorganizes and plans and directs the
administration of the library system according to the most modern,
generally accepted procedures; in cooperation with the Civil Service Com-
mission, supervises the classification, recruitment, in-service training, and
promotion of library personnel; conducts staff meetings; advises and consults
with department and division chiefs; makes recommendations regarding appoint-
ments, promotions, and other personnel matters.

Recommends building sites; helps plan new buildings or alterations in
existing structures; supervises maintenance of buildings and grounds.

Keeps abreast of community needs by being informed of educational,
sociological, and political trends; recommends methods by which the
Library can meet new demands and responsibilities.

Performance Requirements

Knowledge of books and other media for disseminating ideas and information;
ability to plan, organize, direct, and coordinate large-scale library
programs. Ability to speak and write effectively, as demonstrated by
significant publications and public speeches.

The oral examination may touch upon any of the foregoing duties and will
relate to personality factors (some or all) such as: appearance, poise, speaking
ability, verbal facility; alertness; organization of ideas; ability to analyze
situations; ability to command confidence, and to command loyalty and cooperation
of staff; adaptability, reaction to social pressure and willingness to assume
responsibility.

Applicants for the above examination must, on the date set for the exami-
nation, be citizens of the United States, at least twenty-one years of age
(except that veterans are not subject to age limitations), and must have re-
sided in the state of Illinois continuously for at least two years next pre-
ceding the date of such examination.

Each applicant must purchase an examination fee stamp, or stamps, from the
City Collector, Room 107 City Hall, Chicago, and the same must be affixed to his
application blank in the space provided therefor. Out-of-town applicants who do
not appear in person to file their applications may request application blanks
by mail and may mail their completed application forms to the Civil Service Com-
misson for filing, accompanied by a postal money order or certified check for
$5.00 payable to the City Collector of the city of Chicago to pay for examination
stamps to be so affixed. No refunds of fees can be made.

Those desiring to take the above examination must file applications with the
Civil Service Commission, 208 City Hall, before 5:00 o'clock P.M. weekdays
(12:00 o'clock Noon Saturdays) on or before the fourth day preceding the date set
for the examination.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION:

JAMES S. OSBORNE
SECRETARY

This announcement was posted on the Commission's bulletin board, and was given
official publication in a Chicago newspaper. In addition, copies were sent to a
number of librarians whose names were suggested by Dr. Carnovsky and others, along with a letter inviting application for the examination. In view of the prominence of the position in question and in view of the relatively limited field of possible candidates, it is unlikely that any eligible person was unaware of the announcement of the examination.

The next decision to be made was in regard to the education and professional experience desirable for this position, and the relative importance of these two requirements. Inasmuch as requirements for different positions vary, and the supply and demand of qualified applicants for each position fluctuates with changing circumstances, individual training and experience standards are constructed for each examination given by the Chicago Commission. For this examination, of a total of 100% for education and experience combined, 40% was assigned to education and 60% to experience. Considerable exchange of opinion took place before these weights were agreed upon, and in fact it was not until a few days before the examination that final agreement was reached. It was recognized that standards could not be set above the level of the probable candidates. Inasmuch as the consultants were familiar with the background of prominent librarians in the state of Illinois, they were able to make an estimate which proved to be very accurate. Another additional factor was the individual backgrounds of the decision-making group. Some members of the group had college backgrounds and high-level work experience; other members had advanced graduate education and high-level work experience. The solution adopted in the educational sector of the examination was to give credit only to those with at least college graduation, and to give no additional credit beyond the master's degree in library science. For work experience, it was decided to begin giving credit at the level of a Regional Librarian, Branch Librarian, or Department Head of a large public library system, or at the level of a Head Librarian of a small public, specialized, or college or university library. Three levels of work experience were defined, with credit dependent upon the level of the position and the number of years the position was held. It was decided to give credit only for the one highest administrative position held by each candidate. Additional credit was given for the teaching of library science in an ALA-accredited library school. The experience standard suggested by the consultants and the Commission's examining official, and adopted officially for this examination, is shown below:

I. Education 40% (Credit given only for one of the following categories)

- Bachelor's degree, not in library science, 20%
- Master's degree, not in library science, 25%
- Bachelor's degree in library science (5th year program) 30%
- Bachelor's degree in library science (6th year program) 35%
- Doctor's degree, not in library science, 35%
- Master's or Doctor's degree in library science 40%

II. Library Administration and Library Science Teaching 60% (Credit given only for A1 or A2 or A3, plus B but not to exceed 60%)

A. Library Administration.

1. Primary Administration.
   a. Head Librarian or Assistant Librarian of the public library system of a city with a population of 750,000 or more; OR
   b. Head Librarian or Assistant Librarian of a university library with 1,000,000 or more volumes; OR
   c. Dean of an ALA-accredited school of library science
8 or more years completed 60%
7 years completed 59%
6 years completed 58%
5 years completed 56%
4 years completed 54%
3 years completed 51%
2 years completed 47%
1 year completed 42%

2. Secondary Administration.
   a. Head Librarian or Assistant Librarian of the public library system of a city with a population of\text{250,000 to 749,999}; OR
   b. Head Librarian or Assistant Librarian of a specialized public or private library with\text{500,000 or more volumes}; OR
   c. Head Librarian or Assistant Librarian of a university library with\text{250,000 to 999,999 volumes}

5 or more years completed 42%
4 years completed 41%
3 years completed 40%
2 years completed 38%
1 year completed 35%

3. Tertiary Administration.
   a. Head Librarian of the public library system of a city with a population of\text{65,000 to 249,999}; OR
   b. Head Librarian of a specialized public or private library with\text{100,000 to 499,999 volumes}; OR
   c. Head Librarian of a university or college library with\text{100,000 to 249,999 volumes}; OR
   d. Regional Librarian, Branch Librarian, or Department Head of the public library system of a city with a population of\text{750,000 or more}

5 or more years completed 30%
4 years completed 29%
3 years completed 27%
2 years completed 24%
1 year completed 20%

B. Library Science Teaching in an ALA-accredited University or College.
   3 or more years (full-time) completed 24%
   2 years (full-time) completed 20%
   1 year (full-time completed 15%

The most complex problem, of course, was the selection of areas for the essay and oral examinations. Following a meeting at which the group was joined by the President of the Commission and the President of the Library Board of Directors, it was agreed that the questions would be broad in scope, administrative in content, and practical in nature. No questions would be asked on specialized aspects of librarianship, e.g., "Describe the methods which have been used in surveying book collections, pointing out values and shortcomings in each," "Catalog an incunabulum," or "Date a Greek papyrus." At this conference no decision was reached as to the number of essay questions or their specific wording, although it was thought probable that one comprehensive question for the morning test session and three or four more particularized questions for the afternoon test session would be used. The comprehensive essay question phrased at that time was: "Develop a ten-year program for a typical public library system in a metropolitan area." The other essay questions under consideration were (a) Assuming no urgent or critical pro-
problems and that a typical public library system in a metropolitan area is a "going concern", write an essay on the accomplishments which reasonably could be expected by a head librarian during his first year in the system. (b) Assuming that building conditions do not restrict the program of a typical public library system in a metropolitan area, what is the best table of organization for a library with a budget of $1.50 per person? How far is it best to carry departmentalization? (c) In what way is it best to conduct a survey of the branch system of a typical public library system in a metropolitan area? What are the significant principles to consider in order to formulate recommendations regarding the location and type of branch to be established? (d) Write an essay on library finance, emphasizing customary methods of evaluating library support and expenditures, with advantages and shortcomings of each. Present the case for and against a special earmarked library tax. And (e) discuss the implications of the communications revolution in relation to the future of public library policies and practices.

The questions considered for the oral interview were (a) Propose a program for creating and maintaining staff morale. (b) Defend the library budget before a municipal council finance committee which seeks to reduce the library's budget request. And (c) what action is it best for a library director to take if he plans to carry through some sort of major change or service in the library organization and he believes that his organization will resist this change?

The conference was concluded with the group's decision to use the Commission's Examining Division office in the Chicago City Hall as a clearing-house, and to have its Director, (in collaboration with Dr. Carnovsky) make a selection of questions and put them into suitable form for final review by the consultants. Since the three consultants were separated geographically, further discussion was conducted continuously and exhaustively through the mails. In time, the one essay question was selected for the morning session of the examination, and three essay questions for the afternoon. Tentative "model" answers for each essay question were developed by each consultant. No model answers were needed for the oral questions, which were designed to test personality characteristics and not substantive knowledge. Considerable difference of opinion developed in several areas, both as to the essay response desired and as to the wording of the questions, since the task of developing model answers requires careful consideration of the precise wording of each question. On June 22, 1950, Mr. Downs wrote the Commission that he had received an emergency assignment from the US Army for a special mission to Japan, and would have to resign from the committee of consultants. Again through Dr. Carnovsky, another consultant was secured - Dr. Bernard R. Berelson, Dean of the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago. He accepted the assignment and in a few days, without looking at the contributions of the other consultants, submitted model answers for the proposed essay questions. From the three sets of model answers a tentative composite model answer was developed for each essay question. These model answers were regarded as tentative, inasmuch as it was recognized that the candidates might bring out valid points which had not been anticipated by the group of examiners.

During this period of correspondence each of the consultants was sent a copy of an oral examination rating sheet, which had been adapted for this particular examination from a form developed by the Commission for previous oral examinations. This form proved acceptable to the consultants. The final wording of the essay questions was agreed upon, and a decision was made to use two oral questions. The first oral question was to be one which concerned library contact with the public in a controversial problem area. The second oral question was to bring out internal staff relationships from the perspective of the head librarian. A total of
30 minutes was provided for each individual oral interview. Each candidate was allowed 15 minutes on each question to make his presentation and to answer queries from the Oral Board. The Oral Board was composed of the three consultants and the examination director, who acted as chairman without vote. A court reporter recorded the candidate's answers to the questions, including all discussion between candidates and examiners. Candidates were given the first oral question 10 minutes before they entered the oral examination room. Blank cards were furnished on which they could make notes for referral in the examining room. The two oral questions were (a) A branch library of the public library system of a city with a population of one-million or more has provided such novels as _The Naked and the Dead, The Young Lions_, etc. A delegation from a PTA in the neighborhood of this branch library tells the head librarian of the library system that it is emphatic in its objection to the use of profanity and the unconventional sex discussion in these novels, and insists that the books be withdrawn from the branch. What answer should the head librarian make to this delegation? And (b) what action should the head librarian of the public library of a city with a population of one million or more take to create and maintain staff morale?

The oral examination rating sheet used by the consultants to evaluate candidates during the interview contained 12 questions, and gave the raters three possible answers for each question. Each candidate's interview score was obtained by averaging the total marks of the three consultants. The questions and the points allocated to each of the answers follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How appropriate is the physical bearing of the candidate? (Consider stature, posture, gait, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How appropriate is the dress and general appearance of the candidate? (Consider grooming: appearance of hair, nails, teeth, shoes, etc.; appropriateness and neatness of clothes, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How appropriate is the candidate's voice and enunciation?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How does the candidate adapt to the interview situation?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent does the candidate express himself in clear and convincing manner? (Consider grammar and clarity of presentation, as well as organization of ideas.)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent does the candidate grasp ideas and analyze situations?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How self-confident does the candidate show himself in the interview situation?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To what extent can the candidate be expected to develop the loyalty of his staff?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions

(a) Superior, (b) Acceptable, (c) Not Acceptable.

The four essay examination questions and the model answers which were used to score them follow. Two hours were allowed for answering the first question and 2-1/2 hours for answering all of the other three questions.

1. What steps should be taken in developing a ten-year program for the public library system of a city with a population of one-million or more? Model answer (and maximum points for each part): (a) participation of board and staff (4), (b) community characteristics - composition and its projection (7), (c) goals and objectives - short and long run (7), (d) present status survey (7), (e) related agencies (2), (f) financial potential (7), (g) public relations (2), and (h) evaluation (4) - total points 40.

2. What are the implications of the communications revolution for the public library? (Disregard technical developments such as microfilm, etc., within the library.) Model answer (and maximum points for each part): (a) use in library and resultant effect (6), (b) social impact on public library of this change (12), and (c) use of media by library for public relations and stimulation (2) - total points 20.

3. Present two plans of internal organization for the public library system of a city with a population of one million or more. Justify the plan you prefer. Model answer (and maximum points for each part): (a) do both plans cover the system, including specialized administrative functions, such as personnel and public relations? (4), (b) library objectives and type of library (4), (c) coordination of agencies, line and staff (4), (d) span of control (4), and (e) recognition of subject divisions and functional divisions (4) - total points 20.

4. What are the significant factors that should be considered in determining the location, relocation, and types of branches, as well as other extension services, in the public library system of a city with a population of one million or more? State why you consider each factor significant. Model answer (and maximum points for each part): (a) objectives (2), (b) community analysis (5), (c) lo-
cation and site-positive and negative (5),(d) kind of branch (2), (e) auxiliary services–bookmobiles, sub-branches, contracts, etc. (3), and (f) financial (3) – total points 20.

**Administering the Examination**

The number and per cent of people who would be able to pass the examination were limited by three considerations: restriction of recruitment to residents of the state of Illinois, absence of minimum qualifications for admission to the examination, and decision by the Library Board of Directors, the Civil Service Commission, and the consultants that eminent administrative librarianship was required for success on this examination. Thirteen candidates registered for the examination. One, a housewife, did not take the examination. The participants, three women and nine men, ranged in age from 33 to 69. At the time of the examination they were employed as follows - 3 were assistant librarians of the public library system of a city with a population of 750,000 or more, 1 was assistant librarian of a special library with 500,000 or more volumes, 3 were head librarians of public library systems of cities with a population of 65,000 to 249,999, 1 was head librarian of a special library with 100,000 to 499,999 volumes, 1 was branch librarian of the public library system of a city with a population of 750,000 or more, 1 was an associate professor of library science, 1 was an educational administrator, and 1 was a musician (unemployed).

The examination started at 8:30 AM and, with an hour intermission for lunch, continued until 6 PM. The candidates were escorted to lunch in two separate groups, according to whether they had or had not taken their oral examination. There was no security problem on the written examination because the morning essay papers were turned in before lunch. Candidates were dismissed in the afternoon as soon as they had completed the other three questions and had appeared before the Oral Board. That evening the three consultants and the Director of Test Construction started work on the 2-1/2 pounds of paper turned in by the candidates. Only these four people read and graded the papers. The problem of how much credit to grant for several unusual education and experience records was worked out. Each member of the group then read all of the examination papers. The tentative model answers were revised slightly to cover several points made by candidates but not anticipated by the group. The remainder of the first grading session was occupied with a consideration of how much partial credit to allow for answers giving incomplete discussion, and with an analysis of the points enumerated in the model answers. The "day's" work was brought to a close at 2 AM. At 8:30 the same morning, the group reassembled, and by the end of the afternoon had assigned preliminary marks to the essay answers, and the two out-of-town consultants were homeward bound. The other two members of the group were charged with carefully reviewing all of the essay papers. They reread each answer to determine whether and to what extent each of the specific points enumerated in the model answer was covered by each candidate. For example, each candidate’s answer to the first question was read through eight times by one reader, each time for one particular point enumerated in the model answer. This detailed review produced several minor changes in essay grades. One remaining point later was clarified by telephone calls to Detroit and Pittsburgh and an exchange of airmail letters with Mr. Munn in Sweden, where he was attending a UNESCO conference.

The final results were determined after the three tests had been graded separately on the basis of 100 points and weighted according to the figures in the examination announcement, 50% for the essay questions, 30% for the oral interview, and 20% for experience. The results were announced on September 1, 1950. Miss Gertrude E. Gscheidle, then an Assistant Librarian of the Chicago Public Library,
was first on the list. On November 1, 1950, after time had been given the three candidates who had passed the examination to file for veteran's preference, the Library Board of Directors appointed Miss Gecheidle Librarian of the Chicago Public Library system. The separate test and total examination scores for each candidate (listed anonymously in rank order) follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay (x 5)</th>
<th>Oral (x 3)</th>
<th>Experience (x 2)</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>81.67</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>72.33</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>78.67</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>55.33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examination was difficult for the group, and only three candidates made over 70% the minimum passing mark of the Chicago Commission. The examination distributed the candidates in spectrum fashion over almost the entire range of possible scores, from 11% to 85%. The 12 candidates together could have accumulated a possible 1200 points on each one of the three tests. Their actual total scores were 568 points on the essay test, 526.67 points on the oral interview, and 698 points in the experience rating. The total scores made by all candidates for these three tests had a spread or range of more than 15 percentage points from the highest (experience) to the lowest (oral) total score. Several candidates made scores on one part of the examination which differed by more than 100% from the scores they made on other parts. It is clear, therefore, that the three parts of the examination were measuring different things. From a test standpoint, these different measures of ability were useful because they did yield different results.

It may be of interest to record here that the total cost to the Civil Service Commission of constructing, administering, and scoring the examination was 245 man-hours, or $700. This does not include the services of the consultants who were not paid for their services; their expenses were paid for by the Library Board of Directors.

**Conclusion**

As this examination is viewed in retrospect, two major disadvantages stand out in this particular type of merit selection. First, the total evaluation of a person's fitness for a position is not best accomplished by a simple arithmetical balancing of the different measures of ability used on an examination. On the contrary, evaluation should be a subtle process in which non-mathematical compensation for applicant's strengths and weaknesses are made in terms of the personality and skill configuration of each applicant. Second, the requirement of candidate anonymity further restricted the selection operation. In this particular selection process the identity of the competitors could not be kept secret because most of the candidates already were known to the examiners. Consequently, all candidates were
introduced by name to the Oral Examining Board. Furthermore, since the educational and work experience of each candidate necessarily was so unique, there was no question as to the identity of the candidate described by the unsigned experience forms which each candidate completed. The essay papers however were unsigned, and for the most part were not identifiable as they were being read by the examiners.

Progressive employment selection procedure requires that considerable background information be obtained about an applicant before the applicant is interviewed. Good procedure also requires that the interviewer possess considerable freedom to vary his approach from candidate to candidate. Adequate check-up should follow an interview. Furthermore, group interviews are not as satisfactory for the initial evaluation as the single interviewer technique. Obviously, and for good historical reasons, the ordinary civil service agency does not operate in such an uninhibited manner. The consultants found it somewhat artificial deliberately to exclude from consideration any information they already possessed about some of the candidates. While the consultants also reported that they felt their effectiveness was somewhat reduced by these formal limitations to the selection process, they anticipated these handicaps and used the 30-minute oral interview with each candidate to maximum advantage. Each interview, while centering about the two major areas of discussion established by the oral questions, probed different sectors of the problems, according to the line of development taken by each candidate and the need of the examiners to get sufficient information to enable them to rate each candidate according to the criteria enumerated on the oral rating form.

Positive assets of such a formalized examination process are the open publicity given the announcement of the examination (even though this examination was limited to residents of one state), and the scrupulously careful and detailed conduct of the construction, administration, and scoring of the examination. Government's action in making public the details of all criteria and procedures used in an examination process is not generally matched by business, industry, or educational institutions. Beyond legal requirements, civil service commissions begin to satisfy personnel needs as well as democratic ideals when they conceptualize, verbalize, and execute their specific objectives with precision and effectiveness. The environment of government is formal and somewhat restrictive. However, it is also receptive to volunteer participation of private citizens; and, when such service is provided by distinguished specialists, government becomes the instrument for the highest kind of democratic administration.

FOOTNOTES

(1) Illinois Revised Statutes: 1949, Chap. 24-1/2, Sec. 47.
(2) Ibid., Chap. 81, Sec. 5.
(3) Ibid., Chap. 24-1/2, Sec. 48.