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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. THE RELATION OF THE SALARY SCHEDULE TO QUALITY EDUCATION

The goal of American education today is quality education, a system of education wherein every student has the opportunity, regardless of racial, national, religious, cultural, or economic background to reach his optimum in intellectual, moral, social, and physical development.

Quality education depends upon qualified teachers. In this pursuit of quality education, one of the gravest problems facing the school administrator today is that of staffing the schools with an adequate complement of teachers of high quality. Salary is a consideration which is closely related to quality staffing. It becomes the problem of the school administration to schedule salaries which, at the minimum, are sufficient to attract talented and intellectually able young people into the profession and, at the maximum, sufficiently adequate to retain teachers in the profession on a career basis. A successful salary schedule attracts and helps to retain competent persons and reduces teacher-turnover. Salary scheduling, thus, is a high priority consideration in the recruitment and retention of quality teachers.

Quality education depends, too, upon staff morale. Morale is inextricably bound to salary which makes the problem of salary one of the most complex in the whole personnel field. A teacher is influenced, not only by the value placed upon his services by his placement on a salary schedule, but upon the placement
of his co-workers on the same schedule.

Quality education depends, too, upon increasing the quality of teachers in service. The quality of teaching service is related to salary scheduling. A salary schedule should be so designed as to encourage good teachers to become better teachers, to stimulate teachers to professional growth, and to encourage teachers to increase their value to a school system. A salary schedule, if it is effective, can improve the quality of teaching service and be almost unsurpassed for maintaining a staff on a high level of competence.

The extent to which a salary policy advances quality education, through recruiting and retaining qualified teachers, through maintaining a staff on a high level of morale, and through increasing the competence of teachers in service depends, to a great extent, upon the base or bases used to determine teachers' salaries. At present the bases used most commonly to determine teachers' salaries are years of experience and levels of preparation. However, the commonness of these bases for determining teachers' salaries does not necessarily mean that they advance quality education.

B. Formulating a Salary Schedule

The problem of salary scheduling and its influence upon quality education is one which must be considered annually by boards of education at the time budgets are adopted since the legal life of a salary schedule is but one year, although a schedule should be an expression of a continuing viewpoint on education.

Building a salary schedule requires prudent planning of expenditures for salaries. With growing pupil enrollments, education requires more and more
dollars for additional school staff, for additional school construction, and for additional materials of instruction. There never seems to be sufficient money to accomplish all that needs to be done. Those dollars that are expended for teachers' salaries have to be spent prudently in order to get the greatest value from them.

Building a salary schedule involves intricate technical problems. Among these are the following: selecting the bases or criteria which shall be used to determine salary, dividing the schedule into classes, setting maximum and minimum salaries for each salary class, establishing increments and predicking conditions for them, evaluating each teacher's credentials for the purpose of proper placement on the salary schedule, and securing sufficient revenue to guarantee the schedule. In addition, in building a salary schedule, attention must be given to the attitudes and viewpoints of the tax-paying public, the members of the board of education, the superintendent, and members of the school staff, as well as legal requirements of state statutes and local rules of boards of education and professional and ethical obligations.

Building a salary schedule also involves major questions of policy. Each time a budget is adopted, boards of education, superintendents, and other involved school personnel must analyze their policies and philosophies in an attempt to answer the following unresolved issues:

1. Should there be different salary schedules for elementary school teachers and for secondary school teachers?
2. Should recognition be given for differing levels of preparation?
3. Should recognition be given for experience?
4. Should increments be automatic or conditional?
(5) Should recognition be given for different degrees of efficiency?
(6) Should men and women be paid the same salaries?
(7) Should allowances be given for the support of dependents?
(8) Should there be extra pay for extra duties?

C. The Problem

These unresolved issues reduce to the question, "What bases should be used to determine teachers' salary schedules?" This question is the problem under investigation. This study, which will be limited to elementary and secondary school personnel, will be directed toward the purpose of making recommendations upon which future decisions, in terms of the policy considerations mentioned above, might be based. These recommendations will involve the inclusion or exclusion of the following provisions in the salary schedule to be adopted: 1) a single salary schedule for elementary and secondary teachers; 2) increments for study and preparation beyond that required for certification; 3) increments for experience; 4) automatic or conditional increments; 5) increments for degrees of teaching efficiency; 6) sex differentials; 7) dependency allowances; 8) extra pay for extra duties.

D. Definition of Terms

Throughout this study the following terms will be used and in accord with the definitions given below:

AUTOMATIC INCREMENTS: increases in salary granted unconditionally

BUDGET: a financial plan for a school district for a period of time, usually one year
CERTIFIED: permitted legally to function as a teacher, certain required conditions having been met

CLASS: a horizontal division on a salary schedule (synonymous with Lane)

CONTRACT: an agreement between a legally qualified teacher and a board of education for services to be rendered

EXTENDED-SERVICE MAXIMUMS: advanced placement on a salary schedule because of unusual longevity

INCREMENT: a specific and expected increase in salary

LANE: horizontal division on a salary schedule; a classification for a particular level of preparation

MERIT SCHEDULES: salary schedules in which placement depends upon an evaluation of a teacher's efficiency

MAXIMUM: highest possible salary on any particular schedule

MINIMUM: lowest possible salary on any particular schedule

POSITION SCHEDULES: schedules in which basic groups are established in terms of the level of the teaching position

PREPARATION SCHEDULES: schedules in which basic groups are established in terms of the amount of professional training which the teacher has completed

PROBATIONARY STATUS: the condition of a teacher during an initial period of employment, a time in which his services are carefully evaluated before a grant of tenure; length varies, usually, from one year to five years

SALARY SCHEDULE: a written, detailed statement by a board of education, indicating all salaries available to teachers and the
conditions necessary to attain each salary

SINGLE SALARY SCHEDULE: a salary schedule whereby teachers are paid salaries which are independent of the level (elementary, secondary) at which they teach

STEPS: vertical progressions on a salary schedule

TEACHER'S EFFICIENCY: an estimate or evaluation of the services of a teacher

TENURE: the state of employment which is permanent to the degree that dismissal can take place only for serious cause, proven through a regular procedure, usually a public trial.

E. The Procedure

Present salary schedules can be better understood if viewed in terms of their evolution. Teachers' salaries have always been a problem, both for the teachers and for those who have had to pay them. To understand the elements present in today's schedules, it is helpful to know how they developed. An historical study, thus, will be undertaken first and presented in Chapter II.

Present salary schedules can be better understood, also, if viewed in relation to other salary schedules, schedules which determine the salaries paid to persons engaged in commercial and industrial occupations and in other professions. Such a comparison will be made and presented in Chapter III.

Present salary schedules are determined not alone by philosophical principles, but by economic and legal considerations as well. The limitations of financial resources and the legal restrictions of federal and state statutes and rules of local boards of education will be discussed in Chapter IV.

However, the foundation of a salary schedule is the policy decision
regarding the base or bases which shall be used to determine the salary schedule. To try to determine the soundest bases for a schedule, several steps will be taken.

First, salary data from school systems of varying sizes will be examined for the school year 1961-62. The school districts will be divided into three groups on the basis of population.

Group I - Districts 500,000 and over in population.
Group II - Districts 100,000 - 499,999 in population.
Group III - Districts 30,000 - 99,999 in population.

Group I includes 26 districts. Group II includes 147 districts. Group III includes 59 districts. Data from all the districts in each group will be reviewed.

Second, professional views regarding the bases for teachers' salary schedules will be solicited from those who, by virtue of their positions, should be best qualified to make an intelligent judgment. Consequently, questionnaires will be used to obtain opinions from members of boards of education, school superintendents, principals, and teachers.

Through the use of a questionnaire, opinions regarding the salary schedules which they administer will be requested from fifty superintendents selected as follows:

Group I - ten
Group II - thirty
Group III - ten
Group I would include:

Atlanta, Georgia
Boston, Massachusetts
Chicago, Illinois
Dade County, Florida (P.O., Miami)
Dallas, Texas
Denver, Colorado
Orleans Parish, La. (P.O., New Orleans)
San Francisco, California
Seattle, Washington
Washington, D.C.

Group II would include:

Albuquerque, New Mexico
Baltimore, Maryland
Birmingham, Alabama
Charlotte, N.Carolina
Columbia, S. Carolina
Des Moines, Iowa
El Paso, Texas
Erie, Pennsylvania
Flint, Michigan
Hartford, Connecticut
Honolulu, Hawaii
Indianapolis, Indiana
Jacksonville, Florida
Kansas City, Kansas
Las Vegas, Nevada
Louisville, Kentucky
Nashville, Tennessee
Newark, New Jersey
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
Pasadena, California
Portland, Oregon
Providence, Rhode Island
Rochester, New York
Rockford, Illinois
Sacramento, California
Savannah, Georgia
Spokane, Washington
St. Paul, Minnesota
Tucson, Arizona
Wichita, Kansas
Worcester, Massachusetts

Group III would include:

Brookline, Massachusetts
Fond du Lac, Wisconsin
Gulfport, Mississippi
Harlingen, Texas
Highline School District, Washington (P.O., Seattle)
Ithaca, New York
Monterey, California
Riverside-Brookfield Township High School District, Ill. (P.O., Riverside)
Rock Hill, South Carolina
St. Cloud, Minnesota

Board members will be questioned through a questionnaire regarding their opinions on single salary schedules, merit schedules, sex differentials, family allowances, extra pay for extra duties, increments for additional study, and whether increments should be automatic or conditional. Board members in ten school districts from Groups I, II, and III, with varying kinds of salary schedules, will be polled.

One hundred elementary and secondary principals will be asked to complete a questionnaire intended to reveal their views regarding teachers' salaries and the bases that should be used to determine them. The selection will be as indicated below. The sampling will be random.

Chicago - fifty - single salary schedule
Jacksonville, Fla. - twenty - merit rating
Trenton, N.J. - ten-units of approved study
Columbia, S.C. - ten - scores on N.T.E.
Pasadena, Calif. - ten - extended service maximums

Teachers will be asked to complete a questionnaire to reveal their views regarding salary scheduling for teachers. School districts with varying kinds of salary schedules will be selected. At least three districts will be chosen. Five schools in each district will be selected by random sampling, and all of the teachers in each of these schools will be asked to complete the
questionnaire. Elementary and secondary schools will be included.

The professional viewpoints of the board members, superintendents, principals, and teachers who respond to the questionnaires will be presented in Chapter V.

From all of the foregoing material, an appraisal will be made of present views and practices. The merits and demerits of the various elements possible in salary scheduling will be discussed. Based on these, recommendations will be made regarding the bases for teachers' salary schedules. This will be the substance of Chapter VI.

F. Limitations

This study has the same limitations that any similar study has in that limited sampling will be employed with regard to the distribution of questionnaires. Much effort will be expended, however, to make the sampling representative with regard to size of school districts, geographic location, and type of salary schedule in the polling of board members, superintendents, principals, and teachers.
CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

To understand the present bases for teachers' salaries, it is helpful to examine the evolution of teachers' salary schedules in the United States. A relationship between the status of the teacher and the salary paid to him can be found in every period of our national development. The threads which have become merit rating, a single salary schedule, extra pay for extra duties, etc. can be traced through the weave of our national history.

A. Early Practices

1. The Early Colonial Period

In the early colonial period, the status of the teacher was extremely low. While some differences existed among the colonies, in all, the New England Colonies, the Middle Colonies, and the Southern Colonies, according to histories of the period, the lot of the teacher was a very trying one. Teaching was not regarded as a profession in itself. The person who contracted to teach usually had to agree to assist in other capacities. The combination of teaching and allied duties determined the salary of the teacher. A few votes of New England towns, as reported in Cubberley,¹ will serve to illustrate this practice:

Newberry, in 1693, voted, "that Mr. John Clarke be called to assist in the work of the ministry at the west end of the town, ...and also to keep a grammar school."

In 1718, Lynn instructed the selectmen to employ a school-master and to make an agreement with him that should "have relation to some help for Mr. Shepard in preaching."

Rowley, in 1726, voted the schoolmaster "one pound for preaching on the Sabbath day."

Bradford, in 1729, voted to hire as school-teacher one "who could also be helpful in the ministry as occasion required."  

Other combinations, other than teaching and the ministry, are revealed by the following comment from Cubberley, who states, "The local farmer who taught school in the winter for a small sum, and the transient teacher who 'kept school' for a small sum and board, later became common in New England. In Providence, the first schoolmaster kept a public house, in Milton a shoemaker also taught, at Woburn the town clerk also taught, etc."  

In the Middle Colonies, the professional status and, consequently, the salary of the teacher were no higher than that in the New England Colonies. There, too, the teacher was expected to render other services, such as those of preacher, chorister, bell-ringer, sexton, and janitor. The following agreement, made in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, in 1747, will serve to illustrate. "I, the undersigned John Hoffman, parochial teacher of the church at Lancaster, have promised, in the presence of the congregation, to serve as chorister, and as long as we have no pastor, to read sermons on Sunday. In summer I promise

---

2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid., p. 53.
to hold catechetical instruction with the young, as becomes a faithful teacher, and also to lead them in singing, and to attend to the clock. ⁵ This was certainly a contract and a salary tied to extra duties. And, with all of this, the pay was usually small and not easy to collect. ⁶

In the private adventure schools of the Middle and Southern Colonies and in the charity schools could be found the least qualified and most poorly paid teachers. ⁷ Many of these teachers were itinerant teachers. ⁸ Others were really indentured servants. ⁹ They not only did not receive a salary for their teaching, but were sold for a certain number of years of labor, usually four or five, to pay for their passage, as indicated by Cubberley:

Once in a while a planter would start a little school for the benefit of his own children and the other white children who chanced to live near or on his plantation. The teachers of such plantation schools were apt to be redemptioners and exported convicts. In Europe at this time the lot of the poor was extremely hard, and many persons came across the Atlantic solely to escape the misery at home. The captain of the ship that brought over a penniless man of this class was allowed to sell him for four years to pay his passage. It was also customary to transport men who had been convicted of small crimes and sell them for periods of greater or lesser length. When one of these unfortunates could read and write, he sometimes was purchased for a schoolmaster, and teachers of this kind were common in both Southern and Middle Colonies. ¹⁰

"Other servants of this type were sold directly to those wanting them by the

⁵Ibid.
⁶Ibid.
⁷Ibid., p. 54.
⁸Ibid.
⁹Ibid.
¹⁰Cubberley, p. 54, citing Johnson, Old Time Schools and Schoolbooks, p. 32.
ship captains, who brought them over."\(^{11}\) "When a ship arrives in the River," wrote an English missionary preacher at Newcastle, Delaware, in 1727, 'it is a common expression with those who stand in need of an Instructor for their children - Let us go and buy a School-Master.'\(^{12}\)

Cubberley reports another curious method of payment known as boarding 'round'.\(^{13}\) This must certainly have been a scheme which was less than satisfactory for all concerned. It was a method of compensating teachers without the use of public money. The teacher stayed with the families of the children he taught. His teaching services alone did not entitle him to his keep, however, because he was also expected to help with the household chores. This was a practice which was common until the middle 1800's.\(^{14}\) The stay of the teacher with a family was determined by the number of children the family had in school. Salary was thus scheduled according to the number of children in a family who were taught.

Where wages were paid, there seems to be little uniformity among the colonies paying them. In the New England towns, twenty pounds seems to be the most common salary.\(^{15}\) Boston seemed to have the highest salary rate and became the goal of ambitious teachers, according to Elsbree:

---

\(^{11}\)Cubberley, p. 54.

\(^{12}\)Ibid.

\(^{13}\)Ibid., p. 325.

\(^{14}\)Ibid.

Ezekial Cheever was receiving sixty pounds per annum there in 1693 and his grandson, who assisted him, was paid forty pounds in 1699. Salaries rose gradually in Boston during the eighteenth century and in 1758 the sum of one hundred and twenty pounds was allowed for the yearly compensation of a schoolmaster and his assistant. Since the assistant, commonly known as usher, received anywhere from thirty-five to fifty pounds of this amount as his share, the regular salary of the master was at least seventy pounds.  

In the colonial period, according to Elsbree, while there were no carefully defined schedules for salary, had there been any, they would probably have been position schedules because, he states:

Grammar-school masters were usually better paid than writing-school masters, although the policy regarding this matter was never clearly defined. Whether the public considered the task of teaching the higher branches more difficult, calling for both greater ability and greater effort on the part of teachers, or whether the salary differential favoring grammar school masters arose out of other considerations cannot be finally answered here. In all probability the colonists accepted the practice common in the Old Country without inquiring seriously into the merits of the case. 

2. The Later Colonial Period

In the later colonial period, private schools, open to anyone who could pay the tuition, appeared. Financially, the teacher was usually better off in one of these schools because of the tuition. Collecting the fees, however, was a problem. It was a generally accepted practice to collect fees in advance. If a teacher failed to enforce this rule, he stood in danger of not receiving the fee. Good reports regarding "one man who gave as the reason for strict

17 Elsbree, pp. 86-87.
enforcement of the prepayment rule that he had been committed to debtor's prison because previous pupils neglected to pay their fees.\(^{19}\)

The masters in some of the publicly-supported schools also came in time to supplement their public income by tutoring after regular school hours in their homes.\(^{20}\)

The salary of a teacher or the tuition due him was not always in the form of currency since currency was very scarce in the colonies and goods and services became the medium of exchange.\(^{21}\) According to Elsbree, "Prior to 1700, the most widely used mediums of exchange in New England were beaver skins and 'country pay'. The latter consisted of agricultural products and livestock."\(^{22}\) Sometimes schoolmasters were paid partly in money and partly in some commodity.\(^{23}\) Fluctuations in the values of the commodities received frequently worked hardships for the teachers concerned.

Another item of importance in the consideration of teachers' salaries in the colonial period is the fact that teachers were exempt from taxation in some of the colonies.\(^{24}\) Since exemptions can be considered the equivalent of income, the salary paid was not always a true indication of the measure of compensation of a teacher. Tax exemptions were by no means universal,

\(^{19}\) Good, citing Seybolt, The Private School.

\(^{20}\) Cubberley, p. 64.

\(^{21}\) Elsbree, p. 97.

\(^{22}\) Ibid.

\(^{23}\) Ibid.

\(^{24}\) Ibid., p. 102.
3. The Post-Colonial Period

Since education was left to the states as an unmentioned power by the tenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, it is necessary to look to the state constitutions to gain information regarding education and, more particularly, provisions for remuneration for teachers in the post-colonial period:

Vermont, in its first constitution (1777), directed the establishment of schools in each town "with such salaries to the masters, paid by the town" as would "enable them to instruct youth at low prices."\textsuperscript{26}

North Carolina, in its constitutions of the preceding year, had inserted a similar provision for low-priced instruction.\textsuperscript{27}

Pennsylvania, in its constitution of 1776, directed the establishment of a school in each county "with such salaries to the masters, paid by the public, as may enable them to instruct youth at low prices."\textsuperscript{28}

Next to be examined are early state laws regarding education. There were no laws regarding payment for teachers. However, some of the states did enact good school laws. These, of necessity, would have improved the lot of the teacher. Following are some significant provisions from some of the states' legislation. The citations were found in Cubberley.\textsuperscript{29}

Vermont, in its school law of 1827, required certificates of teachers. It can be expected that with a raise in the standards for teachers there was a subsequent rise in remuneration. State aid was also granted to school

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., p. 103. \textsuperscript{26} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{26} Cubberley, p. 96. \textsuperscript{28} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid. \textsuperscript{29} Ibid., p. 98.
The New Hampshire School law of 1789 set rates for town taxes for schools and also required certificates for teachers.

Massachusetts, in its general school law of 1789, required that "all teachers be certificated, and that all grammar school teachers be college graduates or certificated by the minister as skilled in Latin."\(^{30}\)

Even though some inroads were being made to improve the status of public education and, consequently, the lot of the teacher, the professional or financial position of the teacher after the Revolutionary War did not differ too greatly from that of the teacher in the later colonial period. Teachers still received meager salaries which had to be supplemented in many ways.

Education, in spite of the vocal support given to it by statesmen of the early republic, was considered secondary in importance to the business of political reorganization, the expansion of American trade, and the improvement of agriculture.

B. 1810 - 1865

The situation did not improve too greatly immediately thereafter, but many steps which were to improve the status of the teacher considerably were underway. Such reforms as normal schools, teachers' institutes, state and county supervision, improved certification, and the extension of the school program were all to add to the status of the teacher and to improve his financial position.

\(^{30}\) Ibid.
The Lancastrian system (1815-1840) was valuable in paving the way for public support of education.\(^{31}\) The Lancastrian system provided an economical means of educating large groups of students. It increased and expanded interest in education. It accustomed the people to schools and to contribute something toward their support. Once accustomed to the practice they continued it, even though with the breakdown of the Lancastrian system, education became more expensive.

In 1810 and thereafter, full male suffrage in the states came to be more common.\(^{32}\) With the extension of suffrage came the realization that education was important for more than just the few - the wealthy and those who were to be trained for the ministry. With this awakening came added willingness for support for the schools.

From 1845 to 1858, teachers salaries rose steadily.\(^{33}\) Certain iniquities existed, however, in that "City teachers received anywhere from two to three times as much salary as that paid to rural teachers...women fared badly in comparison with men, the disparity between the salaries of city men and women teachers being noticeably greater than that prevailing in rural districts."\(^{34}\)

Good reports the findings of Horace Mann in his Eleventh Report, regarding the teachers' salaries of the times:

---

\(^{31}\)Ibid., p. 136.

\(^{32}\)Ibid., p. 153.

\(^{33}\)Elsbree, p. 273.

\(^{34}\)Ibid.
TABLE I

TEACHERS MONTHLY WAGES EXCLUSIVE OF BOARD, ABOUT 1847

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>$24.51</td>
<td>$8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>10.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td>8.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>4.75$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Good, p. 159, citing Mann's Eleventh Report

The disparity in salaries between men and women teachers provoked considerable discussion and agitation and appeared several times in the resolutions of teachers' associations and institutes. Despite the theoretical justifications for equal pay, which were more usually conceded than not, practice was not significantly influenced by them and women continued to suffer discrimination because of their sex, in all states, until the equal-pay laws of the present century were passed.35

A significant development of this period was the establishment in the Boston teachers' salary schedule of..."financial incentives in the form of stipulated annual increments to be given with each year of experience in the school system up to the established maximum. While the practice was not generally followed in cities before 1860, the principle adopted by the Boston school committee was destined to become the model for many school systems in a later period."36

---

35Flisbree, p. 275.

36Ibid., p. 279.
While position-type schedules were the order of the day, the single-salary schedule idea was advocated in a few quarters but nothing was done about it. The chairman of the school committee in Manchester, New Hampshire, in his discussion of salaries in the annual school report (1858) is quoted in Elsbree as follows:

While I believe a faithful Primary school teacher is required to do the most work in her school room, and should really be the best teacher, she will not naturally expect so large a salary as one who is engaged in a Grammar or High school. While $250, except in the case of especial merit, should be the highest salary for instruction in Primary or Middle Schools, an additional sum of $25 or $50 will be demanded for good Grammar School assistants and a corresponding increase for assistants in the High School.  

And merit-rating was not without its advocates, even at that time. The Indiana state superintendent in the Indiana School Report, 1866, proposed that:

So far as practicable, the teacher's pay should grade according to ability, not of necessity, according to the grade of examiner's certificate. Certificates are issued chiefly upon scholarship; but scholarship is not all that enters into the account in estimating the ability of a teacher. Ability to instruct, to discipline, to inspire with a love of learning; in short, all that goes to make a successful educator should enter into the account, hence so far as practicable, the pay should grade accordingly.

This position has been a controversial issue to the present time.

There was also discussion at this time of dependency allowances. The following is quoted from the Philadelphia School Report, 1864:


38 Elsbree, pp. 283-284, citing Indiana School Report, 1866, p. 80
"...true...standard of compensation should be the value of the service rendered...if compensation is to be measured by home demands, or by the extent of a man's family, we must adopt a sliding scale...must be increased for every addition to his family and diminished for every death."39

The financial position of teachers became stronger and more stable in the period immediately preceding the Civil War. The position of the teacher was more favored than it had been in any period heretofore. However, greater progress in this respect had been made in the city than in rural areas. Too, greater progress had been made with regard to male teachers' salaries than had been made in the improvement of a living wage for women.

Clearly defined salary schedules were not present during this period, except in some cities where uniform systems of payment might be found. In some cases, additional compensation was available for increased training and experience.40 Differentials between the sexes in matters of payment could still be found. Individual bargaining was still the most widespread method of determining the compensation a teacher would receive.41 However, the position of the teacher was gaining in strength due to the better preparation of the teacher as a result of the establishment of normal schools.

C. 1865 - 1890

During this period, teachers' wages increased gradually. And the difference between male and female salaries decreased gradually since women

39 Albree, p. 283, citing Philadelphia School Report, 1864, p. 29
40 Ibid., p. 287
41 Ibid.
made greater gains in salary increases during this period than men.\textsuperscript{42}

Improvement in the teacher's financial position was due to several factors. "Teachers were better organized and more vocal in 1890 than in 1865; the demand for teachers was also greater during the latter part of the century, due to extension of public education upward to include the high-school years; and, finally, the qualifications of teachers commanded greater respect, because they were substantially higher in 1890 than at the beginning of this period, despite the fact that many teachers were still without any special preparation for their work.\textsuperscript{43}

Teaching had still not attained its proper status since the salary awarded was far below that of a professional worker.

D. 1890 - 1935

After 1890 the economic position of the teacher advanced considerably in spite of the setbacks caused by the World War and the depression of the 1930's.\textsuperscript{44} More time and effort on the part of more interested parties and organizations was devoted to the problem of teachers' salaries than at any preceding period in American history. By the second decade of the twentieth century, salary scheduling was progressing from a crude state to one of carefully defined policies and procedures.

Through the efforts of educational statesmen, certain features of salary

\textsuperscript{42}ibid., p. 431

\textsuperscript{43}ibid., p. 433.

\textsuperscript{44}ibid., p. 439.
scheduling were revealed which were destined to become a pattern for future years. Dyke, in one of the earliest comprehensive studies of teachers' salaries in America, listed the provisions for the cities which he deemed to have the best schedules in 1898. "For most of the positions included in these schedules a minimum salary was indicated and for at least half of them an annual increment was stipulated. A stated maximum appears to have been common to all the schedules, varying in amount with size of city and position held. The number of annual increments for classroom teachers ranged from three to sixteen, the average being approximately six in the high school and seven in the primary and grammar schools."

Dyke's contribution to the advancement of the status of the teacher was considerable, because his study of teachers' salaries was the most comprehensive that had been made up until that time. "Not only did he make a clear exposition of the economic theory of teachers' salaries, but he explained the reasons why they were low, citing tradition, sentiment, public ignorance, public indifference, inefficiency of teachers, and the sex of teachers as the chief causes of the lowly state of the profession."

Even more important to the advancement of the cause of the teacher than

---

15 Ibid., p. 440.
17 Elsbree, p. 440.
18 Ibid., p. 441.
19 Ibid.
the few outstanding educational leaders who were particularly vocal, was the leadership exercised by professional associations after the turn of the century. 50

"In 1903, the National Education Association appointed a committee to 'inquire into and report upon salaries, tenure of office, and pension provisions of teachers in the public schools of the United States'."51

"In 1913, under the direction of Professor Robert C. Brooks of Swarthmore College, the National Education Association made another report on salaries, devoting the major portion of the study to facts bearing on cost of living. This helped to focus the attention of teachers and boards of education upon the relationship of salaries to the professional and economic needs of teachers..."52

The next study of teachers' salaries was made in 1918.53 It was titled Teachers' Salaries and Cost of Living and was prepared by a committee of the National Education Association.54 "The cost of living had risen rapidly during the war period and teachers' salaries had lagged behind...The sympathies of the committee toward the efforts, if not the methods, of teachers' unions in securing more equitable salary arrangements is indicative of the feeling of injustice which prevailed..."55

In 1919, Professor E. S. Fwenden made a comprehensive study, Teachers' Salaries and Cost of Living..."56

50 Ibid. 51 Ibid., p. 442. 52 Ibid. 53 Ibid. 54 Ibid. 55 Ibid. 56 Ibid.
Salaries and Salary Schedules in the United States, 1918-1919. Elsbree rates Evenden's study very highly:

"Evenden evolved, from his study of best practice and from his own thinking about possible procedures, a rather definite plan of setting up and operating a salary schedule. There had been no clear philosophy underlying most salary schedules heretofore and no reasonable defense for practice... Evenden provided a rational explanation for his proposals. He urged the adoption of the single-salary schedule and suggested specific standards for the administration of schedules. His recommendations carried great weight in the many debates of salary issues engaged in by teachers and school boards during the next decade." 57

A follow-up study was the National Education Association Salary Committee study, Teachers' Salaries and Salary Trends in 1923. 58

This bulletin contained comparative information on salaries of school employees in cities of various sizes, data on cost-of-living trends, salary schedule provisions, and a chapter on 'Principles and Standards in the Making and Administration of Teachers' Salary Schedules'. One of the interesting disclosures of this report was the number of communities operating single-salary schedules. Whereas in 1918-1919 there were no salary scales embodying all the principles which are ordinarily understood to be included in a single-salary schedule, in 1923, 15½ or 16 per cent of all American cities were operating schedules of this type.

According to the findings of this study, 57 per cent or 538 of the cities reporting rated the quality of the teaching service, but in most instances the ratings did not affect salaries directly......... Among the recommendations of the committee was the one which played a very important part in salary scheduling and which in recent years has proved to be ill adapted to the current situation. It was laid down as a sound principle that the annual salary increment should approximate 10 per cent of the salary. Thus, if a teacher's minimum wage were $1500 a year, the increment would be $150, whereas if it were only $900, it would be correspondingly reduced to $90. In 1923 a 10 per cent increment was considered conservative since, in the words of the committee, "it stands not only for interest upon his investment in training but also for the increased earning power

56 Ibid., p. 143.
57 Ibid.
58 Ibid., p. 143.
resulting from successful experience'.59

From 1923 until the present, the National Education Association, and particularly its Salary Committee, has been a leader in the study of teachers' salaries.60 Biennial comprehensive studies of teachers' salaries in all communities with populations in excess of 30,000 are published. Detailed information is provided with regard to minimum and maximum salaries, increments, increment conditions, special salary features, and salary patterns.

"In 1935 a committee, of which E. R. Buckingham was chairman, submitted a report which was issued as a Research Bulletin of the Association on The Teacher's Economic Position. This report has been used as a source of reference by nearly every local salary committee in America and is looked upon as an authoritative document by members of the profession."61

Toward the latter part of this period, some of the gains which had been made at the turn of the century and shortly thereafter were lost due to the financial state of all parts of the country during the economic depression of the 1930's.

Teachers' salaries were reduced everywhere and by as much as 25 to 50 per cent. Many were paid in scrip and since teachers have to live from day to day, the scrip was usually cashed at a discount. This amounted to a further cut in salary. Many teachers were unpaid or were paid in part only. Chicago in 1934 obtained a loan of $22,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to pay back salaries; and for the first time in more than three years the teachers of Chicago were paid in full. Three years later the

60. Elsbree, p. 445.
61. Ibid.
board was again without funds. The case of the second largest city was not unique.

F. Recent Trends

Since 1935 teachers' salaries have risen consistently and significantly. This is due, in part, to the fact that the economy of the nation has improved consistently since then. It is also due to the fact that since 1941 and the United States entry into the War there has been a teacher shortage which has become more acute each year. Teachers' salaries are related to the law of supply and demand. The improved financial position of the teacher is due, too, to the efforts of organized groups of teachers such as the Classroom Teachers' Division of the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, and state and local teachers' associations. Attention has been given at all levels and by all groups directly concerned with the matter of teachers' salaries to sound principles of salary scheduling. Individual bargaining is a thing of the past. Sound principles of salary scheduling have improved teachers' salaries. Schedule makers collect data on cost-of-living and use these statistics as an aid in preparing schedules. Comparative studies are made of the salaries paid to persons in other vocations requiring similar training and experience. Studies are made, too, of the salaries paid to teachers in other communities.

The improved financial position of the teacher and the changes in the basic character of salary scheduling have resulted in the following kinds of salary structures or salary provisions in recent years.

---

62 Good, p. 513
1. The Single Salary Schedule

The greatest change in the development of salary scheduling over the years has been the change from position type schedules to preparation type schedules. "As recently as 1919-20 the custom everywhere in the United States was to pay higher salaries to high-school teachers than to elementary-school teachers. By 1920-21 at least two school systems - Denver and Des Moines - had adopted single salary schedules."63 So complete has been this change that by 1951-55 "98 per cent of city salary schedules were of the single salary variety."64

2. Merit Rating Schedules

"Since 1938-39, the NFA Research Division has kept a record of large urban school districts having salary provisions for superior-service maximums."65 At one time a considerable number of schedules included provisions for higher salaries for superior teaching. "In 1938-39, 20.4 per cent of the schedules of the large urban school districts examined provided superior-service maximums. By 1952-53, this had fallen to a low of 4.0 per cent. From 1952-53 to 1958-59 the per cent increased to 6.2."66 In 1961-62, 5.8 per cent of the school districts of 30,000 - 499,999 in population had quality

---

63 Ibid.
66 Ibid.
There were no such provisions in school districts of over 500,000 in population, 2.8 per cent in school systems of 100,000 - 99,999, and 6.5 per cent in school systems 20,000-99,999 in population. The national trend over the years has been that the number of school systems with merit provisions is inversely proportional to the size of the districts.

It is evident that there has been a substantial drop in provisions for superior-service maximums in the salary schedules of large school districts from 1939 to about 1953, and of a slight upturn since:

The salary schedules for 1957-58 and 1958-59 revealed a high turnover in school districts providing superior-service maximums. Of the urban school districts that in 1957-58 reported superior-service maximums, about 27 per cent sent a schedule to the NEA in 1958-59 from which the provision had been dropped. Only 57 per cent of the districts sent a schedule in which the provision was retained. It is regrettable that 1958-59 salary schedules from 17 per cent of the school districts that provided superior-service maximums in 1957-58 were not available for comparison. If these 17 per cent had dropped these provisions in the same proportion as those that reported, only about two-thirds of the superior-service provisions had survived. 69

3. Family Allowances and Sex Differentials

Another factor in salary scheduling which has undergone considerable change in recent years is the equal-pay provision enforced in many states by law and in many communities by the rules and regulations of boards of educa-

---


69 NEA's, Quality of Service Provisions, p. 10.
In some districts, equal-pay provisions have been supplanted by family allowances since it is felt that this takes into consideration the financial problems of the female teacher with dependents as well as the married man. "In 1930-31, there were 41.8 per cent of the salary schedules which provided salary differentials for men; in 1940-41, 26.3 per cent; in 1950-51, 7.3 per cent; in 1958-59, only 2.8 per cent."\(^7\)

The following data was obtained by analyzing the salary schedule data in the NFA Research Report on Salary Schedules for Classroom Teachers, Urban Districts 100,000 and Over in Population, 1961-62 and Salary Schedules, Classroom Teachers, Urban Districts 30,000 to 99,999 in Population, 1961-62.

In 1961-62, out of 738 districts with populations over 30,000 reporting schedules to the NFA, 1.7 per cent had a differential for men and 2.3 per cent had family allowances. The range in sex differentials was $100-$400. In two cases the sex differentials were qualified. In Mason City, Iowa, there was a $100 differential for men with an M.A.; in La Crosse, Wisconsin there was a $200 differential and a family allowance. The range in family allowances was $100-$1200. It is interesting to note that in 1961-62 in school districts 30,000 - 99,999 in size there were ten districts that provided sex differentials and twenty-one that provided family allowances. Of districts 100,000 and over in population, three provided sex differentials and none provided family allowances.

\(^7\)Asbree, p. 151

I. Extra Pay for Extra Duties

Many modern salary schedules carry provisions for remuneration for duties assumed in addition to the regular duties of a classroom teacher. According to the NFA, "There has been no systematic nationwide survey of extra-pay practices in recent years. However, on the questionnaire circulated to school districts over 30,000 in population in connection with its 1958-59 survey of salaries paid school employees, the NFA requested respondents to indicate whether or not higher than regular salaries were paid to teachers with specific assignments. Of the 55% districts which replied to the question, 493 granted extra pay for extra duties."\(^{72}\)

F. Recent Studies

Reference has been made previously to the fact that the Research Division of the NFA conducts a biennial study of teachers' salary schedules. The Index to American Doctoral Dissertations reveals the following information with regard to studies of teachers' salary schedules. In the period 1933-1947 no studies were made. From 1948-1951 there were five. From 1952-1955 there were none. Since 1956 there have been fifteen. Interestingly, of the fifteen studies that have been made since 1956, thirteen have dealt exclusively with the subject of merit rating.

CHAPTER III

A COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' SALARIES WITH SALARIES PAID IN OTHER OCCUPATIONS

A study of teachers' salary schedules suggests an examination of compensation paid to persons in other occupations. Since business, industry, and the professions compete in the same labor market, there are relationships among the monetary compensations they offer.

The bases used to determine salaries paid to persons outside the teaching profession are not unlike the bases which determine teachers' salaries. Levels of preparation and years of experience are the most common determinants of teachers' salaries. Many salaries outside the teaching profession depend upon the same bases. Salaries of some engineers, chemists, and social welfare workers might be cited as examples. In other cases, merit, extra duties, or sex differentials affect salary. Salaries of some architects, journalists, and clergymen support this.

However, to compare teachers' salary schedules with those used in business, industry, and the professions, it is necessary to reflect upon the factors which create the actual differences which determine the compensation available outside the teaching profession with that available to teachers. Next, it is necessary to look at the results of those differences by comparing salary schedules in other occupations with those established by boards of education.
A. Factors Influencing Teachers' Salaries

There appear to be three major factors which cause different standards to be applied to teachers' salaries in contrast to non-teaching salaries. These factors are public attitudes, supply and demand, and economic values.

1. Public Attitudes

The image which exists in the public mind regarding a profession helps to determine the compensation available in that profession. It should be noted that the number of professions is increasing. At one time only medicine, law, and the ministry were considered professions. A 1958 publication of the NTA73 lists eighteen occupations as professions. The following personnel are classified as professionals: physicians, dentists, lawyers, osteopaths, architects, engineers, veterinarians, pharmacists, natural scientists, chemists, social scientists, editors and reporters, foresters, social welfare workers, clergymen, librarians, dietitians.74

One attitude in the public mind regarding teaching is that teaching is not a profession. For many decades when teachers were not required to have any special preparation and before there were any standards for the certification of teachers, this was true. The fact that this is no longer true today has not erased from the public mind the image of a teacher as a non-professional. Today, with the exception of law, medicine, and dentistry, greater preparation is required for licensing as a teacher than for any other


74 Ibid., p. 8.
profession. In 1956, seventy-nine per cent of all teachers had a bachelor's degree and thirty-eight per cent had five or more years of college. If figures for this year were available, they would be much higher.

The characters which the public calls to mind when it thinks of teachers are unfavorable to the profession. Foremost are Ichabod Crane, Our Miss Brooks, and Mr. Peepers. Literature and the media of mass communication have not been kind to the developing image of a teacher. The doctors, dentists, and lawyers one meets in literature, on radio, and on television are usually very articulate, extremely dedicated, and not at all unattractive. This enhances the images in the public mind of the professionals in these categories.

Too, people tend to have more regard for that which is less common and teachers do constitute a large group of professional workers. According to a table, there are about seven times as many teachers as lawyers, six times as many as doctors, three times as many as nurses, and two times as many as engineers.

The price people are willing to pay for a professional service is related directly to their regard for the person who performs the service. Unfortunately, the image of the teacher in the public mind does not awaken in it a desire to pay too great a compensation to a teacher.

2. Supply and Demand

Doctors, dentists, lawyers, and architects, except for those few who are

---

75 Ibid., p. 12.

salaried, can regulate their own incomes by the fees that they charge. Fees charged are frequently related to the demand for a particular service. Since the demand for physicians exceeds the supply, physicians are in the comfortable position of being able to raise their fees, limit their hours, and restrict their services. This is not an indictment of physicians but a comparison of the position of the teacher with that of the physician.

The shortage of engineers forces businesses and industries to compete in the market-place for the services of engineers. This competition takes the form of attractive salary offers with additional fringe benefits and improved working conditions. It must be admitted that the teacher shortage has resulted in an increase in teachers' salaries, too, but the increase, generally, has not been significant.

In contrast to the other professions, the teacher shortage is compensated by other measures. To compensate for the teacher shortage, thousands of unqualified persons have been admitted to the profession through temporary or provisional certification, class sizes have been increased, and services have been curtailed.

It appears that the law of supply and demand has served to raise standards and increase wages in other professions, whereas in teaching it has served to lower standards while influencing salaries only insignificantly.

3. Economic Values

Some people place a higher value on private production than they do on government services. Regardless of how unessential a private good is, the individual in purchasing it feels his money is spent more prudently than when he pays it in taxes to the government in order that services essential to his
well-being be provided.

Galbraith, in *The Affluent Society*, refers to this attitude as follows:

> At best public services are a necessary evil; at worst they are a malign tendency against which an alert community must exercise eternal vigilance...Such attitudes lead to some interesting contradictions. Automobiles have an importance greater than the roads on which they are driven. We welcome expansion of telephone services as improving the general well-being but accept curtailment of postal services as signifying necessary economy.

The businessman who creates a felt need for a frivolity through the psychological persuasion of advertising is admired and the sales of his product reflect the public acceptance of this psychologically induced need. Millions of people are willing to go into debt to purchase unessentials and frivolities on the installment plan. But people are reluctant to pay through taxes for such essentials as adequate police protection, effective municipal or state government, or sufficient school buildings staffed by adequately prepared teachers recruited by salaries vastly increased over what is offered today. The businessman who creates a need for an unessential product is deemed a genius or, at the very least, a very enterprising gentleman. The government official who asks for increased revenue for a needed service is deemed a wastrel.

The public mind, in its determination of worth, values private production as good economically and public expenditures as money spent "down the drain". This disparity in economic values has resulted in lower salaries for teachers.

The factors discussed in the preceding pages have influenced the development of teachers' salary schedules. They have resulted in an inadequate

---

supply of money being available for teachers' salaries. Perhaps they have hampered boards of education to the extent that salary schedules do not reflect the philosophy of the board but rather represent the best that a board can do with the funds available. The extent to which they, and other less related factors, have influenced teachers' salaries are revealed by the following data.

B. Comparative Studies of Teachers' Incomes with Other Incomes

1. The Ford Fund Study

The Fund for the Advancement of Education is an independent philanthropic organization established in 1951 by the Ford Foundation to work in the field of formal education.

With a deep concern for assisting the schools to find solutions for the critical teacher shortage, the directors and officers of the Fund decided to conduct over a period of years a comprehensive investigation of the teaching profession. All major aspects of the profession were analysed including its attractiveness, the kind of people who enter it, its holding power, the ways in which professional people are utilized, and the promising innovations for improving the status and effectiveness of the profession. The economic aspect of the investigation was carried on by Beardsley Ruml and Sidney G. Tickton.

One of the conclusions in their report is pertinent to this study:

The American society is deteriorating in the sector most critical for future progress and well-being. The quality of the future depends on education at all levels, and the quality of education depends on its top leadership. The best talent of the younger generation finds that education is not as highly valued by its seniors as law, medicine, advertising, or many technical skills. The response of the talented members of the young generation is rational and what might be expected. The talented members of the
younger generation choose to enter law, medicine, advertising, the mechanical vocations, or the arts.78

2. Percent of National Income Spent for Education in the U.S.

The lack of public acceptance of the need for better schools at a time when expenditures for private needs is constantly increasing is revealed by the slight share of the Gross National Product that falls to the support of schools.

3. The "Real Purchasing Power of Various Incomes

It might be said that teachers' salary schedules are less sensitive to the economic effects of depression than are the salaries of other professionals. However, they are less sensitive to periods of prosperity, too, and our national economy is characterized by long periods of prosperity with only occasional periods of depression.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year ended</th>
<th>Total national income a/ (in millions)</th>
<th>Total expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools b/ (in millions)</th>
<th>Total expenditures for public and private schools and colleges b/ (in millions)</th>
<th>% of col. 3 is of col. 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>$ 67,814</td>
<td>$ 2,251</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>75,729</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>59,708</td>
<td>2,216</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>52,517</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>40,459</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>48,959</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>57,057</td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>64,911</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>73,618</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>67,581</td>
<td>2,233</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>72,753</td>
<td>2,289</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>81,634</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td><strong>$3,200</strong></td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>101,710</td>
<td>2,333</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>137,694</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td><strong>3,204</strong></td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>170,310</td>
<td>2,308</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>182,639</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td><strong>3,522</strong></td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>181,218</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>180,879</td>
<td>2,907</td>
<td><strong>4,168</strong></td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>198,177</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>223,487</td>
<td>4,311</td>
<td><strong>6,571</strong></td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>217,690</td>
<td>5,010</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>211,876</td>
<td>5,838</td>
<td><strong>8,796</strong></td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>279,313</td>
<td>6,528</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>292,155</td>
<td>7,311</td>
<td><strong>11,312</strong></td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>301,794</td>
<td>9,092</td>
<td><strong>13,950</strong></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>350,636</td>
<td>10,955</td>
<td><strong>16,812</strong></td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>367,384</td>
<td>13,569</td>
<td><strong>21,120</strong></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>317,180</td>
<td>15,013</td>
<td><strong>24,722</strong></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>127,629</td>
<td>16,898</td>
<td><strong>26,768</strong></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a/ From U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics.  
July 1962. (Figures are for the calendar year.)  
b/ From U.S. Department of  
Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education. (Figures are for the  
school year.)  
c/ Estimated by U.S. Office of Education.  
d/ Estimated by NEA Research Division.
TABLE III

THE CHANGES IN "REAL" PURCHASING POWER IN MEDICINE, DENTISTRY, AND EDUCATION, 1929-1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physicians</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentists</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents, large universities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors, large universities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals, big city high schools</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

79Ram and Tiekton, p. 42.
A COMPARISON OF WAGES AND SALARIES IN VARIOUS OCCUPATIONS AND INDUSTRIES IN 1904 AND 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>1953 Actual Salary (Average)</th>
<th>1904 Actual Salary (Average)</th>
<th>1953 Salary Deflated to &quot;Real&quot; Purchasing Power</th>
<th>50 Year Change in &quot;Real&quot; Purchasing Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidents, large universities</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$4,300</td>
<td>$4,196</td>
<td>- 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors, large universities</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>- 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professors, large universities</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professors, large universities</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,338</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors, large universities</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals, big city high schools</td>
<td>9,156</td>
<td>3,552</td>
<td>2,497</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals, small city high schools</td>
<td>6,523</td>
<td>1,931</td>
<td>1,833</td>
<td>- 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, big city high schools</td>
<td>5,526</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>- 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, small city high schools</td>
<td>4,292</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, big city ele. schools</td>
<td>4,817</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>60%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

80 Rum1 and Tickton, pp. 32-33.

* For the country as a whole (including big cities), the average number of school days increased from 117 per year in 1904 to 182 days per year by 1953, an increase of 23 per cent. If allowance is made for these changes in the number of school days in the year these estimates would be reduced and the resulting percentages may provide a truer picture than the gross percentages of the change that took place in the earning power of teachers during the period.
### TABLE IV (Cont'd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>1953 Actual Salary (Average)</th>
<th>1904 Actual Salary (Average)</th>
<th>1953 Salary Deflated to &quot;Real&quot; Purchasing Power</th>
<th>50 Year Change in &quot;Real&quot; Purchasing Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, small city ele. schools</td>
<td>3,682</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, small town ele. schools</td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>119%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive officials, large railroads</td>
<td>11,592</td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>3,109</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad engineers</td>
<td>7,352</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad conductors</td>
<td>6,676</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad firemen</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>137%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad switchtenders</td>
<td>4,697</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>134%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad clerks</td>
<td>3,984</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers in auto. manu.</td>
<td>4,917</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>140%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers in coal mining</td>
<td>4,196</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>163%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers in elec. machinery manu.</td>
<td>4,133</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>131%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers in stone, clay and glass manu.</td>
<td>3,956</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>122%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers in furniture manu.</td>
<td>3,570</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>137%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone operators</td>
<td>3,224</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers in tobacco manufacturing</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>107%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In making comparisons it should be noted also that while the number of hours of work per year by teachers was increasing 1904-1953, the number of hours worked by people in industrial occupations was decreasing significantly.
While this study is not concerned with salary schedules at the college level, it is interesting to note the deterioration in purchasing power of the salaries available to those employed in colleges and universities.

**TABLE V**

PROFESSOR'S TOP SALARY IN 1908 AT THREE UNIVERSITIES AND AMOUNT NECESSARY TO PROVIDE SAME "REAL" PURCHASING POWER IN 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Actual Salary Received 1908 (No Income Taxes)</th>
<th>Amount Necessary Before Income Taxes to Provide Same &quot;Real&quot; Purchasing Power in 1953 as in 1908</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$29,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>19,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>19,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1891, President Harper of the University of Chicago, after consultation with Mr. John D. Rockefeller and Dr. Frederick Gates, established a salary for professors at the University at the rate of $7,000 a year for the most eminent of the group invited... The 1953 figure equivalent in purchasing power to the $7,000 in 1891 would be $38,300.82

---

81 Ruml and Tickton, p. 46  
82 Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Salary Received</th>
<th>Salary Deflated to &quot;Real&quot; Purchasing Power²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>$ 873</td>
<td>$ 873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>2,052</td>
<td>1,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>2,086</td>
<td>1,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>2,192</td>
<td>1,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>1,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>2,407</td>
<td>1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>1,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>1,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>1,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>2,469</td>
<td>1,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>2,434</td>
<td>1,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>1,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>2,735</td>
<td>1,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>1,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>4,019</td>
<td>1,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>4,172</td>
<td>1,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>4,817</td>
<td>1,394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²The salary and wage figures have been deflated back to 1904 levels of "real" purchasing power by deducting the amount of Federal income taxes and social security taxes paid and then applying the change in the level of prices shown by the Consumers Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Ruml and Tickton, p. 60.
It can be seen from the foregoing data that, while teachers' salaries have been increasing, teachers are not maintaining a professional status nor participating in the economy to the extent that they should. And in the years which followed the Ruml and Tickton study, the situation did not improve too much according to a later study by Tickton, *Teaching Salaries Then and Now—A Second Look*, a study which was also financed by the Ford Foundation.

In that study, Tickton states, "A few years ago, Beardsley Ruml needled the American public with the fact that a teacher was paid on the average less than a skilled mechanic, and that a university professor received less than a locomotive engineer. By the end of 1959 the situation hadn't changed much, but some activity was beginning to be noticed on the education front - at least at the top level."84

---

### h. Industrial Salaries and Teachers' Salaries

**TABLE VII**

AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS PER FULL TIME EMPLOYEE, BY INDUSTRY, 1956 - 1961$^{15}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All industries, total</td>
<td>4,036</td>
<td>4,205</td>
<td>4,346</td>
<td>4,558</td>
<td>4,707</td>
<td>4,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>1,738</td>
<td>1,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural services, forestry, and fisheries</td>
<td>3,378</td>
<td>3,424</td>
<td>3,680</td>
<td>3,803</td>
<td>3,811</td>
<td>3,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>5,015</td>
<td>5,218</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>5,510</td>
<td>5,685</td>
<td>5,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal mining</td>
<td>5,315</td>
<td>5,459</td>
<td>5,418</td>
<td>5,801</td>
<td>6,108</td>
<td>6,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthracite mining</td>
<td>4,167</td>
<td>4,315</td>
<td>4,261</td>
<td>4,368</td>
<td>4,533</td>
<td>4,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bituminous and other soft coal mining</td>
<td>4,944</td>
<td>5,162</td>
<td>4,831</td>
<td>5,322</td>
<td>5,376</td>
<td>5,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude petroleum and natural gas</td>
<td>5,193</td>
<td>5,125</td>
<td>5,599</td>
<td>5,862</td>
<td>5,924</td>
<td>6,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmetallic mining and quarrying</td>
<td>4,593</td>
<td>4,733</td>
<td>4,911</td>
<td>5,124</td>
<td>5,320</td>
<td>5,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract construction</td>
<td>4,674</td>
<td>4,923</td>
<td>5,060</td>
<td>5,254</td>
<td>5,488</td>
<td>5,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and kindred products,</td>
<td>4,193</td>
<td>4,367</td>
<td>4,540</td>
<td>4,757</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>5,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco manufactures</td>
<td>3,186</td>
<td>3,376</td>
<td>3,505</td>
<td>3,659</td>
<td>3,857</td>
<td>3,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile-mill products</td>
<td>5,282</td>
<td>5,350</td>
<td>5,399</td>
<td>5,663</td>
<td>5,730</td>
<td>5,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel and other finished fabric products</td>
<td>3,011</td>
<td>3,101</td>
<td>3,158</td>
<td>3,289</td>
<td>3,312</td>
<td>3,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumber and furniture products</td>
<td>3,568</td>
<td>3,646</td>
<td>3,761</td>
<td>3,968</td>
<td>4,003</td>
<td>4,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper and allied products</td>
<td>4,764</td>
<td>4,963</td>
<td>5,114</td>
<td>5,420</td>
<td>5,517</td>
<td>5,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing, publishing, and allied industries</td>
<td>4,925</td>
<td>5,082</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>5,445</td>
<td>5,610</td>
<td>5,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals and allied products</td>
<td>5,297</td>
<td>5,579</td>
<td>5,829</td>
<td>6,114</td>
<td>6,321</td>
<td>6,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products of petroleum and coal</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>6,285</td>
<td>6,470</td>
<td>6,876</td>
<td>6,950</td>
<td>7,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber products</td>
<td>4,818</td>
<td>5,126</td>
<td>5,212</td>
<td>5,561</td>
<td>5,654</td>
<td>5,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather and leather products</td>
<td>3,214</td>
<td>3,358</td>
<td>3,397</td>
<td>3,577</td>
<td>3,589</td>
<td>3,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone, clay, and glass products</td>
<td>4,560</td>
<td>4,719</td>
<td>4,911</td>
<td>5,207</td>
<td>5,337</td>
<td>5,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metals, metal products, and miscellaneous</td>
<td>1,984</td>
<td>5,217</td>
<td>5,389</td>
<td>5,721</td>
<td>5,828</td>
<td>6,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery, except electrical</td>
<td>5,265</td>
<td>5,404</td>
<td>5,527</td>
<td>5,894</td>
<td>6,025</td>
<td>6,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical machinery</td>
<td>4,728</td>
<td>4,913</td>
<td>5,257</td>
<td>5,533</td>
<td>5,699</td>
<td>5,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation equipment</td>
<td>5,456</td>
<td>5,614</td>
<td>6,038</td>
<td>6,366</td>
<td>6,625</td>
<td>6,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobiles and automobile equipment</td>
<td>5,450</td>
<td>4,703</td>
<td>6,092</td>
<td>6,359</td>
<td>6,558</td>
<td>6,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>4,014</td>
<td>4,135</td>
<td>4,301</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>4,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>5,179</td>
<td>5,302</td>
<td>5,570</td>
<td>5,828</td>
<td>6,020</td>
<td>6,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade and auto services</td>
<td>3,345</td>
<td>3,469</td>
<td>3,583</td>
<td>3,721</td>
<td>3,849</td>
<td>3,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, insurance, and real estate</td>
<td>4,115</td>
<td>4,306</td>
<td>4,495</td>
<td>4,714</td>
<td>4,840</td>
<td>5,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>4,112</td>
<td>4,248</td>
<td>4,333</td>
<td>4,514</td>
<td>4,689</td>
<td>4,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and commodity brokers</td>
<td>7,151</td>
<td>7,103</td>
<td>7,885</td>
<td>8,775</td>
<td>8,358</td>
<td>9,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>6,616</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>5,321</td>
<td>5,519</td>
<td>5,622</td>
<td>5,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance carriers</td>
<td>4,194</td>
<td>4,370</td>
<td>4,518</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,870</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance agents and combination offices</td>
<td>4,611</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td>5,018</td>
<td>5,265</td>
<td>5,517</td>
<td>5,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>3,128</td>
<td>3,213</td>
<td>3,361</td>
<td>3,534</td>
<td>3,618</td>
<td>3,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>4,972</td>
<td>5,243</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>5,765</td>
<td>5,928</td>
<td>6,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroads</td>
<td>4,084</td>
<td>4,816</td>
<td>6,085</td>
<td>6,058</td>
<td>6,228</td>
<td>6,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and highway passenger transportation</td>
<td>3,824</td>
<td>3,927</td>
<td>4,053</td>
<td>4,175</td>
<td>4,223</td>
<td>4,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway freight transportation and warehousing</td>
<td>5,065</td>
<td>5,261</td>
<td>5,465</td>
<td>5,810</td>
<td>5,957</td>
<td>6,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water transportation</td>
<td>6,083</td>
<td>6,143</td>
<td>6,463</td>
<td>6,589</td>
<td>6,832</td>
<td>7,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air transportation</td>
<td>5,481</td>
<td>5,752</td>
<td>6,027</td>
<td>6,606</td>
<td>6,868</td>
<td>7,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline transportation</td>
<td>5,962</td>
<td>6,269</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>6,708</td>
<td>6,870</td>
<td>6,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services allied to transportation</td>
<td>4,460</td>
<td>4,803</td>
<td>4,906</td>
<td>5,111</td>
<td>5,387</td>
<td>5,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and public utilities</td>
<td>4,612</td>
<td>4,813</td>
<td>5,063</td>
<td>5,385</td>
<td>5,642</td>
<td>5,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone, telegraph, and related services</td>
<td>4,177</td>
<td>4,318</td>
<td>4,528</td>
<td>4,883</td>
<td>5,113</td>
<td>5,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio broadcasting and television</td>
<td>6,613</td>
<td>6,756</td>
<td>7,128</td>
<td>7,288</td>
<td>7,140</td>
<td>7,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities: electric and gas</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td>5,247</td>
<td>5,513</td>
<td>5,815</td>
<td>6,116</td>
<td>6,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local utilities and public service</td>
<td>3,538</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>3,880</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>4,346</td>
<td>4,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels and other lodging places</td>
<td>3,001</td>
<td>3,146</td>
<td>3,262</td>
<td>3,423</td>
<td>3,595</td>
<td>3,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal services</td>
<td>2,602</td>
<td>2,703</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>2,874</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>3,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private households</td>
<td>2,851</td>
<td>2,986</td>
<td>3,081</td>
<td>3,230</td>
<td>3,370</td>
<td>3,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and trade schools and employment agencies</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>2,131</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>2,336</td>
<td>2,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous repair services and hand trades</td>
<td>3,976</td>
<td>4,043</td>
<td>4,209</td>
<td>4,318</td>
<td>4,391</td>
<td>4,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion pictures</td>
<td>3,009</td>
<td>4,075</td>
<td>4,209</td>
<td>4,391</td>
<td>4,589</td>
<td>4,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusement and recreations</td>
<td>3,705</td>
<td>3,930</td>
<td>4,235</td>
<td>4,556</td>
<td>4,631</td>
<td>4,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical and other health services</td>
<td>2,532</td>
<td>2,612</td>
<td>2,751</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>3,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal services</td>
<td>3,556</td>
<td>3,795</td>
<td>3,940</td>
<td>4,106</td>
<td>4,222</td>
<td>4,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and other professional services</td>
<td>5,085</td>
<td>6,073</td>
<td>6,302</td>
<td>6,557</td>
<td>6,887</td>
<td>7,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>3,327</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>3,668</td>
<td>3,856</td>
<td>4,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit membership organizations</td>
<td>3,395</td>
<td>3,533</td>
<td>3,672</td>
<td>3,815</td>
<td>3,918</td>
<td>4,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and government enterprises</td>
<td>3,894</td>
<td>4,048</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,683</td>
<td>4,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal - general gov't.</td>
<td>3,923</td>
<td>4,034</td>
<td>4,208</td>
<td>4,491</td>
<td>4,739</td>
<td>4,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian</td>
<td>4,808</td>
<td>4,971</td>
<td>5,511</td>
<td>5,682</td>
<td>5,916</td>
<td>6,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>3,393</td>
<td>3,462</td>
<td>3,711</td>
<td>3,882</td>
<td>3,932</td>
<td>3,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal - government enterprises</td>
<td>4,676</td>
<td>4,758</td>
<td>5,174</td>
<td>5,252</td>
<td>5,525</td>
<td>5,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and local - general government</td>
<td>3,746</td>
<td>3,906</td>
<td>4,152</td>
<td>4,325</td>
<td>4,533</td>
<td>4,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public education</td>
<td>3,827</td>
<td>4,085</td>
<td>4,313</td>
<td>4,522</td>
<td>4,752</td>
<td>5,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonschool</td>
<td>3,676</td>
<td>3,817</td>
<td>3,985</td>
<td>4,119</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td>4,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and local - government enterprises</td>
<td>4,201</td>
<td>4,314</td>
<td>4,462</td>
<td>4,654</td>
<td>4,827</td>
<td>4,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the world</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>5,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addendum: All private industries</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>4,238</td>
<td>4,319</td>
<td>4,570</td>
<td>4,712</td>
<td>4,837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE VIII

**SALARIES OF JOBS IN INDUSTRY AND EDUCATION REQUIRING COMPARABLE AMOUNTS OF EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING, 1959**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting Salaries for Jobs Requiring a Bachelor’s Degree</th>
<th>Teachers in Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Development personnel</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>New York City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemists</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountants</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesmen</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trainees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,370</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,925</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,580</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,330</td>
<td>$4,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,200</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Salaries for Jobs Requiring a Master’s or Professional Degree and Five Years’ Experience |                             |
| In Industry                                                                 | Teachers in Public Schools |
| Engineers                                                                  |                             |
| Pharmacists                                                               |                             |
| Physicists                                                                 |                             |
| Chemists                                                                   |                             |
|                                                                          | New York City suburbs       |
|                                                                          |                             |
| $8,300                                                                    |                             |
| $7,500                                                                    |                             |
| $7,160                                                                    |                             |
| $7,200                                                                    |                             |
|                                                                          | New York City suburbs       |
|                                                                          | such as Garden City,        |
|                                                                          | Great Neck, Manhasset and   |
|                                                                          | Scarsdale                   |
|                                                                          | $6,000-6,500                |
|                                                                          |                             |
|                                                                          | New York City               |
|                                                                          | 5,800                       |

| Starting Salaries for Jobs Requiring a Ph.D. Degree |                             |
| In Industry                                                                 | In Large Colleges and      |
|                                                                                                                                  |
| Engineers                                                                  | Universities                |
| Chemists                                                                   | Junior faculty members     |
|                                                                          | $5,000-7,000                |
| $9,925                                                                    |                             |
| $8,580                                                                    |                             |

---

5. Teachers' Salaries and Other Professional Salaries

TABLE IX

PER CENT OF MEDIAN INCOME \(^{\text{87}}\) 1950 CENSUS
17 PROFESSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>PER CENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physicians</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentists</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteopaths</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median income of 11 professions</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinarians</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacists</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural scientists</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemists</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social scientists</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editors and reporters</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foresters</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social welfare workers</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers – public and private</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergymen</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietitians</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

C. Economic Status of Teachers in 1961-62

This is the title of a Research Report of the NEA. It is an analysis of the economic status of the teaching profession. Included are the latest figures on teachers' salaries, earnings in other occupations, consumer prices, income, and family budgets.

Following are some of the major findings:

For the school year 1961-62, the total instructional staff, including classroom teachers, principals, supervisors, and other instructional personnel, will receive an average annual salary of $5,716. Classroom teachers will receive $5,527.

Teachers' average salaries are increasing faster than the cost of living.

In recent years teachers' salaries have risen to a level about fourteen percent above the earnings of all wage-and-salary workers, and for the first time since 1940 have caught up with the average employee in manufacturing.

Civilian federal employees still have a fourteen – percent salary advantage over teachers.

In the winter of 1960-61 private industry in 108 Standard Metropolitan Areas paid an average salary of $9,471 to salaried members of professional occupations.

Teachers' salaries in 1960-61 for urban districts over 30,000 averaged $5,926.

A budget study as of September, 1961 for salaried junior professional and executive workers estimates the cost of maintaining a family of four at $9,742. Less than one percent of all classroom teachers received a salary this size.

---

Wages alone do not indicate the full compensation an employee receives. To wages must be added the values he receives in fringe benefits. According to Kleinman "...little attention has been given in educational circles to the level of benefits provided for teaching personnel. The information to be found on the subject is sketchy, but tends to support the contention that benefits available to public school personnel today have not kept pace with those found in other segments of the economy."89

Ruml and Tickton, in their study on teachers' salaries point out that, "On the question of prerequisites and fringe benefits, there are no adequate data. We feel however that over the years, these prerequisites have increased relatively outside the teaching profession and that accordingly the use of compensation figures alone understates rather than distorts the overall impression."90

---


90 Ruml and Tickton, p. 114.
CHAPTER IV

PROBLEMS RELATED TO SALARY SCHEDULING

A. Financial

One of the greatest problems in building a salary schedule is to build one which the board members feel is just and equitable, but yet is one which the district is able to pay. This is a contributing factor to the decision regarding which base will be used to determine the schedule.

1. Cost and Quality

One reason that finance is such an important problem as school budgets are developed is that there is a relationship between the cost and the quality of education. Several studies have indicated that there is a one-to-one relationship between expenditure level and quality. Furmo found that the

91 Paul R. Mort, Walter C. Reussner, and John W. Polley, Public School Finance (New York, 1960), pp. 77-86, citing the following studies:

55
average salary paid to teachers in a school district was a good predictor of the quality of education in that district in that the funds spent for teachers' salaries closely paralleled the expenditure level.  

2. Sources of Revenue

The expenditure level and, consequently, the quality of education in a school district depends upon the ability of the district to raise sufficient revenue. The budget is the financial plan for a school district for a future period of time, usually one year. The budget is generally divided into the following categories for accounting purposes: current expense, capital improvement, long and short term debt payment, and interest payment. Current expense includes all of the money disbursed for daily operation of the schools. Included in current expense is the cost of instruction which includes teachers' salaries. The cost of teachers' salaries is the largest item

Maine School Finance Commission: The Financing of the Public Schools of Maine, (Augusta, Maine, 1934)
William P. McLure, Let Us Pay for the Kind of Education We Need, Bureau of Educational Research, (University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi, 1948)
Orrin F. Powell, Educational Returns at Varying Expenditure Levels, Bureau Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, (New York, 1933)
Rhode Island Commission on the Legal Structure of Rhode Island Public Education: Schools for Our Children (Providence, R.I., 1941)
George D. Strayer, Director, A Report of a Survey of Public Education in the State of West Virginia, State of West Virginia, Legislative Interim Committee, (Charleston, West Virginia, 1945)

92Mort, Reuss, and Polley, p. 115, citing Purno's "Projection of School Quality from Expenditure Level."
in current expense, usually. Since the quality of education is directly related to the quality of the staff, preparation of the budget required serious attention to the matter of teachers' salaries. The amounts that can be appropriated for teachers' salaries depend upon the amounts of revenue which a district can raise.

The greatest source of revenue for the operation of the schools is the property tax. This is a local tax, which currently runs third to state and federal tax yields. This was not always the case. "In 1933 the property tax produced more revenue than all the other taxes put together. In 1943 it was still the largest single revenue producer, but by 1956 it had declined to approximately eleven per cent of the total. However, the change is in part due to the awesome increase in federal taxation, to a lesser extent to increases in taxes at the state level, and to a minor extent to the interesting development of new forms of local taxation. Despite the decline, the property tax produced two and one-half times as much revenue in 1956 as it had any time prior to the depression."93

Historically, the schools have depended on the property tax as a means of support. The property tax is levied partly on the benefit theory and partly on the ability to pay theory. While the property tax is a very productive tax, it is difficult, if not impossible, to support the schools through this means alone. Property owners can bear only so much of a burden tax-wise and are becoming increasingly unwilling to pay tax bills any larger than those being issued currently. Ruml and Tickton reflect upon the following defect

---

93 Mort, Reusser, and Polley, p. 129.
of the property tax. The public schools being tied to the property tax as their principal source of revenue found themselves unable to share in the rising national income, access to which is through the income tax. Galbraith states the case similarly in dwelling upon the fact that federal revenues have increased proportionately with private economic growth. He states:

Here (states and localities) tax revenue - this is especially true of the General Property Tax - increase less than proportionately with increased private production... Thus we currently find by far the most serious social imbalance in the services performed by local governments. The FBI comes much more easily by funds than the city police force. The Department of Agriculture can more easily keep its pest control abreast of expanding agricultural output than the average city health service can keep up with the needs of an expanding industrial population.

Mort, Reussers, and Polley list the following to offset some of the shortcomings of the property tax:

1. The property tax has been levied for centuries and for that reason alone is expected and accepted.
2. Property, despite the tremendous diversification of wealth, still represents with some justice a rough measure of wealth.
3. What possible substitute is there for it? Any tax which produces more than $11 billion a year cannot easily or quickly be replaced.
4. The property tax alone of all taxes is the one where the amount of money to be spent is determined first and the money raised to meet this demand. All other taxes work in quite a different manner. The amount to be collected does not depend on the budget but may exceed or fall short depending on business conditions and the accuracy of the original estimate.
5. The demand for revenue on the local level is increasing. The increased population, the improved standards of living (both public and private), the needs caused by inflation, and the scarcity of well-qualified school personnel combine to cause great increases in the outlays for local governmental services.
6. While the property tax is slow to respond to rising prices, it is also slow to respond to a downward change. It is stable and dependable in yield, a fact which enables long-range fiscal plans to be made with some confidence.

94, 95 Galbraith, p. 264
7. Property valuation, a concomitant of property taxation, is deeply imbedded in the whole state and local fiscal structure. It is used in many ways in various states:

a. In the apportionment of state aid for schools
b. In the apportionment of certain municipals aids
c. In the provision of special tax privileges in the form of exemptions for homesteaders, veterans, clergymen, volunteer firemen
d. In the determination of the debt limits for local government
e. In the apportionment of costs of county government.\(^96\)

The property tax is determined in the following manner. The value of each parcel of property is assessed. This assessment is recorded on a tax roll. The total tax roll indicates the total property valuation in the municipality. The municipal government or corporate body, after a determination of its needs, votes whatever tax levy will be necessary to sustain its operations. Each property owner is then billed for his proportionate share of the levy.

Because property taxes cannot bear the entire burden of school operating costs, other local sources of revenue have had to be found. "The taxes most commonly levied on a local basis are income, sales, admissions, cigarette and liquor, motorist licenses, and utilities."\(^97\) Non-property taxes present some of the same problems that property taxes present. Foremost among them are the cost of collection, the difficulty of collection, and evasion of payment. Table X indicates the comparative yield of some non-property taxes.

3. State Responsibility for Financing Education

Whatever financial needs for the schools cannot be met by the local community, must be met by the state. The state is the responsible authority

\(^{96}\)Mort, Reusser, and Polley, p. 131.

\(^{97}\)Ibid., p. 155.
TABLE X

MUNICIPAL NON-PROPERTY TAXES, CITIES OVER 10,000, 1955

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax</th>
<th>Average rate</th>
<th>Yield, in thousands</th>
<th>Population affected, in thousands</th>
<th>Number of Cities</th>
<th>Per Cent of Property Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admissions and amusement</td>
<td>5.86%</td>
<td>$21,507</td>
<td>25,012</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarette</td>
<td>2.64%</td>
<td>37,198</td>
<td>19,640</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline and motor fuel</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>19,527</td>
<td>3,737</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross receipts: business license</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>145,264</td>
<td>25,290</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>11.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>108,631</td>
<td>6,687</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor and alcoholic beverage</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>11,652</td>
<td>5,248</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>42,503</td>
<td>19,491</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public utility gross receipts</td>
<td>2.69%</td>
<td>98,476</td>
<td>42,548</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>5.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>.76%</td>
<td>391,823</td>
<td>24,112</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>32.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


98 Mort, p. 156.
for public education. However, the more responsibility a community can assume for the operation of its school system, the better the situation is. This is because it can be said safely that "control follows the purse". But, it must be recognised that the local community dependent as it is, primarily, on the property tax, cannot survive without state aid.

But, increased state and federal taxes over the past few decades have drained millions of dollars of wealth from the local communities. Consequently, local taxes such as the property tax cannot be expanded to the point where they can accommodate the financial needs of a community. The local community must participate in the state and federal revenues collected from it. With the broadening of the federal and state tax bases and the diminution of the property tax as a percent of total revenues collected, it has been necessary for the local community to seek increased assistance outside its own resources.

"There were sixteen states in the union in 1953-54 that provided more than fifty per cent of school revenue from state sources, whereas thirty-two states provided less than fifty per cent of current operational costs of public elementary and secondary schools."99 "In 1929-30 the states contributed only 16.7 per cent of the total public school revenue. This proportion has steadily increased, standing at 42.7 per cent in 1949-50, an increase of 26 per cent over 1929-30 and 12.4 per cent within the 1940-50 decade."100 Fourteen states now furnish 25 per cent or less of the total education revenue, nineteen states provide from 25.1 to 50 per cent; fifteen states provide from 50.1 to 75 per cent; and two states, Delaware (81.1) and New Mexico (76.7) are in the upper

---

99 Mort, p. 162.
100 Arthus B. Moehlman, School Administration (Cambridge, 1940), p. 171.
quartile. Thirty-three states appropriate less than half and seventeen states contribute more than half of the total education revenue.\textsuperscript{101}

State aid exists in many forms. The usual forms are: general purpose grants, which are grants given by the State which may be used for any part of the instructional program; special grants, which are grants given for special or vocational education; flat grants, which are grants given in an amount per pupil or per unit; and equalisation aid, which is aid given by the state to guarantee a minimum acceptable foundation program in each district.

4. Federal Support for Education

Ideally the local community should be able to support its own educational program. Each year this becomes more difficult and support from a higher level must be sought. This is the state education authority which should be able to fill the gap between the needs of the local community and its ability to raise revenue. In many instances the state cannot fulfill its obligation, however. It then becomes the responsibility of the federal government to make up for the deficiencies.

The federal government has greater fund-raising powers than either state or local governments. At present the federal government collects the largest portion of the tax dollar.\textsuperscript{102} There is only one populace from which taxes can be collected. Hence, the fact that the federal government collects so much means that there is less of a resource for the local or state governments to tap. This makes less local and state revenue available for education. Still the contribution of the federal government to education is small.


\textsuperscript{102}Mort, Rousser, and Polley, p. 180
Federal interest in education began with the granting of land unconditionally to the states. The second phase of federal support of education consisted of the granting of land conditionally to the states, primarily for agricultural, mechanical, and scientific education. The next stimulation by the federal government took the form of assistance to vocational education at the secondary level through the Smith-Hughes and George-Deen Acts. The approval of the Smith-Sears Vocational Rehabilitation Act in 1918 provided for vocational adjustment and rehabilitation for returned soldiers and sailors.  

"During 1934-35, as part of its emergency program, the federal government provided approximately $22,000,000 for aid to submarginal rural districts." As the need for emergency measures because of depressed economic conditions diminished, the need for other emergency measures because of World War II had to be fulfilled.

The Lanham Act was passed during 1941 with generous appropriations for public works including the construction, maintenance and operation of child care centers, schools and recreation centers. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346), better known as the G. I. Bill of Rights, and Public Law 16 for vocational rehabilitation of veterans, provided educational opportunities for all servicemen whose education had been interrupted and those who re-education because of injuries received in service.

Other assistance which the federal government offers to the schools is aid in the form of surplus foods. The most recent legislation which offers direct aid to school systems is the National Defense Education Act which provides assistance on a matching funds basis in the areas of science, mathematics, foreign languages, and guidance.

At present there is pending a bill, H.R. 3000, introduced by Mr. Powell

---

103 Koehlman, p. 469.
104 Ibid.
105 Ibid.
and referred to committee on January 29, 1963. This bill, if passed, would provide definite aid for teachers’ salaries as indicated in Title IV, Part A:

Title IV - Strengthening Elementary and Secondary Education
Part A - Selective and urgent improvement of public elementary and secondary education: Four-year $1.5 billion program of Federal grants to States for teacher salary improvement; i.e., increasing maximum salaries, raising low starting salaries, raising low average salaries in economically disadvantaged districts; support for critical classroom construction needs such as overcrowding, fire and health hazards; support for special projects to improve educational quality particularly in disadvantaged rural and urban areas. Appropriation would be authorized so as to phase out Federal support by the end of program. Public schools only.106

It can be seen from the foregoing that federal aid to education has been in the nature of emergency measures or aid to special areas of instruction. There are increasing pressures for the federal government to assume a greater responsibility in the financing of public education. The following table indicates the per cent of support the various states received from state and federal funds combined in 1956.

106 National Education Improvement Act of 1963.
### TABLE XI

**PER CENT OF SUPPORT FROM STATE AND FEDERAL FUNDS, 1956**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Less than 15%</th>
<th>15-29%</th>
<th>30-49%</th>
<th>50% or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals** 4  13  13  18

---

107 Mort, p. 197.
5. Summary of Financial Problems

At the time budget decisions are made, an important one both because of its implications and because of the size of its expenditure is the decision regarding teachers' salary schedules. The board of education must consider the sources of revenue available to it from local, state, and federal sources. These sources have their limitations as was indicated in the foregoing material. Since education is not a marketable product it is at a disadvantage in the economy. As Galbraith describes it:

The goods and services which are marketable at a price have a position of elementary strategic advantage in the economy. Their price provides the income which commands labor, capital, and raw materials for production....Although aggregate income increases, many tax systems return a comparatively fixed dollar amount.108

A related comment is made by Rumel:

The high tax on corporate profits cannot be compensated for in a tax free institution. The vice president of a company gets a salary increase of $2,000; this increase is an expense of doing business to his company and is deductible for tax purposes. Accordingly, the federal government pays 52% of the increase, and the owners of the business can give the $2,000 at a cost to them of only $960. In education a $2,000 increase is $2,000 net; there being no federal tax, there is no federal tax subsidy.109

A board is limited in what it would like to do by the funds available to it through its tax resources. And every need which it recognizes must be justifiable to a tax-paying public, because people do not like to pay taxes and only through continuing and increasing taxes can public education be supported. The board of education does not have a means of raising revenue such as the post office does (except wherein it has land at rental). And it must compete with

108Galbraith, p. 310.
109Rumel and Tickton, p. 22.
other public services for the tax dollar. Particularly at the federal level must it compete with the billions which must be spent for defence. Accordingly, all financial decisions, and we are particularly concerned with those that relate to teachers' salaries, must be prudent, defensible, conservative, and based upon a sound philosophy of teacher salary scheduling.

B. Legal

Akin to the financial problems which face boards of education as they develop salary schedules are the legal problems involved. Nothing can be done which would be illegal. Primarily, school districts are bound by three kinds of law — constitutional law, statutory law, and case law.

1. Minimum Salary Laws

Most states have statutes which regulate salary schedules. Following is a table of the states which have minimum salary laws with an indication of the year such legislation was adopted.
## TABLE XII

### STATES WITH MINIMUM SALARY LAWS AND DATE OF ORIGINAL ADOPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before 1915</th>
<th>1915-1924</th>
<th>1925-34</th>
<th>1935-44</th>
<th>1945-54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Va.</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Tenn. 1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Georgia 1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn.</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Mass.</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Alaska 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North D.</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Okla. 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode I.</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Main 1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North C.</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a** An earlier minimum salary law was in effect in Ohio from 1927-28 through 1934-35.

**b** A minimum salary law enacted in Mississippi in 1921 became obsolete almost immediately because of the extremely low salary specified.


---

110 Nuggett and Stinett, p. 106.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor's Degree</th>
<th>Master's Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary range and state</td>
<td>Minimum Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000-$5,999</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000-$4,999</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000-$3,999</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XIII CONT'D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,000-$2,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>2,370</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>3,175</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000-$2,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>2,511</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under $2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of course, it should be noted that in many states the statute-prescribed minimums are much lower than the lowest salary in any district in the state. This makes the statute, for all practical purposes, obsolete.

Not all legislation regulates amount of salary. Some states modify the bases which can be used to determine salaries as in statutory provisions that there can be no sex differentials. Following are some examples:

California has an equal-pay law, as has also Massachusetts. The California court held that payment to a woman physical education teacher of a salary lower than the amount paid to a man teaching the same subject violated this state law, since their duties were the same. Chambers v. Davis, 131 Cal. App. 500, 229 P. (2d) 27 (Calif. 1933). 112

2. Salary Standards Other Than Through Minimum-Salary Laws

Some states that have no minimum-salary laws have other legal provisions related to the same objective. These include allotment schedules and allocations of state aid to teachers' salaries. Still other devices are found in the fair-employment schedules or goal schedules advanced by voluntary organizations within states. All of the following information is from an NFA Research Publication: 113

Allotment Schedules

Alabama is an example of a state that sets no minimum legal salaries but makes use of an allotment schedule for distributing state aid to school districts. Local districts do not have to pay to individual teachers the amounts used as the basis of allotment, but the local school boards have an incentive to engage better qualified applicants since the amount of aid rises in proportion


to the level of preparation of the teachers employed. The Alabama allotment is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Rank of certificate of level of preparation</th>
<th>Maximum amount allocated under minimum foundation program for each teacher holding certificate indicated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Code of Alabama 1940, Title 52, sec. 209</td>
<td>I. Master's degree</td>
<td>$4,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Regulations of the State Board of Education Pertaining to the Annual Apportionment of the Minimum Program Fund</td>
<td>II. Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>3,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III. 3 years</td>
<td>2,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV. 2 years</td>
<td>2,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V. Less than 2 years</td>
<td>2,130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The foregoing allotment schedule is a basic element in computing the minimum program of education.

At least three additional states recognize teacher preparation in state aid. Kansas (General Statutes, 1959 Supplement, sec. 72-6103) uses an allotment schedule as an optional method in calculating equalization aid to elementary-school districts. Minnesota (Minnesota Education Code, sec. 124.19) and Missouri (Missouri Revised Statutes, 1949, Title 161, sec. 161.031), in certain types of state aid, vary the allotments to the teaching units concerned, in terms of the certificates held by teachers or the level of preparation of each teacher employed.

Proportional Allocation of State Funds for Teachers' Salaries

Certain state laws specify that a given portion of the state aid per classroom unit be used for teachers' salaries. The following is an example:

Minnesota Education Code, sec. 124.19, subdiv. 1:

To qualify for full payment of general state aid, school districts
must expend for teachers' salaries not less than 65 per cent of the maintenance expenditures exclusive of transportation, up to §150 per pupil unit in average daily attendance.

Goal Schedules Adopted by State Education Associations

A number of state education associations have formally adopted goal schedules for the guidance of local teachers associations and boards of education.

In a number of the states having goal schedules, the schedules are revised at frequent intervals and are definite influences toward the upgrading of salaries.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}}

3. Legality of Fringe Benefits

Fringe benefits are component parts of some salary schedules. In this area case law and legislation have been regulatory. In regard to this issue, Kleinman offers this opinion: "it is always possible for states to pass legislation permitting or mandating the provisions of various benefits."\footnote{Kleinman, p. 36.}

He cites two cases in point:

(1) New York State, which passed two laws in 1958 enabling school districts to provide, at their own expense, health insurance for their employees and dependents of employees; and (2) Wisconsin which passed a law in 1958 empowering the State Teachers Retirement Board to incorporate the variable annuity into the retirement program for teachers of the state. Local school districts, working through and with professional organizations on the local, state, and national levels, can do much to educate state legislators with respect to the merits of permitting the provision or revision of many benefits for staff personnel.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}}

At least one authority believes that specific permissive legislation may

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Ibid.}
\item Kleinman, p. 36.
\item \textit{Ibid.}
\end{itemize}}
not be necessary for school districts to provide insurance benefits for their personnel. Hamilton, in discussing a New Mexico case which upheld the right of a school district to expend funds on group insurance for teachers, observed that:

This case has great significance to education. It recognizes an implied power of boards to provide group and disability insurance for their teachers, if the boards desire. I know of no case to the contrary, and it is possible that educational leaders have been passing up potential substantial benefits for teachers.\(^{117}\)

Hamilton also discusses the similarity in basic principles of municipal cases in relation to possible school cases in this area:

The basic principles of these (municipal) cases would appear to be applicable to the school cases. While there is some conflict among the cases in point, courts generally sustain the power of municipalities to provide such insurance. Various grounds for sustaining the power have been stated. One ground is that providing insurance is but one way of increasing the salaries of its employees. Since the municipal authorities may legally determine the wages and salaries of their employees, the manner in which this is done is within the discretion of the authorities. Another ground is that the health and efficiency of employees are promoted by insurance, thus it serves to further the purposes of the organization. It is obvious that all these principles or rationalizations, if you wish, may be applied to schools just as logically and reasonably as to municipalities.\(^{118}\)

He goes on to ask, at the conclusion of his remarks:

May it not be possible that our preoccupation with higher salaries, retirement plans, and the like, has caused us to neglect the possibility of the important "fringe benefits" discussed herein? At any rate, I recommend that the possibilities suggested be examined carefully.\(^{119}\)


\(^{118}\) Ibid., pp. 18-19

\(^{119}\) Ibid., p. 20.
It would seem from the foregoing that, in the absence of legislation to the contrary, expenditure of school money for "fringe benefits" is neither illegal nor extra-legal. In discussing the New Mexico case, in which in the absence of statute, the right of a board of education to provide life insurance for its teachers was upheld, Hamilton further remarks, "The New Mexico case suggests that specific permissive legislation may not be necessary."120

Summary of Legal Problems

As boards of education prepare salary schedules, they are bound to observe three kinds of law - constitutional law, statutory law, and case law. Most states have minimum salary laws. Some of these differentiate minimums on the basis of experience. Other states grant state aid to districts on the basis of salary apportionments that vary according to the preparation of the teacher. The local communities are not held to the apportionment rates as minimums, however. In some, in the absence of specific legislation, local teachers' associations have been influential in determining salary rates. Another kind of legislation which regulates salary policy is legislation which prohibits boards of education from incorporating certain features in their salary schedules such as salary distinctions based on sex or race. Precedents in case law must also be observed as salary schedules are developed.

120Ibid., p. 17.
CHAPTER V

PROFESSIONAL VIEWS REGARDING THE BASES WHICH DETERMINE
TEACHERS' SALARIES

To evaluate and understand the bases which should be used to determine teachers' salaries, an historical review of teachers' salaries was presented in Chapter II. To further understand salary scheduling, schedules which determine the salaries paid to persons engaged in commercial and industrial occupations and in other professions were analyzed and compared with teachers' salaries in Chapter III. In the last chapter, the financial and legal considerations involved in salary scheduling were outlined. The limitations of financial resources and the legal restrictions of federal and state statutes and rules of local boards of education were discussed.

A. The Board Member

However, the foundation of a salary schedule is the policy decision regarding the base or bases which will be used to determine the schedule. This decision is made for a system of schools by its board of education. The board of education is a governmental body in that it is an agent of the state. It carries out the responsibility of the state, which is to educate the citizens of the state. The school board is composed of laymen and "varies in size from three to more than a dozen members. The modal number in city school systems is
seven and in rural areas, three."\textsuperscript{121}

Generally, the activities of boards of education can be classified under one of the following large functions: (1) planning and policy-making, (2) legislating and (3) appraising and evaluating.\textsuperscript{122} Planning and adopting a teachers' salary schedule is both a planning and policy-making function and a legislative function. With this in mind, the professional opinion of members of boards of education were solicited with regard to the bases which should be used to determine teachers' salaries.

Questionnaires (Appendix I) were mailed to 131 board members in the following seventeen districts:

- Albuquerque, New Mexico
- Baltimore, Maryland
- Chicago, Illinois
- Dallas, Texas
- Erie, Pennsylvania
- Harlingen, Texas
- Hartford, Connecticut
- Jacksonville, Florida
- Las Vegas, Nevada
- Nashville, Tennessee
- New Orleans, Louisiana
- Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
- Pasadena, California
- Rockford, Illinois
- St. Paul, Minnesota
- Savannah, Georgia
- Seattle, Washington

Of the four groups of persons surveyed through the questionnaire - board


\textsuperscript{122}Ibid., pp. 108-109.
numbers, general superintendents, principals, and teachers - the lowest percentage of questionnaires returned was from the board members. The percentage of returns varied from a return of eighty per cent of the board members in New Orleans to a zero per cent of returns from the board members in Dallas and Oklahoma City. The percentage of returns overall for board members was thirty-seven. Many assumptions can be made with regard to the low rate of return of questionnaires from board members, but the facts are disappointing when it is remembered that in the final decision the members of the board of education determine salary policy.

Analysis of the questionnaires returned by board members reveals the following information.

(1) 10 per cent favored separate salary schedules for elementary school teachers and for high school teachers

(2) 97\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent favored increments for experience; 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent did not.

(3) 12\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent favored annual increments for 5 years;
17\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent favored annual increments for 10 years;
30 per cent favored annual increments for 15 years;
17\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent favored annual increments for 20 years;
12\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent favored some other plan, such as annually for 25 years, or annually without limit.
10 per cent did not reply to the question.

(4) In granting increments, 12\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent felt that they should be predicated on satisfactory service; 87\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent felt that they should be predicated upon satisfactory service and professional growth.
(5) With regard to merit rating,

52\% per cent favored it,
35 per cent did not favor it;
12\% per cent did not express an opinion.

(6) 96 per cent favored equal salaries for men and women;
4 per cent did not.

(7) 4 per cent favored allowances for dependents; 96 per cent did not.

(8) 58 per cent felt that there should be extra pay for duties assumed in connection with extra-curricular activities, such as clubs, the school newspaper, etc.;
42 per cent felt that there should not be extra increments for this kind of service;

Of those who approved of increments for this kind of service, many felt that the increment should be granted only if it required service in addition to a regular teaching program.

(9) The board members were evenly divided on the matter of providing increments for schools which are difficult to staff; 50 per cent felt that such an increment should be provided and 50 per cent were against such a provision.

(10) 90 per cent favored increments for educational preparation in addition to that required for original certification; 10 per cent did not approve of compensation for this kind of study.

(11) 30 per cent favored schedules which recognize only an academic degree; 70 per cent favored intermediate schedules between the bachelor's degree and the master's degree and between the master's
degree and the doctor's degree.

(12) 55 per cent felt that a secondary school teacher should receive salary recognition for earning the number of hours required for certification to teach an additional subject; 45 per cent did not approve of additional compensation for this.

(13) 58 per cent favored salary recognition for an elementary school teacher who earns at least sixteen or eighteen hours in a subject taught in the elementary school such as geography, music, primary reading; 42 per cent did not favor such recognition.

(14) 55 per cent favored partial credit on a schedule for educational travel; 45 per cent did not favor this kind of credit.

(15) 9 per cent felt that during the time that a teacher is earning course credits he is less efficient as a teacher because of the time he must devote to study and to attending classes; 91 per cent indicated that they did not think that taking courses impaired a teacher's efficiency. Many added the comment that they felt it really depended upon the individual.

(16) 82 per cent favored constructing salary schedules to encourage secondary school teachers to earn master's degrees in subject areas or related fields rather than in education; 18 per cent did not favor this kind of construction.

(17) 86 per cent felt that there should be restrictions placed upon the kind of course credit which is accepted for placement upon a
particular schedule; 14 per cent felt that there should be no restrictions.

(18) 93 per cent felt that an advanced academic degree was likely to make a teacher a better teacher; 7 per cent felt that this was not so.

(20) 16 2/3 per cent felt that an advanced degree necessarily meant that a teacher was a better teacher; 83 1/3 per cent did not accept this premise.

(21) 21 per cent of the board members felt that ninety per cent of the teachers in their school systems were satisfied with the present method of determining salaries;
31 per cent of the board members felt that seventy-five per cent of the teachers were satisfied with the present method of determining their salaries; 13 per cent of the board members felt that fifty per cent of the teachers in their school system were satisfied with the present method of determining salaries;
3 per cent of the board members felt that twenty-five per cent of the teachers in their school system were satisfied with the present method of determining salaries
3 per cent of the board members felt that ten per cent of the teachers in their school system were satisfied with the present method of determining salaries;
29 per cent indicated that they could not venture an estimate.

(22) 18 per cent of the board members felt that the best teachers in their school systems were actually receiving the best salaries;
68 per cent of the board members indicated that they did not think
the best teachers were actually receiving the highest salaries; 13 per cent indicated that they did not know.

B. The General Superintendent

While the board of education is the policy-making body, the chief executive of a school system is the general superintendent. "...the board plans, legislates, evaluates, and interprets; the superintendent executes."

This is not to say that the general superintendent has no part in policy-making. As the highest professional educator in a school system, he must make recommendations to the board. His recommendation would be expected to be a major influence upon the policy decisions of the board. The general superintendent, then, not only executes a salary schedule but makes recommendations to the board regarding its structure. Opinions from general superintendents were solicited to determine their thinking with regard to the bases which should be used to determine teachers' salaries.

The questionnaire in Appendix II was sent to fifty general superintendents of schools. Following is a list of the superintendents who received the questionnaire and a report of those who responded indicated with an x. Sixty-six per cent of the superintendents responded.

| Akron          | Louisville       | x |
| Alaska         | Miami            | x |
| Atlanta        | Monterey         | x |
| Baltimore      | Nashville        |   |
| Birmingham     | Newark           |   |
| Boston         | New Orleans      |   |
| Brookline      | Oklahoma City    | x |
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Chicago x Pasadena x
Columbia x Portland
Dallas x Providence x
Denver x Riverside x
Des Moines x Rochester x
District of Columbia x Rockford
El Paso x Rock Hill
Erie x Sacramento x
Fond du Lac x St. Cloud x
Flint x St. Paul x
Gulfport x San Francisco x
Harlingen x Seattle x
Hartford x Spokane
Honolulu x Trenton x
Indianapolis x Tucson x
Ithaca x Wichita x
Jacksonville x Worcester
Las Vegas
Los Angeles

Analysis of the questionnaires revealed the following data regarding superintendents’ opinions of the bases used to determine teachers’ salaries schedules.

(1) 7 per cent of the superintendents felt that there should be separate salary schedules for elementary and secondary school teachers; 93 per cent believed that there should be a single salary schedule.

(2) 100 per cent of the superintendents believed that there should be increments for years of experience.

(3) 3 per cent favored annual increments for 5 years;
26 per cent favored annual increments for 10 years;
6 per cent favored annual increments for 12 years;
45 per cent favored annual increments for 15 years;
16 per cent favored annual increments for 20 years;
4 per cent favored increments for longevity.
(4) In granting increments, 34 per cent felt that they should be predicated upon satisfactory service; 6 per cent felt that they should be predicated upon professional growth; and 60 per cent felt that they should be predicated upon satisfactory service and professional growth.

(5) 13 per cent felt that increments should be based upon an estimate of a teachers' efficiency; 71 per cent indicated that they did not think salary should be based upon an estimate of a teachers' efficiency; 16 per cent did not express an opinion.

(6) 97 per cent favored equal salaries for men and women; 3 per cent did not.

(7) 13 per cent favored allowances for dependents; 87 per cent did not.

(8) 56\% per cent favored extra pay for duties assumed in connection with extra-curricular activities, such as clubs, the school newspaper, etc.; 31\% per cent did not favor such increments; 12\% per cent favored such increments only if the added duties involve time beyond the regular school day, not if such duties can be carried on as a part of the regular program.

(9) 20 per cent believed a teacher should receive an increment for teaching in a school which is difficult to staff; 80 per cent did not favor such an increment.

(10) 97 per cent favored increments for educational preparation in addition to that required for original certification; 3 per cent did not favor salary recognition of this kind.
(11) 32 per cent favored schedules only for academic degrees; 68 per cent favored intermediate schedules between the bachelor's degree and the master's degree and between the master's degree and the doctor's degree.

(12) 12\ 3/4 per cent believed that a secondary school teacher should receive salary recognition for earning the number of hours required for certification to teach an additional subject; 78\ 1/2 per cent did not feel that there should be salary recognition for this.

(13) 25 per cent felt that an elementary school teacher should receive salary recognition for earning course credit in an elementary subject such as geography, music, primary reading; 75 per cent did not favor compensation for this.

(14) The superintendents were evenly divided on the question of partial credit on a salary schedule for educational travel; 50 per cent favored it and 50 per cent did not.

(15) During the time that a teacher is earning course credit, 6 per cent felt that he is less efficient because of the time that he must devote to study and to attending classes; 72 per cent did not feel that this kind of activity impaired a teacher's efficiency, and 22 per cent felt that it was purely a matter of the individual teacher.

(16) 90 per cent felt that schedules should be so constructed as to encourage a secondary school teacher to earn a master's degree in the subject taught or in a related field; 10 per cent did not favor this kind of construction.
(17) 77\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent favored restrictions upon the kind of course credit which is accepted for placement upon a particular schedule; 12\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent did not favor restrictions.

(18) 90 per cent felt that an advanced degree is likely to make a teacher a better teacher; 10 per cent did not feel that this was so.

(19) 3 per cent indicated that they thought an advanced academic degree necessarily meant that a teacher was a better teacher; 97 per cent did not think that this was so.

(20) 37\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent of the superintendents felt that 90 per cent of the teachers in their school systems were satisfied with the present method of determining salaries;

31\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent of the superintendents felt that 75 per cent of the teachers in their school systems were satisfied with the present method of determining salaries;

3 per cent of the superintendents felt that 50 per cent of the teachers in their school systems were satisfied with the present method of determining salaries;

28\(\frac{1}{4}\) per cent felt that they could respond to the question.

(21) 20 per cent of the superintendents felt that the best teachers in their school systems were actually receiving the highest salaries;

33 1/3 per cent felt that the best teachers were not actually receiving the highest salaries; 16 2/3 per cent did not feel that they could respond to the question.
C. The Principal

Principals do not determine teachers' salaries except in cases of merit rating where the principal's rating is considered and in such instances as when they belong to a professional organization which attempts to exert influence over the kind of a salary schedule which should be adopted for teachers. This does not mean that the principal is not in an excellent position to evaluate the bases which are used to determine teachers' salaries. Consequently, professional opinions were solicited from principals with regard to the bases which should be used to determine teachers' salaries.

Questionnaires (Appendix III) were sent to 111 principals in five school systems - Chicago, Jacksonville, Trenton, Columbia, and Pasadena. Seventy percent of the questionnaires sent to the principals were returned. Among the four groups surveyed, board members, superintendents, principals, and teachers, the highest percentage of returns was from the principals. Following is a report of the number of questionnaires sent and the percentage of returns from each of the five school systems.

1. 52 questionnaires were sent to Chicago Public School principals; 34 or 65 per cent were returned.

2. 21 questionnaires were sent to elementary, junior high school, and senior high school principals in Jacksonville; 14 or 66 2/3 per cent were returned.

3. 11 questionnaires were mailed to elementary, junior high school, and senior high school principals in Trenton; 8 or 73 per cent were returned.
4. 10 questionnaires were mailed to elementary school, junior high school, and senior high school principals in Columbia, South Carolina; 7 or 70 per cent were returned.

5. 17 questionnaires were mailed to elementary school, junior high school, and senior high school principals in Pasadena; 14 or 82 per cent were returned.

Analysis of the questionnaires returned by the Chicago principals reveals the following:

(1) 30 per cent favored separate salary schedules for elementary school teachers and for secondary school teachers; 70 per cent favored a single salary schedule.

(2) 100 per cent favored increments for experience.

(3) 3 per cent favored annual increments up to 5 years;
    32 per cent favored annual increments up to 10 years;
    30 per cent favored annual increments up to 15 years;
    14 per cent favored annual increments up to 20 years;
    6 per cent favored annual increments up to 35 years;
    3 per cent favored annual increments without any limit;
    6 per cent favored annual increments every five years until retirement;
    6 per cent favored some other plan which they did not indicate.

(4) 15 per cent felt that increments for experience should be predicated upon satisfactory service and 85 per cent felt they should be predicated upon satisfactory service and professional growth.
(5) 43 1/3 per cent felt that increments should be based upon an estimate of a teacher's efficiency; 56 2/3 per cent did not feel that this kind of an evaluation should affect a teacher's salary.

(6) 100 per cent felt that salaries should be equal for men and women.

(7) 9 per cent favored an allowance for dependents; 91 per cent were not in favor of such an allowance.

(8) 56 per cent favored extra pay for duties assumed in connection with extra-curricular activities, such as clubs, the school newspaper, etc.; 44 per cent did not favor extra pay for this kind of activity.

(9) 60 per cent felt that a teacher should receive an increment for teaching in a school which is difficult to staff; 40 per cent did not favor such an increment.

(10) 94 per cent favored increments for educational preparation in addition to that required for original certification; 6 per cent did not approve of compensation for this kind of study.

(11) 35 per cent felt that there should be schedules only for academic degrees; 65 per cent felt that there should be intermediate schedules between the bachelor's degree and the master's degree and between the master's degree and the doctor's degree.

(12) 71 per cent felt that a secondary school teacher should receive salary recognition for earning the number of hours required for certification to teach an additional subject; 29 per cent felt that such recognition should not be given.

(13) 68 per cent favored salary recognition for course credit which an elementary school teacher earns in an elementary school subject such
as geography, music or primary reading; 32 per cent did not favor
this kind of recognition.

(14) 34 per cent favored partial credit for educational travel; 66 per
cent did not favor such credit on a salary schedule.

(15) 15 per cent felt that a teacher is less efficient as a teacher
during the time that he is taking classes; 65 per cent did not feel
that this impaired his efficiency; and 20 per cent felt that it was
strictly a matter of the individual.

(16) 93 per cent felt that salary schedules should be so constructed as
to encourage a secondary school teacher to earn a master's degree in
the subject taught or in a related field; 7 per cent did not favor
such a construction.

(17) 100 per cent favored restrictions upon the kind of course credit
which should be accepted for placement upon a particular schedule.

(18) 73 1/3 per cent felt that an advanced academic degree was likely to
make a teacher a better teacher; 26 2/3 per cent felt that an
advanced degree was not likely to make a teacher a better teacher.

(19) 100 per cent felt that an advanced academic degree did not
necessarily make a teacher a better teacher.

(20) 20 per cent of the principals in Chicago felt that 90 per cent of
the teachers were satisfied with the present method of determining
salaries.

18 per cent of the principals in Chicago felt that 75 per cent of
the teachers were satisfied with the present method of determining
salaries;
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9 per cent of the principals in Chicago felt that 50 per cent of the teachers were satisfied with the present method of determining salaries; 53 per cent of the principals did not respond to the question.

(21) 18 per cent felt that the best teachers in Chicago were receiving the highest salaries;
68 per cent felt that the best teachers in Chicago were not receiving the highest salaries;
14 per cent did not respond to the question.

Analysis of the questionnaires returned by the Columbia principals revealed the following:

(1) 100 per cent favored a single salary schedule for elementary school teachers and for secondary school teachers;
(2) 100 per cent favored increments for experience.
(3) 14 per cent favored annual increments for five years;
  14 per cent favored annual increments for ten years;
  57 per cent favored annual increments for 15 years;
  14 per cent favored annual increments for 20 years.
(3) 100 per cent felt that the increments for experience should be predicated upon satisfactory service and professional growth.
(4) 43 per cent favored increments based upon an estimate of a teacher's efficiency; 57 per cent did not favor this kind of a basis for salary determination.
(5) 86 per cent favored equal salaries for men and women; 14 per cent did not.
(6) 14 per cent favored allowances for dependents; 86 per cent did not.

(7) 57 per cent favored extra pay for extra duties; 43 per cent did not favor this kind of compensation.

(8) 57 per cent felt that a teacher should receive additional compensation for teaching in a school which is difficult to staff; 43 per cent did not feel that this is a good plan.

(9) 100 per cent felt that there should be increments for educational preparation in addition to that required for original certification.

(10) 14 per cent favored schedules only for academic degrees; 86 per cent favored intermediate schedules between the bachelor's degree and the master's degree and between the master's degree and the doctor's degree.

(11) 43 per cent favored salary recognition for a secondary school teacher who earns the number of hours required for certification to teach an additional subject; 57 per cent did not favor such salary recognition.

(12) 57 per cent favored salary recognition for the course credit earned by an elementary school teacher in an elementary school subject; 43 per cent did not favor such recognition.

(13) 86 per cent favored partial credit on a salary schedule for educational travel; 14 per cent did not favor such credit.

(14) 29 per cent felt that a teacher is less efficient during the time that he is earning course credit; 71 per cent felt that this does not impair a teacher's efficiency.
(15) 100 per cent favored restrictions upon the kind of course credit which is accepted for placement upon a particular schedule.

(16) 100 per cent felt that schedules should be so constructed as to encourage a secondary school teacher to earn a master's degree in the subject taught or in a related field.

(17) 100 per cent favored restrictions upon the kind of course credit which is accepted for placement upon a particular schedule.

(18) 86 per cent felt that an advanced degree is likely to make a teacher a better teacher; 14 per cent did not think that this is so.

(19) 14 per cent felt that an advanced academic degree necessarily means that a teacher is a better teacher; 86 per cent did not think that this is so.

(20) 14 per cent felt that 90 per cent of the teachers in Columbia are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries; 82 per cent felt that 75 per cent of the teachers are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries; 14 per cent felt that 50 per cent of the teachers in Columbia are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries; 14 per cent felt that 10 per cent of the teachers in Columbia are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries; 14 per cent did not comment on this matter.

(21) 29 per cent felt that the best teachers in Columbia are actually receiving the highest salaries, 71 per cent felt that the best teachers are not actually receiving the highest salaries.
Analysis of the questionnaires returned by the Duval County principals (Jacksonville) revealed the following:

(1) 100 per cent favored a single salary schedule for elementary school and secondary school teachers.

(2) 100 per cent favored increments for experience.

(3) 25 per cent favored annual increments for 10 years;
   25 per cent favored annual increments for 15 years;
   50 per cent favored annual increments for 20 years.

(4) 100 per cent felt that the increments for experience should be predicated upon satisfactory service and professional growth.

(5) 33 1/3 per cent felt that increments should be based upon an estimate of a teacher's efficiency; 66 2/3 per cent did not favor this.

(6) 100 per cent felt that salaries should be equal for men and women.

(7) 16 2/3 per cent favored allowances for dependents; 66 2/3 per cent did not favor such an allowance.

(8) 76 per cent favored extra pay for extra duties; 24 per cent did not.

(9) 33 1/3 per cent felt that teachers in schools which are difficult to staff should receive an increment; 66 2/3 per cent did not favor such an increment.

(10) 92 per cent favored increments for educational preparation in addition to that required for original certification;
     8 per cent did not.

(11) 41 2/3 per cent favored schedules only for academic degrees;
50 per cent favored intermediate schedules between the bachelor's degree and the master's degree and between the master's degree and the doctor's degree;

8 1/3 per cent favored only one schedule for the master's and doctor's degrees.

(12) 23 per cent felt that a secondary school teacher should receive salary recognition for earning the number of hours required for certification to teach an additional subject; 77 per cent did not favor salary credit of this kind.

(13) 15 per cent favored salary recognition for course credit earned by an elementary school teacher in an elementary school subject such as geography, music, primary reading, etc.; 85 per cent did not favor salary recognition for this kind of credit.

(14) 83 1/3 per cent approved of partial credit on a salary schedule for educational travel; 16 2/3 per cent did not approve of salary credit for this.

(15) 18 per cent felt that a teacher is less efficient as a teacher during the time that he is earning course credit; 82 per cent felt that taking classes did not impair his efficiency at the time.

(16) 100 per cent feel that salary schedules should be so constructed as to encourage a secondary school teacher to earn a master's degree in the subject taught or in a related field.

(17) 50 per cent felt that there should be restrictions placed upon the kind of course credit which is accepted for placement upon a
particular schedule; 50 per cent did not.

(18) The Jacksonville principals were also evenly divided on the question of whether an advanced academic degree is likely to make a teacher a better teacher; 50 per cent felt that it does; 50 per cent did not.

(19) 100 per cent felt that an advanced degree does not necessarily mean that a teacher is a better teacher.

(20) 16 2/3 per cent of the Jacksonville principals who responded felt that 90 per cent of the teachers are satisfied with the present method of determining teacher's salaries;
25 per cent of the principals felt that 50 per cent of the teachers are satisfied with the present method of determining teacher's salaries;
8 1/3 per cent felt that 25 per cent of the teacher's are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries;
33 1/3 per cent felt that 10 per cent of the teachers are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries;
25 per cent did not respond to the question.

(21) 83 1/3 per cent indicated that they did not think that the best teachers were actually receiving the highest salaries;
16 2/3 per cent indicated that they thought they were.

Analysis of the questionnaires returned by the Pasadena principals revealed the following:

(1) 100 per cent favored a single salary schedule.
(2) 100 per cent favored increments for experience.
56 1/4 per cent favored annual increments for 10 years;
12 2/3 per cent favored annual increments for 15 years;
18 3/4 per cent favored annual increments for 20 years;
6 1/4 per cent favored annual increments for 25 years;
6 1/4 per cent favored annual increments for 30 years;

100 per cent felt that increments for experience should be based upon satisfactory service and professional growth.

50 per cent favored increments based upon an estimate of a teacher's efficiency; 50 per cent did not.

93 per cent favored equal salaries for men and women; 7 per cent did not.

7 per cent favored allowances for dependents; 93 per cent did not.

15 per cent favored extra pay for extra duties; 85 per cent did not.

31 per cent favored increments for teaching in a school which is difficult to staff; 69 per cent did not.

100 per cent favored increments for educational preparation in addition to that required for original certification.

100 per cent favored intermediate schedules between the bachelor's degree and the master's degree and between the master's degree and the doctor's degree.

46 per cent favored salary recognition for the number of hours required for certification to teach an additional subject earned by a secondary school teacher; 54 per cent did not.

50 per cent felt that an elementary school teacher should receive
salary recognition for earning course credit in an elementary school budget; 50 per cent did not.

(14) 100 per cent favored recognizing educational travel for partial credit on a schedule.

(15) 25 per cent felt that a teacher is less efficient during the time that he is earning course credit; 50 per cent felt that he is not; 25 per cent felt that it depends on the individual.

(16) 77 per cent felt that schedules should be so constructed as to encourage a secondary school teacher to earn a master's degree in the subject taught or in a related field; 23 per cent did not.

(17) 85 per cent favored restrictions upon the kind of course credit which is acceptable for placement upon a particular schedule; 15 per cent did not.

(18) 93 per cent felt that an academic degree is likely to make a teacher a better teacher; 7 per cent did not.

(19) 7 per cent felt that an academic degree necessarily means that a teacher is a better teacher; 93 per cent did not.

(20) 100 per cent felt that 90 per cent of the teachers are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries.

(21) 70 per cent felt that the best teachers in the school system are actually receiving the highest salaries; 30 per cent felt that they are not.

Analysis of the salary schedules returned by the Trenton principals revealed the following:
(1) 100 per cent favored a single salary schedule.

(2) 100 per cent favored increments for experience.

(3) 25 per cent favored annual increments for 5 years;
    371/2 per cent favored annual increments for 10 years;
    25 per cent favored annual increments for 15 years;
    121/2 per cent favored some other plan.

(4) 25 per cent felt that increments for experience should be predicated upon satisfactory service; 75 per cent felt that they should be based upon satisfactory service and professional growth.

(5) 50 per cent favored increments based upon an estimate of a teacher's efficiency; 50 per cent did not favor such an increment.

(6) 100 per cent felt that salaries should be equal for men and women.

(7) 100 per cent felt that there should not be allowances for dependents.

(8) 371/2 per cent favored extra pay for extra duties; 621/2 per cent did not.

(9) 100 per cent were against increments for teaching in a school which is difficult to staff.

(10) 100 per cent favored increments for educational preparation in addition to that required for original certification.

(11) 25 per cent favored schedules only for academic degrees;
    75 per cent favored intermediate schedules between the bachelor's degree and the master's degree and between the master's degree and the doctor's degree.

(12) 371/2 per cent felt that a secondary teacher should receive salary
recognition for earning the number of hours required for
certification to teach an additional subject; 50 per cent do not; 12½ per cent did not comment.

(13) 50 per cent felt that an elementary school teacher should receive
salary recognition for earning course credit in an elementary
school subject; 37½ per cent did not. 12½ per cent did not
comment.

(14) 62½ per cent favored partial credit on a schedule for educational
travel; 37½ per cent did not.

(15) 100 per cent felt that a teacher is not less efficient during the
time that he is earning course credit.

(16) 100 per cent felt that schedules should be so constructed as to
encourage a secondary school teacher to earn a master's degree in
the subject taught or in a related field.

(17) 75 per cent felt that there should be restrictions placed upon the
kind of course credit which is accepted for placement upon a
particular schedule; 25 per cent did not.

(18) 87½ per cent felt that an academic degree is likely to make a
teacher a better teacher; 12½ per cent did not think so.

(19) 37½ per cent of the Trenton principals thought that 90 per cent of
the teachers are satisfied with the present method of determining
salaries.

37½ per cent felt that 75 per cent of the teachers are satisfied with
the present method of determining salaries.
25 per cent did not respond to the question.
(20) 12\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent felt that an advanced academic degree does necessarily mean that a teacher is a better teacher; 
67\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent felt that a teacher is not necessarily a better teacher because of an advanced degree.

(21) 37\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent felt that the best teachers are actually receiving the highest salaries; 62\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent felt that they are not actually receiving the highest salaries.

Analysis of the principals' questionnaires as a whole revealed the following:

(1) 12 per cent favored separate salary schedules for elementary school teachers and for secondary school teachers; 88 per cent favored a single salary schedule.

(2) 100 per cent favored increments for experience.

(3) 5 per cent favored increments annually for 5 years; 36 per cent favored increments annually for 10 years; 27 per cent favored increments annually for 15 years; 20 per cent favored increments annually for 20 years; 12 per cent favored increments annually for a longer period of time.

(4) 10 per cent favored increments for satisfactory service; 90 per cent favored increments for experience based upon satisfactory service and professional growth.

(5) 43 per cent favored increments based upon an estimate of a teacher's efficiency; 57 per cent did not favor this.

(6) 98 per cent favored equal salaries for men and women; 2 per cent did not.
(7) 10 per cent favored allowances for dependents; 90 per cent did not.

(8) 50 per cent favored extra pay for extra duties; 50 per cent did not.

(9) 44 per cent believed that a teacher should receive an increment for teaching in a school which is difficult to staff; 56 per cent did not favor such an increment.

(10) 61 per cent believed that there should be increments for educational preparation in addition to that required for original certification; 5 per cent did not.

(11) 27 per cent favored schedules only for academic degrees; 73 per cent favored intermediate schedules between the bachelor’s degree and the master’s degree and between the master’s degree and the doctor’s degree.

(12) 50 per cent believed that a secondary school teacher should receive salary recognition for earning the number of hours required for certification to teach an additional subject; 50 per cent did not.

(13) 53 per cent believed that an elementary school teacher should receive salary recognition for earning course credit in an elementary school subject; 47 per cent did not.

(14) 55 per cent believed in partial credit on a salary schedule for educational travel; 45 per cent did not.

(15) 16 per cent felt that a teacher is less efficient during the time that he is earning course credits; 68 per cent did not; and 16 per cent felt that it is a matter of the individual.

(16) 93 per cent felt that schedules should be so constructed as to encourage a secondary school teacher to earn a master’s degree in the
subject taught or in a related field; 7 per cent did not.

(17) 86 per cent favored restrictions upon the kind of course credit which is accepted for placement upon a particular schedule; 14 per cent did not.

(18) 76 per cent felt that an academic degree is likely to make a teacher a better teacher; 24 per cent did not.

(19) 4 per cent felt that an academic degree necessarily means that a teacher is a better teacher; 96 per cent did not.

(20) 33 per cent of the principals felt that 90 per cent of the teachers in their school system are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries;

13 per cent of the principals felt that 75 per cent of the teachers are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries;

9 per cent of the principals felt that 10 per cent of the teachers are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries;

38 per cent of the principals did not comment.

(21) 27 per cent of the principals felt that the best teachers are actually receiving the highest salaries; 62 per cent felt that they are not; and 11 per cent did not comment.
D. The Teacher

Teachers are, of course, the individuals most concerned with the kind of a salary schedule which determines their salaries. Consequently, a study of the bases which should be used to determine teachers' salary schedules would not be complete without an expression of opinion from teachers with regard to the bases which should be used to determine teachers' salaries.

To achieve this, questionnaires (Appendix IV) were distributed to elementary school, junior high school, and secondary school teachers in the cities of Chicago, Illinois, Pasadena, California, and Jacksonville, Florida (Duval County). Following is a report of the number of questionnaires distributed and the percentage of returns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Number distributed</th>
<th>Per cent returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the questionnaires returned by the Chicago teachers revealed the following:

(1) 15 per cent favored separate salary schedules for elementary school teachers and for secondary school teachers; 85 per cent favored a single salary schedule.

(2) 98 per cent favored increments for experience; 2 per cent did not.

(3) 2 per cent favored annual increments up to 5 years;
    15 per cent favored annual increments up to 10 years;
    25 per cent favored annual increments up to 15 years;
41 per cent favored annual increments up to 20 years; 17 per cent favored some other plan.

(4) 18 per cent felt that increments for experience should be predicated upon satisfactory service; 5 per cent felt that they should be predicated upon professional growth; 77 per cent felt that they should be predicated upon satisfactory service and professional growth.

(5) 26 per cent favored increments based upon an estimate of a teacher's efficiency; 74 per cent did not.

(6) 90 per cent favored equal salaries for men and women; 10 per cent did not.

(7) 24 per cent favored allowances for dependents; 76 per cent did not.

(8) 52 per cent favored extra pay for extra duties; 48 per cent did not.

(9) 73 per cent felt that a teacher should receive an increment for teaching in a school which is difficult to staff; 27 per cent did not.

(10) 92 per cent favored increments for educational preparation in addition to that required for original certification; 8 per cent did not.

(11) 16 per cent favored schedules only for academic degrees; 84 per cent favored intermediate schedules between the bachelor's degree and the master's degree and between the master's degree and the doctor's degree.
(12) 72 per cent felt that a secondary school teacher should receive salary recognition for earning the number of hours required for certification to teach an additional subject; 28 per cent did not.

(13) 74 per cent felt that an elementary school teacher should receive salary recognition for earning course credit in an elementary school subject; 26 per cent did not.

(14) 44 per cent favored partial credit on a schedule for educational travel; 56 per cent did not.

(15) 19 per cent felt that a teacher is less efficient during the time that he is earning course credit; 81 per cent did not.

(16) 94 per cent felt that schedules should be so constructed as to encourage a secondary school teacher to earn a master's degree in the subject taught or in a related field; 6 per cent did not.

(17) 75 per cent favored restrictions upon the kind of course credit which is accepted for placement upon a particular schedule; 25 per cent did not.

(18) 70 per cent felt that an advanced degree is likely to make a teacher a better teacher; 30 per cent did not.

(19) 3 per cent felt that an advanced academic degree is likely to make a teacher a better teacher; 97 per cent did not.

(20) 6 per cent felt that 90 per cent of the teachers in Chicago are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries; 20 per cent felt that 75 per cent of the teachers are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries;
20 per cent felt that 50 per cent are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries;
5 ½ per cent felt that 25 per cent are satisfied with the present method;
5 ½ per cent felt that 10 per cent are satisfied with the present method; 1 3 per cent did not comment.

(21) 9 per cent felt that the best teachers in Chicago are actually receiving the highest salaries; 6 ½ per cent did not; and 27 per cent did not comment.

Analysis of the questionnaires returned by the Jacksonville teachers revealed the following:

(1) 16 per cent favored separate salary schedules for elementary and secondary school teachers; 84 per cent favored a single salary schedule.

(2) 69 per cent favored increments based upon an estimate of a teacher's efficiency; 31 per cent did not.

(3) 20 per cent favored allowances for dependents; 80 per cent did not.

(4) 71 per cent favored extra pay for extra duties; 29 per cent did not.

(5) 1 6 per cent felt that a teacher should receive an increment for teaching in a school which is difficult to staff; 52 per cent did not.

(6) 93 per cent favored increments for educational preparation in addition to that required for original certification;
7 per cent did not.

(7) 19 per cent favored schedules only for academic degrees; 81 per cent favored intermediate schedules between the bachelor's degree and the
master's degree and between the master's degree and the doctor's degree.

(8) 56 per cent felt that a secondary school teacher should receive salary recognition for earning the number of hours required for certification to teach an additional subject; 44 per cent did not.

(9) 58 per cent felt that an elementary school teacher should receive salary recognition for earning course credit in an elementary school subject; 42 per cent did not.

(10) 70 per cent favored partial credit on a schedule for educational travel; 30 per cent did not.

(11) 30 per cent felt that a teacher is less efficient as a teacher during the time that he is earning course credit; 70 per cent did not.

(12) 97 per cent felt that schedules should be so constructed as to encourage a secondary school teacher to earn a master's degree in the subject taught or in a related field; 3 per cent did not.

(13) 91 per cent favored restrictions upon the kind of course credit which is accepted for placement upon a particular schedule; 9 per cent did not.

(14) 86 per cent felt that an advanced academic degree is likely to make a teacher a better teacher; 14 per cent did not.

(15) 100 per cent felt that an advanced academic degree does not necessarily mean that a teacher is a better teacher.

(16) 3 per cent felt that 90 per cent of the teachers in Jacksonville are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries;
6 per cent felt that 75 per cent of the teachers are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries;
13 per cent felt that 50 per cent of the teachers are satisfied with the present method;
11 per cent felt that 25 per cent of the teachers are satisfied with the present method;
1.6 per cent felt that 10 per cent of the teachers are satisfied with the present method;
21 per cent did not respond to the question.

(17) 7 per cent felt that the best teachers in Jacksonville are actually receiving the highest salaries; 80 per cent felt that they are not; and 13 per cent did not comment.

Analysis of the questionnaires returned by the Pasadena teachers revealed the following:

(1) 11 per cent favored separate salary schedules for elementary and secondary school teachers; 88 per cent favored a single salary schedule.

(2) 100 per cent favored increments for experience.

(3) 8 per cent favored increments annually for 5 years;
30 per cent favored increments annually for 10 years;
26 per cent favored increments annually for 15 years;
30 per cent favored increments annually for 20 years;
9 per cent favored some other plan.

(4) 11 per cent felt that increments for experience should be predicated upon satisfactory service; 89 per cent felt they should be predicated upon
upon satisfactory service and professional growth.

(5) 30 per cent favored increments based upon an estimate of a teacher's efficiency; 61 per cent did not.

(6) 99 per cent felt that salaries should be equal for men and women; 1 per cent did not.

(7) 11 per cent favored allowances for dependents; 89 per cent did not.

(8) 71 per cent favored extra pay for extra duties; 29 per cent did not.

(9) 55 per cent favored an increment for teaching in a school which is difficult to staff; 45 per cent did not.

(10) 95 per cent favored increments for educational preparation in addition to that required for original certification; 5 per cent did not.

(11) 6 per cent favored schedules only for academic degrees; 94 per cent favored intermediate schedules between the master's and doctor's degrees.

(12) 70 per cent felt that a secondary school teacher should receive salary recognition for earning the number of hours required for certification to teach an additional subject; 30 per cent did not.

(13) 74 per cent favored salary recognition for course credit earned in an elementary school subject by an elementary school teacher; 26 per cent did not.

(14) 93 per cent favored partial credit on a schedule for educational travel; 7 per cent did not.

(15) 30 per cent felt that a teacher is less efficient during the time he is earning course credit; 70 per cent did not.
(16) 92 per cent felt that salary schedules should be so constructed as to encourage a secondary school teacher to earn a master's degree in a related field; 8 per cent did not.

(17) 76 per cent favored restrictions upon the kind of course credit which is accepted for lane placement; 24 per cent did not.

(18) 77 per cent felt that an academic degree is likely to make a teacher a better teacher; 23 per cent did not.

(19) 100 per cent felt that an academic degree does not necessarily make a teacher a better teacher.

(20) 1 per cent felt that 100 per cent of the teachers in Pasadena are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries; 32 per cent felt that 90 per cent of the teachers are satisfied; 31 per cent felt that 75 per cent of the teachers are satisfied; 1 per cent felt that 10 per cent are satisfied; 35 per cent did not respond to the question.

(21) 22 per cent felt that the best teachers in Pasadena are actually receiving the highest salaries; 60 per cent felt that they are not; and 18 per cent did not respond to the question.

The following added comments appeared on the questionnaires of Pasadena teachers:

"I believe we have a good schedule - the maximum is twice the minimum."

"I am personally satisfied with our salary schedule."

"Pasadena has a very good schedule."

"Our system has a splendid schedule."

"I feel that ours is excellent."
"I think ours is tops."

"Pasadena has a fine salary schedule which the great majority of teachers appreciate."

"Our system has a fine plan for teachers' salaries and we are all grateful and work to improve ourselves."

Analysis of the teacher's questionnaires as a whole revealed the following:

(1) 10 per cent favored separate salary schedules for elementary and secondary school teachers; 90 per cent favored a single salary schedule.

(2) 99 per cent favored increments for experience; 1 per cent did not.

(3) 5 per cent favored increments for experience annually up to 5 years; 24 per cent favored increments for experience annually up to 10 years;

26 per cent favored increments annually up to 15 years;

31 per cent favored increments annually up to 20 years;

11 per cent favored increments for experience based on some other plan.

(4) 14 per cent felt that increments for experience should be predicated upon satisfactory service;

3 per cent felt that increments for experience should be predicated upon professional growth;

83 per cent felt that increments for experience should be based upon satisfactory service and professional growth.

(5) 41 per cent favored increments based upon an estimate of a teacher's efficiency; 59 per cent did not.
(6) 95 per cent felt that salaries should be equal for men and women; 5 per cent did not.

(7) 17 per cent favored allowances for dependents; 83 per cent did not.

(8) 64 per cent favored extra pay for extra duties; 36 per cent did not.

(9) 59 per cent felt that a teacher should receive an increment for teaching in a school which is difficult to staff; 41 per cent did not.

(10) 93 per cent favored increments for educational preparation in addition to that required for original certification; 7 per cent did not.

(11) 10 per cent favored schedules only for academic degrees; 90 per cent favored intermediate schedules between the bachelor's degree and the master's degree and the doctor's degree.

(12) 68 per cent felt that a secondary school teacher should receive salary recognition for earning the number of hours required to teach an additional subject; 32 per cent did not.

(13) 70 per cent felt that an elementary school teacher should receive salary recognition for earning course credit in an elementary school subject; 30 per cent did not.

(14) 70 per cent felt that educational travel should be recognized for partial credit on a schedule; 30 per cent did not.

(15) 26 per cent felt that a teacher is less efficient during the time he is earning course credit; 74 per cent did not.

(16) 94 per cent felt that schedules should be so constructed as to encourage a secondary school teacher to earn a master's degree in the
subject taught or in a related field; 6 per cent did not.

(17) 79 per cent favored restrictions upon the kind of course credit which is accepted for placement upon a particular schedule; 21 per cent did not.

(18) 75 per cent felt that an advanced academic degree is likely to make a teacher a better teacher; 25 per cent did not.

(19) 99 per cent felt that an advanced academic degree does not necessarily mean that a teacher is a better teacher; 1 per cent did.

(20) 17 per cent felt that 90 per cent of the teachers in their school system are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries; 22 per cent felt that 75 per cent of the teachers in their school system are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries; 10 per cent felt that 50 per cent of the teachers in their school system are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries; 5 per cent felt that 25 per cent of the teachers in their school system are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries; 13 per cent felt that 10 per cent of the teachers in their school system are satisfied with the present method of determining salaries; 33 per cent did not comment.

(21) 66 per cent felt that the best teachers in their school system are not receiving the highest salaries; 14 per cent felt that they are, and 20 per cent did not comment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>board members</th>
<th>superintendents</th>
<th>principals</th>
<th>teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Salary schedule</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increments for experience</td>
<td>97 1/2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increments for merit</td>
<td>52 1/2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal salaries for men and women</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency allowances</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra pay for extra duties</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56 1/2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increments for teaching in a school which is difficult to staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increments for additional preparation</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate schedules between the academic degrees</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increments for secondary teachers who acquire additional certification</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12 1/2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increments for elementary teachers who increase preparation in depth in an elementary school subject</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial credit on a schedule for travel</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should a secondary school teacher be encouraged to acquire a master's degree in a subject area?</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the best teachers in your school system receiving the highest salaries?</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A school district prepares a budget, which is a plan for financing the
district for a period of time, usually one year, in order that the funds avail-
able for the operation of the district may be spent most prudently in such a
way that they help to secure the maximum of quality in education in that
district. Quality education depends upon quality teachers. Quality education
is also directly related to the level of expenditure because cost-quality
studies, as previously cited, prove a one-to-one relationship between expendi-
ture level and quality. The quality of teachers according to research, is thus
related to the expenditure level of a district.

The expenditure level for teacher's salaries has increased regularly and
considerably during the history of our country. To appreciate this, we need
only reflect upon the financial and professional position of the teacher at
other periods. In the early colonial period the status of the teacher was
extremely low. The person who contracted to teach usually had to agree to
assume other duties such as church sexton, bell ringer, or preacher, since
teaching was not considered a profession in itself. In addition the teacher
had to cooperate with a system known as 'boarding round', whereby the teacher
would stay with the families of the children he taught for periods of time
varying according to the number of children in the family who were taught.
This was necessary to maintain a livelihood which was mere sustenance. In some cases, teachers were indentured servants. In the post-colonial period, such reforms as normal schools, teachers' institutes, state and county supervision, and certification laws were underway. In the period following the Civil War, the position of the teacher improved considerably. After 1890, the economic position of the teacher advanced in spite of the setbacks caused by the World War and the depression of the 1930's. More time and effort on the part of more interested parties and organizations was devoted to the problem of teachers' salaries than at any preceding period in American history. By the second decade of the twentieth century, salary scheduling was progressing from a crude state to one of carefully defined policies and procedures. Since 1935, teachers' salaries have risen significantly. This is due in part to the improvement in the economy of the nation, in part to the shortage of teachers, and in part to the more professional status accorded teachers. Today the teacher has tenure, the security of a salary schedule rather than individual bargaining, fringe benefits, and incentives for professional growth.

Even though the position of the teacher is remarkably better than at any other period of our national history, the financial or professional position of the teacher has not advanced as well as that of persons in other professions. In 1950, the median income of teachers was less than that of persons in fourteen other professions - physicians, dentists, lawyers, osteopaths, architects, engineers, veterinarians, pharmacists, natural scientists, chemists, social scientists, editors and reporters, foresters, and social welfare workers.

This has resulted in a severe recruitment problem for boards of education
as college students and graduates make their vocational choices. The NEA research report cited above reports the median minimum salary in school districts with a population over 500,000 to be $4,000 for persons with a bachelor's degree and $4,500 in districts 100,000-499,999. Dr. Frank Endicott, Director of Placement, Northwestern University, in his Seventeenth Annual Report, reveals the following as average starting salaries for men college graduates of 1963 in various occupations: engineering, $6,816; accounting, $6,000; sales, $5,772; general business trainees, $5,736; other fields, $5,988.

The unfavorable financial position of teachers in relation to persons in other professions and occupations is due to several factors. The revenue available for teachers' salaries is limited. The greatest source of revenue for the operation of the schools is the property tax. This is a local tax which currently runs third to state and federal tax yields. This is the situation today, whereas in 1933, the property taxes produced more revenue than all the other taxes put together. In 1956, it was producing eleven per cent of the total. Increased state and federal taxes over the past few decades have drained millions of dollars of wealth from the local communities. Consequently, local taxes, such as the property tax, cannot be expanded to the point where they can accommodate the financial needs of a school district. The tax system is at the point where it is returning a fixed amount, but with the rapid expansion of the economy, persons in other professions and occupations are in a strategic position to advance their political positions.

Another factor which retards the proper progression of teachers' salaries is public opinion with regard to teachers. The image which exists in the public mind regarding a profession helps to determine what the public is
willing to pay in compensation to a member of the group. The stereotypes of the teacher which have been developed do not create a favorable image. Too, many members of the public do not regard the teacher as a professional.

Another facet of public opinion which keeps teachers' salaries depressed is the public attitude toward public services and the tax bills it must pay to sustain them. People, for the most part, place a higher value on private production than they do on government services because in the purchase of the products of private production an individual makes a personal determination with regard to the way his money is spent. The payment of taxes is not voluntary nor is the individual given a part in determining how his taxes will be spent. The public mind, in its determination of worth, values private production as good economically and public expenditures as money spent "down the drain." This disparity in economic values has resulted in holding teachers salaries at a lower level than they should be.

With only limited funds available, there is all the more reason why the funds that are available should be spent cautiously to achieve the greatest value from them. It would seem that one way in which they could be used to encourage a respect for quality education would be to reward the best teachers by paying them the highest salaries. This does not seem to be the case very generally. Of the respondents to the questionnaire, only eighteen per cent of the board members, twenty per cent of the superintendents, twenty-seven per cent of the principals, and fourteen per cent of the teachers felt that the best teachers were actually receiving the highest salaries through the operation of the teachers' salary schedule in the school system with which they were associated.
Why is this so? Why is the money apparently not being distributed properly? It could be concluded that the bases which determine the distribution of money for salaries are faulty or inadequate. If this is true, the schedule is not accomplishing purposes which it could accomplish. It is not providing an incentive for teacher growth. It is not creating good morale. It does not satisfy the board member that he has made the best policy decision. It does not give the superintendent the feeling that he is administering a good instrument. It does not give the principal and teacher the feeling that justice is prevailing.

What should be done with regard to the formulation of teachers' salary schedules?

B. Recommendations

Basic to a good salary schedule is sufficient revenue so that the lowest salary is sufficient to attract the most able college graduates and the highest sufficient to adequately reward the experienced superior career teacher as a true member of a profession. Following are recommendations for the implementation of such a schedule.

1. There should be a single salary schedule for elementary school teachers and for secondary school teachers. This enables a teacher to teach at the level at which he can teach most effectively.

2. There should be increments for experience, predicated upon satisfactory service and professional growth. The experienced teacher is, most usually, a better teacher than the inexperienced teacher and for the good teacher, the more experienced she becomes, the better she
becomes. While there is not complete correlation between experience and the quality of teaching service, there is a direct relationship which should be recognized on a salary schedule.

3. To offset the inequities of increments for experience, a school district might explore the possibility of increments for merit to find a satisfactory method of determining this and a method which would be acceptable to those involved. It could be a goal of salary makers to devise such a method, but until a successful one is constructed, increments for merit should be withheld. There is not as much opposition to merit rating as some literature and some professional organizations would lead an observer to believe. Of the persons who responded to the questionnaire, thirteen per cent of the superintendents favored a merit increment, forty-one per cent of the teachers favored it, forty-three per cent of the principals favored it, and fifty-two and one-half per cent of the board members favored it.

4. Salaries should be equal for men and women. Differentials do not improve the quality of teaching service.

5. There should not be increments for dependents. These differentials, likewise, do not improve the quality of teaching service.

6. There should not be extra pay for extra duties if the responsibility for such duties is compensated by a reduction in the teaching load. If there is not a compensation in time, a district should give consideration to monetary compensation.

7. There should be increments for teaching in a school which is difficult to staff, if the reason why it is difficult to staff cannot be
overcome by administrative provisions.

8. There should be increments for educational preparation beyond that required for original certification. There should be more flexibility than just recognition for academic degrees. There should be intermediate schedules between the bachelor's and master's degree and between the master's degree and doctor's degree. There should be restrictions upon the kind of course credit which is acceptable for placement upon a particular schedule. Otherwise, the situation becomes farcical and the teacher is advancing to a higher schedule by earning course credit in subjects which do not make the teacher a better teacher. Intermediate placement should require at least sixteen or eighteen hours. It might be the amount needed for certification to teach an additional subject. For an elementary teacher, it could be a strengthening of preparation in an area of the elementary school curriculum. The secondary school teacher should be encouraged to obtain a master's degree in a subject area rather than in the field of education. This incentive should be definite and positive because the secondary school teacher is more likely to be a better secondary school teacher if he has a master's degree in a subject area rather than in education.

A salary schedule with these adoptions is more likely to discriminate positively and to reward the better teachers than a schedule without these provisions. The schedule is a sounder one if it rewards the teachers in the degree to which they should be rewarded. No man-made instrument, by its very nature, can be perfect, but it is felt that the recommendations above would
relieve and eliminate some of the inequities which do exist in salary schedules. These recommendations would offer incentive to good teachers to become better teachers. This would mean a consequent increase in the quality of education in the school district embodying them in its salary schedule. Many present-day schedules include some of these recommendations. All of them can be found in different schedules, but no schedule includes all of them. A schedule which would include them would be an eclectic schedule embodying the best of present-day practices. Through financial recognition of quality teachers, talented and intellectually able young people would be attracted into the profession and superior teachers would be retained on a career basis. Morale would be high. The schedule would be a further move toward the goal of quality education, a system of education wherein every student regardless of his racial, national, religious, cultural, or economic background would have the opportunity to reach his optimum in intellectual, moral, social, and physical development, the key to which is a professional, competent, highly skilled quality teacher.
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