

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 718

TM 820 865

TITLE Development of USES Specific Aptitude Test Battery for Ticket Agent (any ind.) 238.367-026.

INSTITUTION Utah State Dept. of Employment Security, Salt Lake City. Western Test Development Field Center.

SPONS AGENCY Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.

REPORT NO S-200R82

PUB DATE 82

NOTE 22p.; Appendix 3 marginally legible due to small print.

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Aptitude Tests; Employment Qualifications; Job Analysis; *Occupational Tests; Personnel Evaluation; Predictive Measurement; *Test Construction; Test Use; Test Validity; *Vocational Aptitude

IDENTIFIERS Test Batteries; *Ticket Agents; USES Specific Aptitude Test Battery

ABSTRACT

The United States Employment Service (USES) Specific Aptitude Test Battery (SATB) for Ticket Agent is evaluated from three points of view: (1) technical adequacy of the research; (2) fairness to minorities; and (3) usefulness of the battery to Employment Service staff and employers in selecting individuals for ticket agent positions. Research demonstrated a statistically significant and useful relationship between proficiency as a ticket agent and the SATB. The SATB can be expected to produce a useful increase in the proportion of highly proficient workers. When the SATB was applied to the validation sample, composed of individuals who were employed and therefore considered competent, an increase from 65 percent to 74 percent in the proportion of highly proficient workers was found. Similar results were found for the cross-validation sample. A greater increase can be expected when the battery is used with applicants, because the range of relevant abilities is wider among applicants than among employed workers. The report includes: (1) research summary; (2) procedure; (3) analysis; and (4) validity of the battery. Descriptive statistics for subgroups of the validation sample; descriptive rating scale; and job description are contained in the appendices. (Author/PN)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

**Ticket Agent
(any ind.)
238.367-026**

Development of USES
Specific Aptitude
Test Battery S-200R82



U.S. Department of Labor
Employment and Training Administration
U.S. Employment Service
1982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED0223718

Tm 820 865

2.

DEVELOPMENT OF USES SPECIFIC APTITUDE TEST BATTERY

for

TICKET AGENT (any ind.) 238.367-026

S-200R82

**Developed in cooperation with the California, District of Columbia,
Florida, Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, New Jersey, New York,
North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Texas, and Virginia
Employment Services**

Analysis and Report

by

**Western Test Development Field Center
Salt Lake City, Utah**

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

**Employment and Training Administration
United States Employment Service**

1982

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The United States Department of Labor and affiliated Employment Service Agencies express their sincere gratitude to the following organizations for cooperating in this research.

North

American Airlines, Inc., Detroit and Inkster, Michigan
American Airlines, Inc., Newark, New Jersey
American Airlines, Inc., Buffalo, New York and Syracuse, New York
American Airlines, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio
Delta Airlines, Inc., Detroit, Michigan
Pan American World Airlines, Inc., Detroit, Michigan
Piedmont Airlines, Chicago, Illinois
Piedmont Airlines, Newark, New Jersey
United Airlines, Chicago, Illinois
United Airlines, Newark, New Jersey

South

American Airlines, Inc., San Antonio and Houston, Texas
Braniff International Airlines, Dallas and Houston, Texas
Eastern Airlines, Alexandria, Virginia
National Airlines, Tampa, Florida
Piedmont Airlines, Louisville, Kentucky
Piedmont Airlines, Winston-Salem, North Carolina
Piedmont Airlines, Washington, D. C.

West

American Airlines, Los Angeles, California
Continental Airlines, Portland, Oregon
Golden West Airlines, Newport Beach, California

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	ii
RESEARCH SUMMARY	1
PROCEDURE	2
Job Analysis	2
Experimental Test Battery	3
Validation Sample Description	3
Criterion for Validation Study	3
Cross-Validation Sample Description	5
Criterion for Cross-Validation Study	5
ANALYSIS	5
VALIDITY OF THE BATTERY	7
Criterion Related Validity	8
Effectiveness of the Battery	8
Subgroup Analysis	9
Prior Battery	10
APPENDIX 1	
Descriptive Statistics for Black and Nonminority Subgroups	11
APPENDIX 2	
Descriptive Statistics for Female and Male Subgroups	13
APPENDIX 3	
Descriptive Rating Scale	15
APPENDIX 4	
Job Description	19

DEVELOPMENT OF USES SPECIFIC APTITUDE TEST BATTERY S-200R82

for

TICKET AGENT (any ind.) 238.367-026

RESEARCH SUMMARY

This report is designed to provide the information required to evaluate the Specific Aptitude Test Battery (SATB) for Ticket Agent from three points of view: (1) technical adequacy of the research; (2) fairness to minorities; and (3) usefulness of the battery to Employment Service staff and employers in selecting individuals for Ticket Agent positions.

Research demonstrated a statistically significant and useful relationship between proficiency as a Ticket Agent and the following Specific Aptitude Test Battery:

<u>Aptitudes</u>	<u>Cutting Scores</u>
G - General Learning Ability	95
V - Verbal Aptitude	100
N - Numerical Aptitude	90

Two samples were used in this research. The validation sample, on which the SATB was developed, consisted of employed workers (including 48 blacks) from 12 states and the District of Columbia. Data were collected during 1973-80. The tests used were those of the General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB). Job proficiency was measured by supervisory ratings.

A second sample tested in 1958 confirmed or cross validated the SATB. This sample consisted of 55 employed Ticket Agents. The same experimental tests were used. The criterion or job proficiency measurement was supervisory ratings.

Test research analysts found no evidence of difference in validity between blacks and nonminorities; the battery proved to be fair to blacks and nonminorities and females and males using several definitions of fairness. Additional information is presented in the Validity of the Battery section and in Appendixes 1 and 2.

The SATB can be expected to produce a useful increase in the proportion of highly proficient workers. When the SATB was applied to the validation sample, composed of individuals who were employed and therefore considered competent, an increase from 65% to 74% in the proportion of highly proficient workers was found. Similar results were found for the cross-validation sample. A greater increase can be expected when the battery is used with applicants, because the range of relevant abilities is wider among applicants than among employed workers.

PROCEDURE

A concurrent design was used for the validation study; test and criterion data were collected at about the same time at each of the separate employment sites over a period from 1973 to 1980.

Job Analysis

A job analysis was done by observing the workers' performance on the job and by consulting with supervisors. Analysts prepared a job description based on the job analysis. This description was used to select an experimental sample of employed Ticket Agents and to choose an appropriate criterion or measure of job performance.

Job duties of workers at each location listed in the ACKNOWLEDGMENT section were compared with the job description and found to be essentially the same. If minor differences were found, the job description was modified. The job description shown in Appendix 4 is the result of this process and may be used to provide information on the applicability of the test battery resulting from this research.

Each job duty was rated for frequency of performance, percentage of time spent, and level of difficulty. Critical job duties were identified on the basis of these ratings.

At least one analyst at each location rated the aptitudes as irrelevant, important, or critical to performance of the job duties at that location. A synthesis of these ratings and their rationale follows:

G - General Learning Ability

Required to learn reservation and ticketing procedures and promote travel service; to plan travel routes; to insure that there is available space; and to check baggage.

V - Verbal Aptitude

Required to answer inquiries regarding flight schedules and accommodations; to direct passengers to designated boarding areas; and to make public address announcements of arrivals and departures.

N - Numerical Aptitude

Required to compute fares, refunds or balances due for reissued tickets in case of changes; and to compute baggage weight, travel rates and times.

Q - Clerical Perception

Required to check rates, schedules, computer printouts and manuals, to insure that ticket information is accurate.

Experimental Test Battery

The experimental test battery for the validation sample consisted of all 12 tests of the GATB, B-1002B. Information on the composition and developmental research of the GATB may be found in the Manual for the General Aptitude Test Battery, Section III, Development, available from the Government Printing Office.

Validation Sample Description

The validation sample consisted of 201 Ticket Agents (109 males and 92 females) employed at various locations in the North, South, and West (see ACKNOWLEDGMENT). A total of 63 were minority group members (48 blacks, 9 Spanish Surnamed, 1 Oriental, and 5 other) and 138 were nonminority group members. The means and standard deviations for age, education, and experience of sample members are shown in Table 1.

Several American Airlines subsamples used an employer prepared Agent Selection Guide which includes tests of arithmetic reasoning, clerical perception, English usage and judgment situations. The test itself is not available, but cut-off scores were not used. Workers had at least three months' experience on a job which has duties similar to those found in the job description in Appendix 4. Descriptive statistics for black and nonminority subgroups are shown in Appendix 1.

Criterion for Validation Study

The criterion for the validation sample consisted of supervisory ratings. Each subject was rated twice by a first line supervisor with an interval of two weeks between ratings, or once each by a first and second line supervisor. Because sample members' aptitude scores are confidential, supervisors had no knowledge of test scores of workers. Thus, the possibility of these scores affecting ratings did not exist.

A descriptive rating scale was used. The scale (see Appendix 3) consists of six items. Five of these items cover different aspects of job performance. The sixth is a global item on the "all-around" ability of a Ticket Agent. Each item has five alternative responses corresponding to different degrees of job proficiency. For the purpose of scoring items, weights of 1 to 5 were assigned to the responses. The total score on the rating scale is the sum of the weights for the six items. The possible range for each rating is 6-30.

A review of the job description indicated that the subjects covered by the rating scale were directly related to important aspects of job performance.

- A - Quantity of work: A Ticket Agent must work quickly and efficiently to direct passengers, answer questions, check baggage, make reservations, issue tickets, determine fares, keep records, meet flight schedules or other deadlines and accommodate customers.
- B - Quality of work: The work of a Ticket Agent must be of high quality to provide optimum service to customers in a competitive industry.
- C - Accuracy of work: A Ticket Agent must be able to obtain, convey, and/or record information precisely from a variety of sources.
- D - Job knowledge: A Ticket Agent must understand, comply with, and be able to convey to others information obtained from charts, flight schedules and reschedules, guides, and manuals.
- E - Job versatility: A Ticket Agent must be capable of executing complex procedures with a variety of forms and equipment, following varying procedures and specifications and must be aware of constantly evolving and changing methods.
- F - "All-around" job ability: Value to the employer involves a combination of the aspects of job performance listed above.

A reliability coefficient of .80 was obtained between the two different job performance ratings, indicating a significant relationship. Therefore, the final job performance criterion consists of the combined scores of the two ratings. The possible range for the combined scores is 12-60. The actual range for the total sample is 25-60. The mean is 44.3 with a standard deviation of 7.6. Table 1 shows the relationship between the job performance criterion and age, education and experience.

TABLE 1

Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Pearson Product-Moment Correlations with the Criterion (r) for Age, Education and Experience

Validation Sample

N = 201

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>r</u>
Age (years)	33.2	7.5	-.05
Education (years)	13.4	1.4	-.17
Total Experience (months)	87.7	71.7	.12

For the purpose of analysis, researchers dichotomized the criterion distribution so as to include, as nearly as possible, one-third of the subjects in the low criterion group and two-thirds in the high criterion group. This procedure is the standard for SATB studies. A criterion cutting score of 42 placed 35% of the overall sample in the low criterion group and 65% in the high criterion group.

Cross-Validation Sample Description

The cross-validation sample consisted of 55 Ticket Agents employed at various locations by Mohawk Airlines. This study was conducted prior to the requirement of providing minority group information. Therefore, minority group status of the sample members is unknown. The means and standard deviations for age, education and experience of sample members are shown in Table 1a.

Criterion for Cross-Validation Study

The criterion for this study consisted of supervisory ratings. The ratings were made in a manner similar to those of the revalidation sample. The relationship between criterion and age, education and experience is shown in Table 1a.

TABLE 1a

Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Pearson Product-Moment Correlations with the Criterion (r) for Age, Education, and Experience

Cross-Validation Sample

N = 55

	Mean	SD	r
Age (years)	25.6	4.6	.141
Education (years)	12.3	1.0	.035
Total Experience (months)	28.0	20.6	.323*

*Significant at the .05 level.

ANALYSIS

The initial step in SATB data analysis is to identify those aptitudes which show some evidence of validity and job relatedness. This evidence can be:

1. Statistical evidence of the correlation (r) between the test and the criterion,
2. Content validity as evidenced by a rating of "critical" based on the job analysis, or

3. Any combination of the following:

- high mean
- low standard deviation (SD)
- rating of "important" based on the job analysis
- demonstrated validity in a prior validation study.

Statistical results for the validation sample are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2
Statistical Results for Validation Sample

N = 201

<u>Aptitude</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>r</u>
G - General Learning Ability	107.5	14.3	.35**
V - Verbal Aptitude	107.0	13.2	.24**
N - Numerical Aptitude	107.5	15.3	.34**
S - Spatial Aptitude	106.6	18.2	.19**
P - Form Perception	115.3	18.1	.22**
Q - Clerical Perception	125.1	17.0	.20**
K - Motor Coordination	116.8	15.4	.11
F - Finger Dexterity	102.4	20.2	.23**
M - Manual Dexterity	111.2	22.1	.22**

**Significant at the .01 level

Table 3 summarizes the qualitative analysis and statistical results shown in Table 2 and shows the aptitudes considered for inclusion in the SATB.

TABLE 3

Summary of Qualitative and Quantitative Data for Validation Sample

Type of Evidence	Aptitudes									
	G	V	N	S	P	Q	K	F	M	
Job Analysis Ratings Critical Important Irrelevant	X	X	X			X				
Statistical Evidence High Mean Low SD Significant r	X	X			X	X	X			
Aptitudes Considered for Inclusion in the Battery	G	V	N	S	P	Q		F	M	

The information in Table 3 indicates the following aptitudes should be considered for inclusion in the battery: G, V, N, S, P, Q, F and M. The objective is to develop a battery of 2, 3 or 4 aptitudes with cutting scores at the point (a) where about the same percent will meet the cutting scores as the percent rated in the high criterion group, and (b) which will maximize the relationship between the battery and the criterion.

The cutting scores are set at about one standard deviation below the mean aptitude scores of the sample, with deviations of five point intervals above and below these points to achieve the objectives stated above.

The following battery resulted:

<u>Aptitudes</u>	<u>Cutting Scores</u>
G - General Learning Ability	95
V - Verbal Aptitude	100
N - Numerical Aptitude	90

VALIDITY OF THE BATTERY

This section of the report first presents evidence of criterion-related validity of the SATB on the validation sample, all relevant subsamples and the cross-validation sample. Next, it provides information on effectiveness and fairness of test norms.

Criterion Related Validity

Table 4 shows that there is a significant relationship between the job performance criterion and the SATB for the validation sample, blacks, nonminorities, females, males, and the cross-validation sample.

TABLE 4
Validity of Battery

Sample	N	High Criterion Group		Low Criterion Group		Chi Square	Significance Level P/2<	Phi Coefficient
		Below Scores	Meeting Scores	Below Scores	Meeting Scores			
Total	201	33	98	35	35	12.54	.0005	.25
Black	48	9	16	14	9	2.97	.05	.25
Non-Minority	138	21	76	18	23	7.04	.005	.23
Male	109	15	55	20	19	10.24	.005	.31
Female	92	18	43	15	16	3.18	.05	.19
Cross-Validation Sample	55	7	30	10	8	5.99	.01	.33

As a further test of battery validity, analysts computed a multiple correlation coefficient for the total validation sample. An R of .37 (significant at the .01 level) was obtained between the job performance criterion and Aptitudes G, V, and N.

Effectiveness of the Battery

The level of validity shown in Table 4 indicates that the SATB will be useful in selection. In the total validation sample 65% were considered to be highly proficient. Of those who met the cutting scores, 74% were judged to be highly proficient, an increase of 9 percentage points over the existing selection method. Similar results were found for the cross-validation sample. These findings are shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Effectiveness of Battery

Selection System	Number Selected	Highly Proficient (High Criterion Group)		Marginal (Low Criterion Group)	
		N	% of Total	N	% of Total
Validation Sample Without Tests With Tests	201	131	65	70	35
	133	98	74	35	26
Cross Validation Sample Without Tests With Tests	55	37	67	18	33
	38	30	79	8	21

The research samples consisted of employed workers on whom some selection had already taken place; presumably those workers who lacked the required abilities had quit, been terminated, or had been transferred. Therefore, a greater increase over existing selection methods in the proportion of highly proficient workers selected is to be expected when the battery is used for selection, as the range of relevant abilities is almost certainly greater among applicants than among employed workers.

Subgroup Analysis

No difference in the validities for blacks and nonminorities was found for this battery; the difference between the phi coefficients for blacks and nonminorities is not statistically significant (CR = .14).

The battery is fair to blacks since the proportion of both blacks and nonminorities that met the cutting scores approximated the proportion who were in the high criterion group; 52% of the blacks met the cutting scores and 52% were in the high criterion group; 72% of the nonminorities met the cutting scores and 70% were in the high criterion group.

No difference in the validities for males and females was found for this battery; the difference between the phi coefficients for male and female subgroups was not statistically significant (CR = -.89).

The battery is fair to females since the percent of both females and males who met the cutting scores approximated the same percent in the high criterion group: 64% of the females met the cutting scores and 66% were in the high criterion group; 68% of the males met the cutting score and 64% were in the high criterion group. Descriptive statistics for these subgroups are shown in Appendixes 1 and 2.

Prior Battery

Analysts checked validity of the prior S-200 Ticket Agent norms on the validation sample. The original battery G-95 V-105 N-90 validated in September, 1962, demonstrated a statistically significant relationship with job proficiency, $\phi = .28$. However, the selected battery, which is identical to the prior battery except that aptitude V is five points lower, demonstrates more fairness to subgroups.

APPENDIX 1

Descriptive Statistics for Black and Nonminority Subgroups

Variable	Black (N = 48)			Nonminority (N = 138)		
	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	Range
Aptitude G	99.5	11.9	75-130	110.0	14.0	76-142
Aptitude V	103.1	11.9	78-129	108.6	13.2	80-143
Aptitude N	98.7	14.4	69-128	110.3	14.3	77-140
Aptitude S	100.0	15.6	61-147	108.5	18.8	65-153
Aptitude P	113.6	19.8	75-156	115.6	17.5	54-161
Aptitude Q	120.9	16.9	82-157	126.1	46.5	91-179
Aptitude K	118.4	13.1	91-148	116.2	16.3	60-159
Aptitude F	102.6	17.1	69-141	101.8	21.0	24-145
Aptitude M	105.5	17.7	66-165	113.4	22.8	43-197
Criterion	41.6	7.2	27- 57	45.2	7.4	25- 60
Age	29.9	6.1	21- 53	34.3	7.6	21- 62
Education	14.0	1.4	10- 17	13.1	1.2	12- 17
Total Experience (months)	61.5	59.5	6-300	96.9	73.4	6-354

APPENDIX 2

Descriptive Statistics for Male and Female
Sample

Variable	Female (N=92)			Male (N=109)		
	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	Range
Aptitude G	105.4	12.9	75-142	109.2	15.3	75-139
Aptitude V	108.3	12.5	80-143	106.0	13.8	78-141
Aptitude N	105.3	15.2	69-138	109.3	15.3	75-140
Aptitude S	102.6	16.9	61-137	110.0	18.7	65-153
Aptitude P	119.5	16.2	91-161	111.8	19.0	54-161
Aptitude Q	130.6	16.3	88-179	120.5	16.3	82-161
Aptitude K	121.3	15.4	86-159	113.1	14.6	60-151
Aptitude F	107.9	18.1	65-141	97.7	20.8	24-145
Aptitude M	110.6	20.1	52-154	111.8	23.8	43-197
Criterion	44.6	7.8	25- 60	44.1	7.4	27- 60
Age	30.7	6.6	21- 53	35.3	7.5	22- 62
Education	13.4	1.4	12- 17	13.3	1.3	10 -17
Total Experience (months)	71.5	67.8	6-354	101.5	72.6	6-325

APPENDIX 3

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR • MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

DESCRIPTIVE RATING SCALE

SCORE _____

RATING SCALE FOR _____

D.O.T. Title and Code

Directions: Please read the "Suggestions to Raters" and then fill in the items which follow. In making your ratings, only one box should be checked for each question.

SUGGESTIONS TO RATERS

We are asking you to rate the job performance of the people who work for you. These ratings will serve as a "yardstick" against which we can compare the test scores in this study. The ratings must give a true picture of each worker or this study will have very little value. You should try to give the most accurate ratings possible for each worker.

These ratings are strictly confidential and won't affect your workers in any way. Neither the ratings nor test scores of any workers will be shown to anybody in your company. We are interested only in "testing the tests." Ratings are needed only for those workers who are in the test study.

Workers who have not completed their training period, or who have not been on the job or under your supervision long enough for you to know how well they can perform this work should not be rated. Please inform the test technician about this if you are asked to rate any such workers.

Complete the last question only if the worker is no longer on the job.

In making ratings, don't let general impressions or some outstanding trait affect your judgment. Try to forget your personal feelings about the worker. Rate only on the work performed. Here are some more points which might help you:

1. Please read all directions and the rating scale thoroughly before rating.
2. For each question compare your workers with "workers-in-general" in this job. That is, compare your workers with other workers on this job that you have known. This is very important in small plants where there are only a few workers. We want the ratings to be based on the same standard in all the plants.
3. A suggested method is to rate all workers on one question at a time. The questions ask about different abilities of the workers. A worker may be good in one ability and poor in another; for example, a "very slow" worker may be accurate. So rate all workers on the first question, then rate all workers on the second question, and so on.
4. Practice and experience usually improve a worker's skill. However, one worker with six months' experience may be a better worker than another with six years' experience. Don't rate one worker as poorer than another merely because of a lesser amount of experience.
5. Rate the workers according to the work they have done over a period of several weeks or months. Don't rate just on the basis of one "good" day, or one "bad" day or some single incident. Think in terms of each worker's usual or typical performance.
6. Rate only the abilities listed on the rating sheet. Do not let factors such as cooperativeness, ability to get along with others, promptness and honesty influence your ratings. Although these aspects of a worker are important, they are of no value for this study as a "yardstick" against which to compare aptitude test scores.

NAME OF WORKER (Print)

(Last)

(First)

SEX: MALE _____ FEMALE _____

Company Job Title: _____

How often do you see this worker in a work situation?

- All the time.
- Several times a day.
- Several times a week.
- Seldom.

How long have you worked with this worker?

- Under one month.
- One to two months.
- Three to five months.
- Six months or more.

A. How much can this worker get done? (Worker's ability to make efficient use of time and to work at high speed.) (If it is possible to rate only the quantity of work which a person can do on this job as adequate or inadequate, use #2 to indicate "inadequate" and #4 to indicate "adequate.")

- 1. Capable of very low work output. Can perform only at an unsatisfactory pace.
- 2. Capable of low work output. Can perform at a slow pace.
- 3. Capable of fair work output. Can perform at an acceptable pace.
- 4. Capable of high work output. Can perform at a fast pace.
- 5. Capable of very high work output. Can perform at an unusually fast pace.

B. How good is the quality of work? (Worker's ability to do high-grade work which meets quality standards.)

- 1. Performance is inferior and almost never meets minimum quality standards.
- 2. Performance is usually acceptable but somewhat inferior in quality.
- 3. Performance is acceptable but usually not superior in quality.
- 4. Performance is usually superior in quality.
- 5. Performance is almost always of the highest quality.

C. How accurate is the work? (Worker's ability to avoid making mistakes.)

- 1. Makes very many mistakes. Work needs constant checking.
- 2. Makes frequent mistakes. Work needs more checking than is desirable.
- 3. Makes mistakes occasionally. Work needs only normal checking.
- 4. Makes few mistakes. Work seldom needs checking.
- 5. Rarely makes a mistake. Work almost never needs checking.

D. How much does the worker know about the job? (Worker's understanding of the principles, equipment, materials and methods that have to do directly or indirectly with the work.)

- 1. Has very limited knowledge. Does not know enough to do the job adequately.
- 2. Has little knowledge. Knows enough to get by.
- 3. Has moderate amount of knowledge. Knows enough to do fair work.
- 4. Has broad knowledge. Knows enough to do good work.
- 5. Has complete knowledge. Knows the job thoroughly.

E. How large a variety of job duties can the worker perform efficiently? (Worker's ability to handle several different operations.)

- 1. Cannot perform different operations adequately.
- 2. Can perform a limited number of different operations efficiently.
- 3. Can perform several different operations with reasonable efficiency.
- 4. Can perform many different operations efficiently.
- 5. Can perform an unusually large variety of different operations efficiently.

F. Considering all the factors already rated, and only these factors, how good is this worker? (Worker's all-around ability to do the job.)

- 1. Performance usually not acceptable.
- 2. Performance somewhat inferior.
- 3. A fairly proficient worker.
- 4. Performance usually superior.
- 5. An unusually competent worker.

Complete the following ONLY if the worker is no longer on the job.

G. What do you think is the reason this person left the job? (It is not necessary to show the official reason if you feel that there is another reason, as this form will not be shown to anybody in the company.)

- 1. Fired because of inability to do the job.
- 2. Quit, and I feel that it was because of difficulty doing the job.
- 3. Fired or laid off for reasons other than ability to do the job (i.e., absenteeism, reduction in force).
- 4. Quit, and I feel the reason for quitting was not related to ability to do the job.
- 5. Quit or was promoted or reassigned because the worker had learned the job well and wanted to advance.

RATED BY	TITLE	DATE
COMPANY OR ORGANIZATION	LOCATION (City, State, ZIP Code)	

APPENDIX 4
JOB DESCRIPTION

Job Title

S-200R82

Ticket Agent (any ind.) 238:367-026

Guide for Occupational Exploration (GOE) Code 07.03.01 Paying and Receiving

Job Summary

Provides customer services at the check-in counter of airline terminals; answers inquiries regarding schedules, routes, services and accommodations available; reserves space, and sells tickets for scheduled trips, and checks in passengers for flight.

Work Performed

*Gives passenger information and makes reservations for available space: Receives requests for reservations by telephone or in person. Answers inquiries regarding scheduled flights such as departure and arrival times, fares, itineraries, baggage allowances and restrictions, and check-in requirements. Refers to Tariff Schedules, Official Airline Guide, Traffic and Sales Manual, Operations Manual and Standard Interline Passenger Procedures whenever needed for necessary information. Records name, telephone number and destination on reservation space chart. When space is not available, enters passenger's name on waiting list. Notifies all stations by teletype when a flight has been completely reserved. Requests space on other airlines when necessary, using teletype and standard codes and abbreviations. Notifies passengers of final confirmation.

*Sells airline tickets, receives payment and makes change: Questions passenger to determine needs for purchasing a ticket for a flight. Checks reservation records to determine available space. May refer to Tariff for information concerning routing and fares. Prepares ticket by recording passenger's name, flight numbers, fare and tax, destination, and departure and arrival times. Receives payment and makes change or issues form for credit card use. Records such information as ticket number, itinerary, fare and tax; obtains passenger's signature on the form when a ticket is issued on wire or exchange order from another airline or on a government order. Records space sold on control chart.

Checks in passengers for flight: Checks passenger's ticket against listing, pulls flight coupon from ticket and records destination on flight manifest. Weighs and tags baggage, entering weight and number of pieces on flight manifest. Staples baggage claim check to ticket envelope, inserts ticket in envelope, marks flight number and destination on envelope and hands to passenger. Gives passenger any pertinent information such as expected delay in flight, or need for confirmation of continuing space.

Performs incidental duties: Opens safe; checks and distributes cash; prepares ticket report; prepares no-show report (a list of names and ticket

numbers of passengers failing to appear); marks flight changes and announces plane arrivals and departures.

*These job duties were designated as critical job duties because they must be performed competently if the job is to be performed in a satisfactory manner. Ticket Agents spend 50% to 98% of their time performing these duties.

20

